SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Almighty God, creator of the universe, and father of all mankind, we render to Thee our humble praises for Thy many blessings to us as a nation and people. Especially in times of concern, help us to realize these blessings. We would ask Thy guidance and direction of this body of government—leaders of the people. Through them and their deliberations may Thy purposes for mankind be advanced, and may we as a nation thus be knit together in a closer unity—a unity which enables men to be strong and at the same time to serve their fellows. This our prayer we offer in Thy name and presence. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EVA BOWRING, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. BOWRING 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 Tuesday, August 17, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

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 amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9859) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10203. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Demetrios Christos Mataraggiotis, and Zoi Demetre Mataraggiotis, his wife, and Christos Mataraggiotis and Constantinos Mataraggiotis, their minor sons;

H. R. 717. An act for the relief of Henriette Matter;

H. R. 822. An act for the relief of Sister Giuseppina Giaccone;

H. R. 832. An act for the relief of Katharine Balsamo;

H. R. 834. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher;

H. R. 839. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Gertrude (Mary Gertrude Kelly);

H. R. 877. An act for the relief of Nasser Esphahanian;

H. R. 1622. An act for the relief of Agustin Mondreal;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Johann Groben;

H. R. 1904. An act for the relief of Patricia A. Pembroke;

H. R. 1975. An act to amend section 2201 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act to the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2061. An act for the relief of Regine du Planty;

H. R. 2154. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leona Hungry;

H. R. 2392. An act for the relief of Brother Eugene Cumerlato;

H. R. 2460. An act for the relief of Charlotte Margarita Schmidt;

H. R. 2483. An act for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia;

H. R. 2500. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Majzner (alias Stanley Maisner);

H. R. 2794. An act for the relief of Mrs. Claire Godreau Daigle;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Sergio Emeric;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of Louie Ella Attaway;

H. R. 3447. An act for the relief of Maria Paccione Pica;

H. R. 3507. An act for the relief of Maj. Elias M. Tsougranis;

H. R. 3520. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erna Rosita Pont (formerly Erna Rosita Michel);

H. R. 3566. An act for the relief of Pimen Maximovich Sofronov;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Marko Ribic;

H. R. 3750. An act for the relief of Inge Beckmann;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards;

H. R. 3874. An act for the relief of Roberto Johnson;

H. R. 4015. An act for the relief of Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg;

H. R. 4054. An act for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana and Montserrat Thomasa-Sanchez Massana;

H. R. 4426. An act for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme and her child;

H. R. 4427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka;

H. R. 4437. An act for the relief of Louise Rank;

H. R. 4522. An act for the relief of Petrus Van Keer;

H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of Alexander Petsche;

H. R. 4908. An act for the relief of Pietro Petralia;

H. R. 4969. An act for the relief of Basilios Xarhoulacos;

H. R. 5119. An act for the relief of Augusta Oppacher Bialek;

H. R. 5194. An act for the relief of Pauline Katzmann;

H. R. 5319. An act for the relief of Henry (also known as Heinrich) Schor, Sally (also known as Sali) Schor, and Gita (also known as Gitta Aviva) Schor;

H. R. 5344. An act for the relief of Bob Kan and Fourere Kan;

H. R. 5459. An act for the relief of Takeko Ishiki;

H. R. 5553. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-lung;

H. R. 5718. An act to limit the period for collection by the United States of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws;

H. R. 5749. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Lubiato;

H. R. 6266. An act for the relief of Frank Robert Gage;

H. R. 6355. An act for the relief of Elena Scarpetti Savelli;

H. R. 6442. An act for the relief of Tamiko Fujiwara;

H. R. 6492. An act for the relief of Rodolfo Navarro;

H. R. 6498. An act for the relief of Elfriede Lina Avitable, nee Roser;

H. R. 6672. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit;

H. R. 6752. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giuseppa De Lisa Quagliano;

H. R. 6762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irmgard (Chrapko) Broughman;

H. R. 6858. An act for the relief of Mrs. Efthemia Soteralis;

H. R. 7031. An act for the relief of Mrs. George A. Meffan;

H. R. 7033. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna J. Weigle;

H. R. 7151. An act for the relief of Mazal Kolman;

H. R. 7217. An act for the relief of Astor Vergata;

H. R. 7229. An act to provide for the conveyance to T. M. Pratt and Annita C. Pratt of certain real property in Stevens County, Wash.;

H. R. 7581. An act for the relief of Gaetano Conti;

H. R. 7734. An act to amend section 47 of the National Defense Act concerning the requirement for bond covering certain property issued by the United States for use by Reserve Officers' Training Corps units maintained at educational institutions;

H. R. 7762. An act for the relief of M. M. Hess;

H. R. 7813. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or cancel certain charges on the Milk River project;

H. R. 7828. An act for the relief of Mariana George Loizos Kellis;

H. R. 7829. An act for the relief of Shimasoi Michiko;

H. R. 7834. An act for the relief of Erika Schneider Buonasera;

H. R. 7885. An act for the relief of Sohan Singh Rai and Jogindar Kaur Rai;

H. R. 7938. An act for the relief of Miss Martha Heuschele;

H. R. 7947. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erika (Hohenleitner) Stapleton;

H. R. 8065. An act for the relief of Carlos Francisco, Manriqueta Mina, and Roberto Mina Ver;

H. R. 8205. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to Virginia Electric & Power Co. of a perpetual

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

easement of right-of-way for electric transmission line purposes across lands of the Richmond National Battlefield Park, Va., such easement to be granted in exchange for, and in consideration of, the conveyance for park purposes of approximately 6 acres of land adjoining the park;

H. R. 8244. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen;

H. R. 8375. An act for the relief of Ilse Radler Hughes;

H. R. 8424. An act for the relief of Mrs. Else Johnson;

H. R. 8554. An act for the relief of Maria M. Khoe;

H. R. 8557. An act for the relief of Ezio Bertoni;

H. R. 8628. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to insure that crude silicon carbide imported into the United States will continue to be exempt from duty, and with respect to the duties applicable to certain prepared fish;

H. R. 8859. An act to convey the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the city of Pawnee, Okla.;

H. R. 8932. An act to reclassify dictophones in the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 8936. An act for the relief of Dana Evanovich;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of Paul James Patrie;

H. R. 9248. An act to amend section 308 (5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 9496. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Hoeft;

H. R. 9512. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franziska (Han) Rigau;

H. R. 9790. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1948, so as to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain public lands in Monroe County, Mich., held under color of title;

H. R. 9953. An act for the relief of Mr. Fu-Ho Chan, Mrs. Fu-Ho Chan, and their child, Richard Chan; and

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 84th Congress.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam 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. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, dated June 1, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION CONTRACT, ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession contract to operate a lodge and provide related services in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS OF MEMBERS OF CREEK NATION OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the distribution of funds belonging to the members of the Creek Nation of Indians, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON MAINTENANCE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

A letter from the Chairman, Rubber-Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Small Defense Plants Administration, for the period from July 31, 1951, through July 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. R. 8651. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo. (Rept. No. 2492).

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

H. R. 9434. A bill to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy (Rept. No. 2493).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H. R. 1553. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2494); and

S. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on excusing Government employees from work on the afternoon of August 31, 1954, to attend the parade of the American Legion in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2495).

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

H. R. 9728. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics" (Rept. No. 2496);

H. R. 9729. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census" (Rept. No. 2497); and

H. R. 9730. A bill to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2498).

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H. R. 569. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases (Rept. No. 2499).

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3884. A bill for the relief of Sing Fong York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and placed on the calendar:

H. R. 10187. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers', auctioneers', and brokers' fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10203. An act to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, since the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] became chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, he has directed the professional staff of the committee to prepare a summary of the activities of the committee during each session of the Congress.

This summary is in the nature of a report to the Congress and to the people of the legislative activities of the committee.

For the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the document ran about 50 pages.

The report for the second session is now in preparation. It will be comprehensive, covering all activities since the beginning of the 2d session of the 83d Congress. It will run possibly 80 pages.

Inasmuch as it is not feasible to submit the report prior to the adjournment of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent for and on behalf of the chairman of the committee, who is absent from the Senate on official business, to submit such report entitled "Summary of Activities of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 83d Congress, 2d Session," after adjournment of the Congress, and to have it printed as a Senate document.

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

MISS IDA KLAUS

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, the city of New York is, at the present time,

organizing and expanding its labor department, a development of which I very much approve, and on which Mayor Robert F. Wagner is to be highly commended. In the process of organizing and expanding this department, Miss Ida Klaus, who for the past 17 years has been employed by the National Labor Relations Board—for the past 6 years as solicitor—has been named as counsel to the New York City Department of Labor.

Miss Klaus' resignation from the NLRB was announced on August 13, to become effective on September 1. I was pleased to see in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to Miss Klaus by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, [Mr. MORSE] who inserted an exchange of correspondence between Miss Klaus and the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Guy Farmer, and also a fine column summarizing Miss Klaus' career in Government, written by Mr. John Herling. This column appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 10.

I am glad that the Senator from Oregon saw fit to commend Miss Klaus, who was originally a New Yorker and now returns to New York to lend her talents to the department of labor of our great metropolis, to assist our Mayor Wagner in giving labor relations their due recognition in our city government.

Although I have not had the opportunity to know Miss Klaus personally, I have known of her work for many years. She has attained a unique status for her sex. Her legal skill has been widely acclaimed. Her expertness in the field of labor law is generally recognized.

I am sure she will continue to do outstanding work in the labor field and that she will add luster to the department of labor of New York City.

LEGISLATIVE GAINS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak not more than 4 minutes on 2 matters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, there are about 4,200,000 business establishments in the United States. Of these, 96 percent are classed as small. New England, in particular, as I have frequently had occasion to say on the floor of the Senate, is a region which draws greatly for its strength upon the energy, resourcefulness, and imagination of its small-business firms.

The 12 months just ended have been notable for the legislative gains to small business through action we have taken in the Senate. I should like to take this occasion to review these gains briefly.

It was just over a year ago that we passed the bill which created the Small Business Administration. I was, I am glad to say, a cosponsor of that bill and testified in its support before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. During the year since the bill was enacted, I have had the opportunity, both as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which reviews the Small Business Administration's budget requests and as a member of the Committee on Small Business, to learn something about the job which the Small Business Administration has been doing. That has been a constantly improving job. It has been done more economically and with ever-increasing efficiency.

Despite the enormous number of business enterprises which it serves, the Small Business Administration is a small agency with fewer than 600 employees. Its major functions fall under four headings. The first of these, and from our point of view in Massachusetts perhaps the most important, is to render assistance to small firms in getting a fair share of Government contracts, both military and civil. Experience has shown that unless special procedures are set up, designed to assure greater participation of small business in Government procuments, the long-run tendency is to concentrate the Government business more and more in large firms. The most effective means thus far worked out of combating this tendency is the so-called joint determination. Under this procedure, representatives of the Small Business Administration meet with purchasing representatives of other Government agencies to go over items to be procured and determine what types and what quantities can be efficiently and economically furnished by small firms. In this way, certain procurements and portions of procurements are selected as appropriate for small businesses. These are set aside exclusively for bidding by them. The Government is thus assured the best possible prices and small business is assured participation in Government purchases.

In the year since the Small Business Administration has been administering set-asides for small business, Massachusetts has received striking benefits. Our small firms bidding on set-asides have won contracts in 79 separate cases, with a total value of $4,185,563. I ask unanimous consent, Madam President, to have inserted at this point in my remarks a list of these firms. It is, I think, an impressive list, including, as it does, firms scattered all over Massachusetts in every type of productive enterprise.

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

TYPE OF PROCUREMENT, JANUARY–JUNE 1954

Angier Sales Corp., Framingham, Mass., $80,729; barrier, wrapping, greaseproof.

Associated Engineers, Inc., Springfield, $27,619; preparation of standard inspection procedure, 30 mm. automatic gun.

Atkins & Merrill, Inc., South Sudbury, $13,085; training aids and drawings.

Atwood & Morrill Co., Salem, $6,321; hydraulic globe valves.

Braeburn Mfg. Co., Lowell, $41,781; coats, firemen.

Baird & McGuire, Inc., Holbrook, $3,694; Wood, preservative.

Charles Belsky, Holyoke, $10,500; cloths, wiping, reclaimed, all cotton, mixed colors, washed and sterilized, water and oil absorbent.

Bomac Laboratories, Inc., Beverly, $35,700; tube-type 1B 27, stock No. N 16–T–51227.

Bomac Laboratories, Inc., Beverly, $41,250; electron tube-type 1B 27–TR–Tube stock No. N 16 T–51227.

Bomac Laboratories, Inc., Beverly, $140,000; tube, hydrogen thratron-type 5C 22.

J. G. Bowden & Son, Inc., Boston, $9,130; webbing, cotton and nylon, natural dyed and finished.

Wm. D. Bright Industries, Waltham, $71,816; panel.

Cargocaire Engineering Corp., Amesbury, $6,470; floating bridge parts.

Control Engineering Co., Norwood, $28,280; amplifiers, magnetic for position indicators, MK 8 and MK 9.

Dempsey Industrial Furnace Co., Springfield, $8,400; furnace, forge, heating, oil-fired.

Charles Dowd Box Co., Inc., Worcester, $2,157; boxes, corrugated.

Doyle Shoe Co., Brockton, $292,105; shoes.

Elnar Products, Inc., Lynn, $266,600; MK 3 pallets.

Everlastik, Inc., Chelsea, $71,825; webbing—nylon.

Exclusive Rug Co., Inc., Chelsea, $27,440; cloths, wiping, reclaimed, all-cotton fabrics, mixed colors, washed and sterilized, water and oil absorbent.

The Granet Corp., Framingham, $1,557; gloves.

Hoyt Worthing Tanning Co., Haverhill, $15,324; chamois, sheepskin.

International Braid Co., Inc., Fall River, $39,275; webbing, cotton and nylon, natural, dyed and finished.

International Equipment Co., Boston, $9,814; medical supplies.

J & J Corrugated Box Corp., Fall River, $1,290; box, corrugated, fiberboard.

R. H. Long Co., Inc., Framingham, $287,332; shoes.

J. R. Lyman Co., Springfield, $15,219; cloths, wiping, reclaimed, all-cotton fabrics, mixed colors, washed and sterilized, water and oil absorbent.

T. Barry Kingman, Marine Construction Co., Cataumet, $66,600; 40-foot personnel boat.

Massachusetts Electric Construction Co., Boston, $49,964; installation of prime-heat treating and auxiliary equipment in building 39.

Massachusetts Waste Supply Co., Chelsea, $24,366; cloth, wiping, cotton, class 2.

Middlesex Paper Tube Co., Lowell, $2,057; VC 1 tubes.

Moore & Cram Webbing Co., West Concord, $3,048; webbing, cotton and nylon, natural dyed and finished.

Needham Manufacturing Co., Inc., Needham, $40,061; pendant chain, bridle chain, minesweeper gear.

Palmer Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wakefield, $31,891; box, electric outlet.

A. Pritzker & Son, Inc., Lawrence, $91,596; jackets, aviators, leather.

Rockland Webbing Co., Rockland, $15,520; webbing, cotton and nylon, natural dyed and finished.

Stevens Walden, Inc., Worcester, $19,320; handle, socket, one-quarter inch square drive, 21 inch diameter, close quarter, and handle, socket, wrench driver and extension, one-quarter inch square drive.

Thos. Taylor & Sons, Hudson, $27,019; cord, elastic, for various aircraft.

Traymore Manufacturing Co., Boston, $15,520; webbing, cotton and nylon, natural dyed and finished.

Ultrasonic Corp., Cambridge, $69,794; sonar, testing sets.

Utility Metal Products Co., Inc., Beverly, $18,310; locker, clothes, shipboard type.

Van Brodie Milling Co., Clinton, $26,000; kit, fishing.

Victory Plastics Co., Hudson, $155,560; M8 A1, scabbard, bayonet, knife.

Waltham Horological Corp., Lynn, $51,870; connector, plug.

Roflan Co., Topsfield, $80,892; trailer, floodlight, with spare parts.

Utility Metal Products Co., Inc., Beverly, $165,341; lockers, clothes, shipboard type.

Bomac Laboratories, Inc., Beverly, $16,125; TR tube, type 1B 58.

John Addison, Marlboro, $164,808; shoes, service, black, high.

Henschel Corp., Amesbury, $22,503; syncro, signal amplifiers.

Sig-Trans, Inc., Amesbury, $93,000; ship control and steering control consoles for FY 54.

Quincy Adams Yacht Yard, Inc.; Quincy, $421,476; aircraft rescue boats.

Shield, Inc., Attleboro, $11,747; badges, clasp and button, lapel.

John Addison Footwear Co., Marlboro, $196,914; boots, service, combat.

R. H. Long Co., Inc., Framingham, $120,005; shoe, high, leather, black.

Adell Corp., Orange, $9,616; reel for 16 mm. film.

Marlboro Wire Goods Co., Marlboro, $32,-976; 3-732-100 splint, wire, ladder 3½ inch by 31 inch.

Market Forge Co., Everett, $18,626; truck, shelf, hand, 4 shelves, 12 meat.

Keith & Keith & McCain, Inc., Rockland, $105,073; radio set cover, CW 329 G.

Apco Mossberg Co., Attleboro, $9,405; wrench, socket.

Baird & McGuire, Inc., Holbrook, $8,465; spray, 20-percent DDT.

Astra Pharmaceutical Products, Inc., Worcester, $193,756; lidocaine hydrochloride with epinephrine injection cartridges.

Potter Press, Waltham, $10,651; paper, recording teletype.

French Mfg. Co., Worcester, $18,086; poncho, short.

Berkshire Plastics Co., Inc., East Longmeadow, $31,807; wads, pyrelin, four 5-inch oblique line, 54 ammunition.

Sirsteak Machinery, Inc., Concord, $2,015; various machine works.

Sparling Bros. Machine Co., New Bedford, $323; various machine works.

Cummings Machine Works, Boston, $1,975; various machine works.

Lombard Governor Corp., Ashland, $11,647; various machine works.

L. F. Fales Machine Co., Walpole, $3,328; various machine works.

Cooperative Machine Co., Jamaica Plain, $852; various machine works.

Pneumatic Drop Hammer Co., Braintree, $1,865; various machine works.

Eugene Engineering Co., Hyde Park, $10,-149; various machine works.

Boston Paper Board Co., Boston, $1,725; paper, duplicating, liquid process.

Deerfield Glassine Co., Monroe Bridge, $33,-160; paper, tracing, overlay.

A. E. Look, Inc., Boston, $4,669; suture, various sizes.

McGregor Instrument Co., Needham, $24,-381; needles, various sizes.

John Addison Footwear, Inc., Marlboro, $41,440; shoes, leather.

O. G. Kelley & Co., Dorchester, $15,091; tanks assembly, photographic mixing and storing.

Hoyt & Worthen Training Corp., Haverhill, $38,462; chamois, sheepskin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, the second major function of the Small Business Administration is rendering financial assistance to small concerns, but never in competition with private lending agencies. It has approved several loans in Massachusetts to deserving small concerns, either directly or in conjunction with banks. Even more important, perhaps, is its financial counselling service through which many owners and operators of small concerns have been able to get their financial houses in order without recourse to loans.

In addition to making business loans, the Small Business Administration has the third function of making disaster loans to aid in the rehabilitation of homes and businesses damaged in windstorms, fires, floods, and other catastrophies. In Massachusetts, fishermen received such loans to assist them in recovering from the devastating storms which swept the New England coast last fall, and more recently, citizens of Peabody, Mass., flooded out by the bursting of a dam, received similar assistance.

Fourth in the list of major functions is the rendering of managerial and technical aid to managements which cannot afford to employ high-priced experts. Pamphlets and booklets are published, addressed to the specific problems of small business, written by experts in their line, and supplying the latest information on administrative and technical processes. More than a million of these publications have been distributed on a request basis and through reprints by trade associations.

Madam President, in addition to establishing the Small Business Administration, the 83d Congress has assisted small business by eliminating inequities in our tax laws which stifled its growth and expansion. In so doing, we have strengthened our entire economy to the benefit not only of those who manage and work in small business, but those who consume the goods and services which are produced.

Last year the Senate Committee on Small Business conducted extensive hearings aimed at exposing the obstructions and handicaps to small business which had crept into our tax laws over the years. The findings of our committee were made available to the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Provisions designed to eliminate these obstructions and handicaps were accordingly incorporated in the monumental tax revision bill submitted by the administration to Congress. With a number of additional improvements helpful to small business, it was recently passed by Congress.

Here are some of the ways in which the new law—the first comprehensive revision of our tax structure in 75 years—will aid small concerns:

Liberalized depreciation: This permits faster write-offs for depreciation on new property acquired in 1954 and later years. Its effect will be to permit tax-free recovery of about two-thirds of the cost in the first half of service life, thus aiding small businesses in the financing of their modernization and expansion.

Treatment of surplus accumulations: This section provides that the burden of proof shall be on the Government to show that earnings accumulations by firms are unreasonable. It also exempts the first $60,000 of earnings accumulations from the penalty tax and takes only the accumulations which are unreasonable in amount.

Research and experimental expenditures: For the first time, a small business, lacking a regular research and experimental budget, has a clear right to deduct its research outlays as current expenses or to amortize them over a 5-year period.

Loss carryover: The new law increases the net loss carryback provision to two years, instead of one year previously allowed. This helps take care of businesses with irregular or spotty earnings, by permitting the offset of losses over a longer period. Any individual who sells his business or business assets will be permitted to use his loss on the sale as a net operating loss carryover.

Relief from double taxation of dividends: Double taxation of corporate earnings has heretofore reduced the incentive to invest, particularly in small new concerns, and has restricted the marketability of new equity shares. Under the new law, the taxpayer is allowed a credit against tax of 4 percent of dividends from domestic corporations, plus an exclusion of the first $50 received. This should stimulate the supply of equity capital.

Optional tax treatment for certain partnerships and corporations: Under the previous system there might be marked differences in tax liability of a business depending on whether it operated as a partnership or a corporation. The new law provides clear, flexible, and equitable rules for handling partnership transactions.

Changes in capital structure: The new law permits the issuance of preferred stock dividends to holders of common stock, without subjecting such distribution to income tax at the time of distribution. This is calculated to remove tax barriers to needed financial rearrangements, so new financing may be had without the temptation by the owners of a small concern to sell out to a large concern.

Redemption of stock to pay estate taxes: The new act broadens the present provisions which permit the tax-free redemption of stock in a corporation to pay estate taxes. Its purpose is to avoid the forced sale or liquidation of a business in order to pay Federal estate taxes.

These tax savings for the individual restore freedom to the individual to spend more of his own money as he sees fit, and increase disposable personal income and thus purchasing power. For business, the savings will help to achieve healthy growth and thereby strengthen the national economy.

Madam President, I believe that the 83d Congress can properly take satisfaction in these achievements on behalf of small business. Certainly I for one take pride in my part in contributing to their fulfillment.

Madam President, I have one other brief statement which I should like to make at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN ADEQUATE OVERSEAS UNITED STATES INFORMATIONAL PROGRAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, a group of prominent citizens, all professionally qualified in the field of communication technique, have voluntarily formed a Committee for an Adequate Overseas Information Program. The committee will perform an important public service by adequately informing their fellow Americans of the true nature and extent of the vicious

campaign being currently waged by the Soviet against this country aimed at discrediting us in the eyes of the world.

The cold war has reached a critical stage. It is more urgent than ever that the United States Government should have an aggressive and positive overseas information program.

In this battle for men's minds, the Communists are conducting an all-out local assault to depict the United States as a Nation of warmongers, as barbarians lacking in culture, who are holding the atomic bomb over the heads of everyone as a threat.

We know this is untrue. We must let the world know it. And to do this effectively, it is imperative that our overseas information program should be thoroughly understood by all Americans.

The membership of the Committee for an Adequate Overeas Information Program has such weight that I am sure it will be most helpful in giving support to the task of the United States information agencies in countering the lies of the enemy and in establishing the truth about the policies of the United States.

I wish the committee success in its most important undertaking.

STOCKPILING OF MANGANESE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for approximately 5 minutes in the morning hour.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, manganese is a very important metal to the future of this country, not only to its domestic needs, but to its needs in time of war. In view of this, a stockpile was established at Deming, N. Mex., because the Government owned stockpiling property and there was a sampling mill there during the war. Then a stockpile was established at Butte, Mont., because the Government was part owner of a mill there. Then a stockpile was established in my State of Arizona, at Wenden.

The ultimate goal of this stockpile program for 1958 is 36 million units. However, it does not appear that this objective will be met. The stockpile in Arizona has apparently done the best of all. The buying station at Butte has not done too well. It is possible that the Wenden portion of the stockpile program will be exhausted about December of this year.

Because we could see that coming, and because of the urgency of stockpiling manganese, we started, in January of this year, attempting to get some answers from the ODM. The purpose of my remarks this morning is to call the attention of the Senate to the difficulty the State of Arizona has experienced in getting even sensible, reasonable answers from the Office of Defense Mobilization.

In January of this year, the Wenden station was just finishing its first year, and it expended more than $2 million for manganese ores. There were 55 regular shippers at the rate of about 3,000 tons a week, the ore averaging about 19 percent and bringing, on the average, about $25 a ton.

On February 2 of this year, a letter went to Dr. Flemming, signed by the entire Arizona congressional delegation, asking that the Wenden quota be raised by 6 million long-ton units of manganese, and stating that otherwise the station would have to close by April 1955.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 2, 1954.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: A survey made by the Arizona State Department of Mineral Resources discloses that at the present rate of intake the 6 million unit quota of manganese allotted to be purchased at the depot at Wenden, Ariz., will be exhausted by April 1955. As you know, under the Malone-Aspinall Act the program does not expire until June 30, 1958.

The survey further shows that it will take an allotment of a further 6 million units of manganese to keep the depot running at its present rate to June 30, 1958.

Due to the low price of zinc and lead and the consequent closing of Arizona mines, the manganese industry in Arizona has assumed important economic proportions. Furthermore, we believe that encouraging a domestic manganese industry is of great importance to the country.

We ask that you have a check made of the conditions cited in this letter, with the view of authorizing and directing the General Services Administration to allocate an additional 6 million units to be purchased at the Wenden depot under regulations not less favorable than those at present in force.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senator.
CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senator.
HAROLD A. PATTEN,
Member of Congress.
JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Later, Madam President, the estimate of April 1955 had to be moved up to December of this year.

This letter also pointed out that manganese mines would take up some of the slack in the mine labor situation created by the lead-zinc shutdown.

Because of the indecision of ODM, and indecision with respect to the entire stockpile program, there is not a lead and zinc mine operating in the State of Arizona today. Yet this is a critical material.

Then on February 19 I wrote a long letter to Dr. Flemming, giving more reasons for adding to the Wenden quota, and asking for an immediate decision. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

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

FEBRUARY 19, 1954.

Dr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: The manganese buying station at Wenden, Ariz., has been so successful in developing a manganese industry in Arizona that its life has been shortened by the fact that deliveries to the station will catch up with allocations long before the Government manganese buying program has been completed.

One only has to study the figures of the three manganese depots, each of which was allotted 6 million units, to ascertain the situation in which the program now stands. Up to December 31, 1953, the unit tabulation stood as follows:

Butte and Phillipsburg, Mont.	428,809
Deming, N. Mex.	789,618
Wenden, Ariz.	2,089,283

In addition to these figures, we must consider the fact that the nationwide carlot program was allotted 19 million units, of which only 557,252 units were delivered up to December 31, 1953.

Under the Malone-Aspinall Act, the date on which this depot must be closed, unless Congress takes further action, will be June 30, 1958. It is perfectly obvious, however, that the present quota of 6 million units for Wenden will be exhausted by April of 1955. I feel that it is urgently important that an additional authorization of 6 million units be made, because it would enable this depot to remain open until the end of the authorized period. This is entirely within the province of your office to accomplish, because it is obvious that two of the stations will have difficulty filling their allotted units, while it is, at the same time, obvious that the Wenden depot will fulfill its allotted units long before the expiration date of the act. The transfer of unused units from other stations would be a highly desirable thing to accomplish because it would encourage further production of manganese in Arizona and would so establish this industry that it would not require a Government buying program after the present requirements have been met.

The men who, by their investments and their efforts, have accomplished the outstanding success of the Wenden depot are entitled to know just what is facing them. If a decison is delayed much longer on the further allocation of units to Wenden, it will seriously affect their financing and the proper planning for economic and profitable production by these 50-odd producers.

If my office can be of any assistance to yours in the solution of this problem let me know, but I would like to have some indication from you as soon as possible as to your intentions concerning Wenden.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, on March 26 the President announced his new mineral policy to aid domestic producers, and mineral producers all over the West took heart because they felt that finally the White House was cognizant of their dire situation, and that something would be done to hurry up the process of making decisions.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks my letter addressed to Dr. Flemming, dated April 15, 1954, and his reply thereto, dated April 20, 1954.

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

APRIL 15, 1954.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: On the 19th of February of this year I wrote to you concerning the allocation by the Government of an additional 6 million units to the manganese depot

at Wenden, Ariz. To this hour I have received no acknowledgment or reply to that letter.

Entirely apart from the urgency of the request as set forth in the aforementioned letter, I think that I am at least entitled to the courtesy of a response thereto. I consider your negligence in this regard inexcusable, and I shall expect an immediate statement from you, not only in answer to my original communication but also in explanation of your tardiness in making that information available to me.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1954.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: This is in reply to your letter of April 15, 1954, in which you point out our negligence in not replying to your letter of February 19 recommending the allocation by the Government of an additional 6 million units to the manganese depot at Wenden, Ariz.

You are quite right. Such delay in at least an acknowledgment cannot be justified, and you have our apologies. In fact, I am using this case to get across to ODM staff that such delays will not be tolerated in the future.

In explanation, but not as an excuse, the proposal made by your letter has been complicated by a number of varying but related proposals for manganese depots and programs. It proved difficult to decide one without deciding all.

During the past 2 months we have been examining the supply-requirements situation in manganese, which has changed considerably since current objectives were set. Interagency advice has been secured on some of the difficult issues involved. Finally, we are studying the implications for manganese of the policies recently announced by the President for long-term stockpile objectives.

You may be sure I will let you know at once when a decision is made. In the meantime, I am going to ask one of my assistants to contact you within the next week in order to go over the entire picture with you. Again, my sincere regrets at our delay in acknowledgment.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On April 23, 1954, I called a conference in my office, at which the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was in attendance, along with other Members of Congress. It was a most unsatisfactory conference. Members of the ODM were there, and they informed us that the additional manganese could be bought in the open market at a savings of from $5 million to $6 million; and, also, that ODM felt it might have enough manganese for both the short- and the long-term programs, but that they were making a study and would let us know.

They apologized for not answering the various letters, for indeed we have had difficulty getting ODM to answer our letters, to say nothing of giving us some intelligent replies when they do answer. They apologized for this, and the March 26 policy was discussed.

On May 1 of this year the congressional delegation wrote a letter to Dr. Flemming, based on the above-mentioned meeting, outlining a plan whereby the ODM could allot the additional units, and again asking that it be done.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter be made a portion of my remarks at this point.

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

MAY 1, 1954.

Mr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization,
Executive Office Building,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLEMMING: In our conference with Messrs. Weaver and Curtis on April 23d we were informed that the stockpile is overbought on manganese and that both the short- and long-range objectives were met prior to the policy statement of March 26, 1954. These calculations were said to include such manganese under the domestic 37 million long-ton units programs as it is expected will be produced by the expiration dates of those programs.

We wish to call to your attention that the Congress, in passing the Malone-Aspinall bill extending the time limits on the domestic procurement programs, not only expected that the entire amounts would be purchased, but provided that the Government should not be limited in further extending the programs, either in quantity or time. There is no implication that the amounts to be procured should be restricted to any particular district or districts. The idea was to stimulate domestic manganese production.

Your representatives admitted that, as the program now is set up, it will not be completed within the legal period as was contemplated by the Congress.

We, therefore, renew our request that an additional 6 million units be allotted to Wenden, for the reasons already advanced in other correspondence, and that you rely upon the fact that sufficient earmarked funds will be returned at the expiration of the programs to more than cover the Wenden commitment. This plan was discussed with Messrs. Weaver and Curtis.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senator.
CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senator.
HAROLD A. PATTEN,
Member of Congress.
JOHN J. RHODES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On April 28 of this year Representative PATTEN, of Arizona, introduced H. R. 8919, to direct the ODM to allot 6 million units to Wenden. This bill was not reported until August 9 of this year.

On May 20 Dr. Flemming wrote a long letter to me in answer to the letter of May 1, the omnibus letter, in which he said practically nothing except that "As indicated in my April 26, 1954, letter, I hope to resolve the issue very shortly."

My senior colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] also received a copy of this letter.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1954.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: I have your May 1, 1954 letter, signed jointly by you, Senator HAYDEN and Congressmen PATTEN and RHODES in which you refer to your recent discussion with Messrs. Weaver and Curtis about the metallurgical manganese ore situation and in which you again urge adoption of your February 2, 1954, proposal that the quota of six million long ton units of manganese ore allotted to the Wenden, Ariz. low-grade manganese ore purchase depot be doubled. In this respect you speak of the intent of the Malone-Aspinwall bill to bring about fulfillment of the domestic purchase depot and carload lot program without reference to production from specific districts and you suggest that financing an increased quota for Wenden could be made from funds earmarked for other purchases under the program which are unlikely to be made. We shall, of course, weigh these points carefully in the course of determining our policy regarding the further acquisition of metallurgical manganese ore.

I would, however, like to comment on one remark in your letter. It cannot be said that both the short- and long-range stockpile objectives have been met at this time. The present or "short range" inventory objective will probably be reached early in 1955, according to presently scheduled shipments under existing contracts. The "long range" objective, however, has not yet been officially established and it will not be precisely known until the current interagency review of supply and requirements factors is completed, a task which may not be accomplished until the end of May or early in June. In saying that the long term objective was covered, I understand Mr. Weaver and Mr. Curtis qualified their statement with the comment it was based on a preliminary estimate of the objective in relation to present inventories and existing contractual commitments under both stockpile and expansion program contracts.

As indicated in my April 26, 1954 letter, I hope to resolve the issue very shortly. Meanwhile I am appreciative of your recommendations and suggestions in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, not getting any results from Dr. Flemming, I wrote the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Small Business [Mr. THYE] on June 9, 1954, outlining the whole Wenden situation in detail, and asking for investigation and action. I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be inserted 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:

JUNE 9, 1954.

Hon. EDWARD J. THYE,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: Attached hereto are copies of letters I have received from certain small mine operators in Arizona and California who ship manganese ore to the GSA purchase depot at Wenden, Ariz. Eighteen letters are attached, but some of them are signed by several operators. More are arriving in the mail each day. I also enclose a letter from the Arizona State Department of Mineral Resources and a tabulation of receipts of manganese at the various Government purchase stations.

Although the attachments are nearly self-explanatory, a short sketch of the situation is in order. The original Government domestic purchase program for manganese called for the purchase of 37 million long-ton units. Eighteen million units were to be purchased at 3 GSA buying stations, each station being allotted arbitrarily 6 million

units without respect to the potential production of the areas. The remaining 19 million units comprise the so-called nationwide carlot program which limits shippers to 10,000 tons of eligible material each.

For one reason or another the domestic programs clearly could not be completed in the time originally set by the GSA directive, and the Aspinall Act was passed extending the time to June 1958. An inspection of my memorandum of May 5, 1954, attached hereto, shows that only at the Wenden, Ariz., station is substantial production being obtained. The overall program is less than 15 percent complete. Production in the Wenden area is rapidly expanding and it now appears that the 6 million long-ton unit allotment may be exhausted by the end of this year.

The producers in the Wenden area have made substantial investments and the operations have absorbed a number of lead and zinc miners who have been thrown out of work. It is essential that the quota at Wenden be raised to lengthen the life of the buying station there, and, as one can see by referring to my memo of May 5, the overall program is so far from being complete that there appears to be no reason why the Wenden quota should not be increased.

I have not been able, after much negotiation with ODM, to obtain a satisfactory reply to my request, and I suggest that the Small Business Committee look into the matter in detail. At the same time the possibility of lifting the 10,000 ton limitation on the carlot program should be considered.

Satisfactory explanations of the delay in the stockpile program at this small mine level have not been forthcoming from ODM. Attempts to get satisfactory explanations have been in vain. If you see fit to direct the attention of the Small Business Committee to this disturbing situation, the staff member who is assigned to this might call Bill Broadgate at Sterling 3-1100. Mr. Broadgate will be happy to go over all the background and details. He is representing the Arizona mine operators in this matter and has been working with me on the case.

I feel sure this is a worthwhile project, as it bears upon the general problem of making us self-sufficient in strategic mineral production.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On June 25 the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, held a joint meeting, with the various members of the delegation, and also representatives from ODM and other interested agencies.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 4 minutes.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. There was no record made, but notes were taken, because this was merely a friendly get-together meeting to find what answer Dr. Flemming might be able to give to us. Nearly everyone of importance in the program from GSA and ODM, from Dr. Flemming on down, was there.

This conference was as inconclusive as the one of April 23. Dr. Flemming stated he would have the necessary stockpile data in his hands early in July, and be able to make a decision about August 1, 1954. He also promised to investigate expanding Wenden under the same authority under which it was originally set up, as the program had nothing directly to do with stockpiling. The talk of stockpiling seemed to be a red herring. Nothing whatever has been heard of this promise, either.

Madam President, I wrote Dr. Flemming in July calling his attention to the fact that he had promised an answer on August 1. I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point my letter to Dr. Flemming of July 21, 1954, and the answer of Dr. Flemming dated August 2, 1954.

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

JULY 21, 1954.

Dr. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: You will recall that in our recent meeting you made the statement that the figures on which you would base your manganese determination would be available to you by the first part of July, and that certainly by the first of August some pronouncement would be coming from your office concerning the future of manganese stockpiling.

Can I continue to be hopeful that this statement will be made within the very near future?

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C. August 2, 1954.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: I have your letter of July 21, 1954, in which you inquire if a decision with regard to the future of manganese stockpiling can be expected by the first of August.

I will be getting in touch with you regarding this matter within the next 10 days.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, to date there has been no answer from ODM or Dr. Flemming or the administration as to what the plans are for the stockpiling of manganese, either in Arizona or in other parts of the country. It is most difficult for a Senator and it is most difficult for a congressional delegation to attempt to work with a branch of Government which either has no power to make decisions, no heart for decisions, or no desire to come to any conclusions.

It seems to me that the period from last January to the present day afforded sufficient time to enable Dr. Flemming of ODM to reply as to the future manganese stockpiling program. It has become a large industry in my State. People are there with money to invest in it. People are there who want to continue in the stockpiling program. But, Madam President, we can well understand that people with money to invest in that kind of a project are not going to wait around day after day while some bureaucrat in Washington dawdles and dawdles and wastes his time. We either have a stockpiling program in this country or we do not have a stockpiling program. If we should ask the miner in Arizona, he would say we do not have a stockpiling program.

We in Arizona produce strategic metals. I wished to call this situation to the attention of the Senate in these closing days, because this is a matter of vast importance to the United States. It is of particular importance to the Southwest and western part of the United States, where the mining operations of our country are carried on, and it is important to the future safety of the Nation to have adequate stockpiling.

I do not believe that we should put American miners out of work to keep cheap labor at work in other countries of the world. There is not a mine operating in my State today which can produce lead and zinc, and if war were to come tomorrow it would take months and months to open those mines. While I do not like to go around channels. I hope my remarks today will wake up the head of the ODM, so that he will either tell us there will be no future program, or will say "Gentlemen, this is your program."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on the nominations on the calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

James P. Randall, for permanent appointment as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Russell E. Atkinson, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Philadephia, Pa.

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

Lewis J. Grout, of Kansas, to be a member of the Board of Parole; and

John E. Henry, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Seventy-five postmasters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert Hoover, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles C. Finucane to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank H. Higgins to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lyle S. Garlock to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

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

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Trevor Gardner to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Birrell Franke to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert McClintock to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Yost to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

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

NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, by request I ask that the nominations for United States circuit judge and United States district judge be passed over for the time being.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jay Neal to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William C. Littlefield to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

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

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist to be Chief, Army Field Forces, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes to be commanding general, VII Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. John Howell Collier to be commanding general, I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Charles Edward Hart to be commanding general, V Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations in the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the other nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

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

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary promotions in the Navy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the Navy, favorably reported on August 17, 1954, but not printed on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of the legislative business.

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

INCREASE OF BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the unfinished business before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9756), an act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I should like to make a brief announcement to the Senate as to the program for the remainder of the day. There is the unfinished business, Calendar No. 2499, H. R. 9756, an act to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to be handled by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Following that will be the supplemental appropriation bill conference report. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Appropriations, will handle that matter for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the committee, who is temporarily absent.

We will follow the consideration of that bill with a calendar call of bills to which there is no objection, starting at the beginning of the calendar and proceeding to the point where the last calendar call was concluded; that is, beginning with Calendar No. 19, S. 242, and ending with Calendar No. 2519, S. 3851; to be followed by the consideration of measures which were placed at the foot of the calendar on the last call. A list of those measures is at the desk, for the information of Senators.

Immediately after we have concluded the call of the calendar, there will be another meeting of the policy committee, and other measures will be recommended for consideration by the Senate, and for me to take up with the minority leader. Several other bills, which we have already scheduled, will be taken up between the conclusion of the call of the calendar

and the meeting of the policy committee. Those measures are:

Calendar No. 2223, H. R. 7130, the immigration and nationality bill.

Calendar No. 2054, H. R. 9987, the merchant marine bill, together with its companion bill, Calendar No. 1817, S. 3219. Because of the time element involved, the Senate probably will take up the House bill.

Calendar No. 2365, S. 3067, relating to executive agreements being made available to the Senate of the United States in the same way in which they are now being made available to the United Nations.

When we have completed consideration of those bills, we shall have another list of proposed legislation, depending on what has been disposed of on the call of the calendar.

INCREASE OF BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9756) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, it was with some reluctance that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill providing for an increase in the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. When the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation was raised to $8½ billion early last spring, we hoped that that would be the last time we would have to increase its borrowing authority, for some years, at least. However, conditions which have developed pose a question as to whether the $8½ billion in borrowing authority will be adequate to carry the agency through with its commitments for the 1954 crop year.

The latest figures I have are as of yesterday, August 17, 1954. I do not claim that they are accurate down to the last dollar. They were given to us by the Commodity Credit Corporation this morning. They show that maximum borrowing authority available of the $8,500,000,000 approximately $6,793,000,000 is now obligated. Last year, from August to January, about $2½ billion was obligated. Therefore it is perfectly obvious that if the Corporation uses close to that amount this year, the $8½ billion may not be adequate. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not believe it will use all of the $8½ billion, but if economic conditions around the world should be such that commerce and trade is lessened, or if the crops of this country should pick up from the present anticipated yield level, a maximum of $9,800,000,000 may be required.

We do not feel safe, therefore, in leaving the maximum borrowing authority at $8½ billion, as it is now. It appears that close to that amount will be used, and it is possible that that amount may be exceeded.

I might point out that the new agricultural bill which was passed yesterday contains an authorization for the use of $50 million a year for the purchase of milk for the school-lunch programs, and also an authorization for the use of $15 million a year for the next 2 years to be used in the brucellosis-eradication program. This $65 million, which can be used next year, was not taken into consideration when we determined how much borrowing authority the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to have.

For that reason, and for the other reasons I have given, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recommends this increase of $1½ billion in the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This amount will bring borrowing authority of the Corporation up to $10 billion. I believe that will probably be the maximum amount needed for some years to come under present prospects. We are hopeful that supplies and production will come in line with demand as to several commodities in which we have a great investment at the present time. I believe they will. I believe that if we raise the maximum borrowing authority to $10 billion that amount will be adequate for many years to come.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it not true that we are approaching this question with a margin of safety in mind?

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it not true that there is a feeling on the part of many members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the Commodity Credit Corporation may not be required to use the $10 billion, but we wish to keep faith with the American farmers, who raise crops under the various programs, and we feel we must have that margin of safety? Is that a fair statement of the situation?

Mr. AIKEN. Frankly, I do not believe all of the $10 billion will be used. However, it is better to have a few hundred million dollars more than is required than to fall short by two or three hundred million dollars, and have to deny loans to farmers who under the law are entitled to such loans.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is it not true that we have noted a very great acceleration in the amount which the Corporation was required to lend, and it is because of anticipation that we may have to hedge against that kind of recurrence that we ask for this safety factor of $10 billion?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. I believe that conditions will become better in this field, although we have no way of guaranteeing it. Therefore, we must make sure that we do not get caught without adequate funds to carry out our commitments, because otherwise we certainly would be in real trouble.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I think that nothing better exemplifies the fact that the handling of the vital agricultural question in the committee is wholly bipartisan, and, likewise, that there is no difference between Senators who favor the new agricultural law, passed last night, and those who do not favor that law, than the fact that all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry favored the enactment of the pending bill, as proposed, and left the matter in the hands of the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, to be presented and passed upon after the new farm bill was out of the way.

I wish the RECORD to show that all members of the committee favor this bill.

Madam President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is amended by inserting after "avocados" a comma and the word "mangoes."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall become effective upon the enactment of this act or upon the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1954, whichever occurs later.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, to make a brief explanation of my amendment, the Senate will recall that in the bill passed last night there is a section relating to certain small crops produced in the southern part of the United States, principally in Florida, which meet foreign competition. Those crops include tomatoes, avocados, and other products which were specified in the bill which was passed last night.

When we reached the conference we found that one of the small fruits which was supposed to be included in that particular measure had not been included in either the House version or the Senate version. Therefore, it could not be included by the conference committee without risking the making of a point of order against the entire conference measure. The conferees were agreed that mangoes should be included, and it was agreed that the proper method to be followed would be that of presenting an amendment at this particular time. So, Madam President, the matter has been discussed by the conferees of the House and the Senate, and unanimously agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LOSS OF NATIONALITY BY PERSONS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2223 (H. R. 7130) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes. I wish to have it made the pending business before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7130) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 (H. R. 7130) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes.

DANGER CONFRONTING OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, much has been said during this session of the Congress about the giveaway programs of the Republican administration. I think there is a giveaway program in progress in this country which is of far greater significance than is anything that has thus far been attributed to the Republican administration. I refer to the attempt to give away our economic system.

Repeated remarks on the floor of the Senate indicate that this infection is penetrating these walls. There are indications that certain Senators either desire to do away with our free-enterprise system and put the Government into business, or that they do not quite understand how the system operates. Because of that, a few days ago I made some remarks of a rather academic nature, trying to educate, where education was needed, and trying to encourage, where encouragement was needed.

I am far more fearful of the effect of the "giveaway" of our free-enterprise system than I am of any indication that this administration may be attempting to give anything away.

There has been sent to all Senators—I have received two copies—from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report a booklet entitled "Toward Full Employment and Full Production," which is issued by the Conference on Economic Progress. A group of very distinguished Americans have lent their names to this effort, and I should like particularly to call attention to one Leon H. Keyserling, former Chairman of the Economic Advisory Committee to the President. As a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report I do not subscribe to the kind of thinking set forth in this publication, and I, as one member of the committee, should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that this booklet was not sent out with the approval of the full committee. If it was sent out with anything in mind, I sincerely hope it was sent out merely to let the members of the committee know what is going on in the minds of this group calling themselves "The Conference on Economic Progress."

Madam President, this formula puts the cart in front of the horse, and if we adopt such a formula, from henceforth the cart will pull the horse.

I wish to read a few short statements from this booklet to illustrate what I mean. In the first place, it is said:

> Government initiative is essential.

Madam President, what is wrong with private initiative in this country? Recently, the tax bill was criticized on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and that criticism shocked me, because I have long had implicit faith in the Senator's adherence to the concept of free enterprise. We should put initiative back into private hands and take it out of the hands of the Government. That tax bill puts money where money is needed, into the hands of investors, so they can buy new tools and erect new buildings, so that jobs will be available in 2 or 3 years from now. It does not put the cart in front of the horse, as does this proposition.

I continue to read from this booklet:

> As indicated by the above table, the annual rate of Federal outlays should be increased by about $3 billion above the rate in the first quarter of this year. This would still be about $2½ billion below the rate in the middle of 1953. If increases of this size in national security outlays are not needed (though they may well be), there are enormous backlogs of needs at home—for roads, schools, hospitals, and many other public works.

Madam President, that is $3 billion more in deficits which this organization suggests. I am sorry to say that some of our brethren in the Senate agree that we should go into deficit spending. I admit that there are jobs that need to be done, schools that need to be built, roads that need to be constructed, bridges that need to be provided. I suggest that if the Federal Government would get out of private business and get out of the business of the counties, the cities, and the States, these lower echelons of government could well finance these projects themselves, and not send their money to Washington, in which case, instead of getting a hundred cents back, they get back only 50 cents or less. It is very easy to talk about $3 billion when we do not have to find the tree on which that money grows.

I read further:

> If the increase in the annual rate of Federal outlays is kept within the general magnitude set forth above, the Federal Government should also reduce personal income taxes by about $4½ billion, with as much of the reduction as feasible as far down in the income structure as feasible to promote current spending.

Madam President, if the Federal Government's fiscal affairs were in such shape as to cut $7½ billion off income taxes, I would say we should do so. But we cannot, willy-nilly, cut $7½ billion. That, with the $3 billion deficit spending suggested in the booklet, makes it $10½ billion. What they are trying to get at is that we should adopt this newly developed brainchild of one of these "eggheads," which is the first indication that the cart is in front of the horse. Our products cannot be manufactured by the Government. They could be manufactured, perhaps, for a few years, and then inflation would be with us, and we would not have any national production or anything but economic chaos in this country.

The tax bill has been criticized for not cutting taxes in the lower brackets. I wish it had been possible to cut all brackets of taxation, for certainly that would have indicated a more sensible, more stable, and a more healthy fiscal condition.

But I ask this question: If the exemption had been raised by $100, as was suggested, would it have been wise to do so, in view of the fact that it would have represented less than the national income of the country for 2 days? Even if we had taken the maximum, it would have been less than the total national income of the country for 1 week. It would have been merely a pin prick upon the total annual economy of the country.

If the exemptions had been raised this year, and if they had been made available to the people of the country, with no relief to the corporations, with no relief to the man who has money to invest in tools, buildings, and jobs, might not the jobs have been vacant in a year from now or 2 years from now, since business cannot grow without the investment of capital? I might add, rather facetiously, also, that for 21 years there was an opportunity to reduce taxes, but they were not cut. The only times taxes were cut were during the 80th Congress and the 83d Congress.

I think the Nation is headed in the right direction, but I call attention to the fact that the soundest point in the President's tax program is where he refers to the American people who have money to invest. Mind you, Madam President, that does not mean only the wealthy, because 55 percent of the stockholders of the Nation have incomes of less than $5,000, so all of America is interested in our economy. It is not merely the rich man; it is not simply the white-collar worker. All of America is interested. I might even suggest that the union member today is the new capitalist of America. He is vitally interested in making certain that factories are built and jobs maintained. He is interested in being able to work a year, 2 years, or 3 years from now. That is of more importance to the worker than a $40 or a $80 cut in taxes, or, I might even suggest, a reduction of $100 or $200. The American worker wants security in his job; and security in his job will come from an accelerated interest in the American economy from the private standpoint, not from the public standpoint.

I continue with the suggestions to achieve a full economy. The booklet suggests:

> Measures to stabilize and in the long run to enlarge farm income, while absorbing surpluses should be undertaken.

That is magic. If that could have been done, it would have been done. I wanted to get into the colloquy last night to ask Senators on the other side of the aisle, who were talking about the disaster which was befalling the farm industry, what their slant really is. Ninety percent of parity is not working. It never has worked, except in time of war. I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate or a person in the country who would advocate that the Nation go to war to prove that 90 percent of parity works. It has not worked.

Instead of standing on the floor and saying that if we take away 90 percent of parity, it will bankrupt the farmers of the Nation, why cannot we offer a program, if that is the trend, which will say that we will take care of the present economic plight, that we will go to 100 percent of parity? Oh, yes; it would be only a few years before it would be necessary to go to 105 percent and then to 110 percent, because there is no magic solution to the farm problem except to get the farm products on the open market, where they can be regulated and controlled by the law of supply and demand.

There is no magic way to get rid of the surpluses, unless, first, we let them lie where they are; or second, ship them to Europe in lieu of money, with the understanding that we shall continue with the program simply in order to ship the surpluses away.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the discussion last night I suggested three factors which might be considered in connection with eliminating some of the farm surpluses and preventing the accumulation of such large surpluses in the future.

First, I suggested that if there could be fuller employment, so that our people could afford a better and a fuller diet, the surpluses would disappear. I think the facts bear out the theory that if the American people ate what they really need to eat, with respect to a better caloric diet, there would not be surpluses of farm products.

Second, more should be done to improve the school-lunch program. Something was done to that effect, although in a small way, in the conference report which was agreed to yesterday.

Third, if we would really get behind the President's program for a lowering of tariffs and a revival of world trade, a great many of our farm products could be sold and disposed of abroad. In that connection, it might be well to point out that, as the Senator from Arizona so well knows, from one-third to one-half of the people of the world are hungry. They live in countries whose products we could procure in return for the food which could be shipped to them. That is particularly true of cotton, in which both the Senator from Arizona and I are interested. Exports of cotton have dropped at least 50 percent. There are many other farm products which could be disposed of abroad, if the United States had the courage really to put into effect a gradual lowering of tariffs and an extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program, which was recommended by the President and by the Randall Commisison, and which was voted for by most of the Democrats in the Senate.

I wonder if the Senator from Arizona does not believe that such programs might do some good?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I intend to cover those propositions; and if the Senator from Tennessee has the patience to wait, I propose to go into them more fully. Merely answering "Yes" or "No" would not suffice, because I have some definite suggestions; and the suggestions will come out of the little blue book. If I do not answer the Senator's questions fully, I shall be happy to do so when I have completed my speech.

I think the Eisenhower administration has taken a very courageous and long-needed step in the farm program. I think the farmers as a whole, instead of resenting it, are thankful that here is an administration which sees the answer. The answer has not been completed this year; but the answer is now in the cards. If the farmer can now be placed in the open market on a competitive basis, without his having to lean on a Government crutch, without creating surpluses, then the farmer will come into his own, as he should, under the free-enterprise system.

It was suggested that the unemployment compensation program should be expanded. I think that is wise. The President has approved it. It is a part of the President's program.

Also, it has been suggested that a higher minimum wage law is needed. In that instance, the issue of States' rights becomes involved. Minimum wages cannot or should not be regulated from Washington. Working conditions in Tennessee do not compare with working conditions in the District of Columbia or in Arizona. The people of the respective States should have the right to set their own minimum wage. If the minimum wage is too low, then the States have the machinery by which the wages can be raised.

I might cite an example in my own State of Arizona. Arizona has a law which provides that 20 persons in any industry can petition the Industrial Commission for a hearing. Only last month the retail trade raised the minimum wage by some $10 a week, through the process of going to the State government.

The Federal Government should not encroach. I consider the suggestion of the Conference on Economic Progress to be merely another step into the already open door to the destruction of the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

It is suggested that a comprehensive, long-range housing program is needed. A housing program already exists in this country. It is one of the great accomplishments of the past administration, and it is one of the great programs which the present administration is continuing. I hope that future administrations will continue in this field, but that they will keep out of public housing. Let the Government provide for the building of houses in the lower price brackets, where the lower-income families can buy them; but let the Government keep out of the dole system of housing, which the Government unfortunately entered.

We now have a good housing program, and the new law which has been adopted in this administration is a good one, which will do much to stir up interest in the housing field.

The next point will answer one of the questions about which the Senator from Tennessee asked. This organization recommends that a liberalized international trade policy should be put into effect, and that some types of foreign aid should be enlarged, especially in underdeveloped areas.

Madam President, some day we shall have to face up to the question of whether or not free trade is going to be a good thing for this country. The Senator from Tennessee mentioned cotton. Let us not fool ourselves about cotton. The foreign cotton market is gone, and we are not going to get it back with high subsidized prices. In the South, home of the Senator from Tennessee, it costs 35 cents a pound to raise cotton in some areas. In the Far West we can raise it for 18½ cents, 19 cents, and 20 cents a pound, but the price is kept high because we have to subsidize one part of the cotton economy. There are a million acres of land devoted to cotton in Chihuahua, Mexico, which cotton has taken over the market of France. That market has been taken away from the producers in this country and they have lost the income they used to obtain from that country. I do not stand here as an optimist and say we are going to recapture the markets of the world. Every time one of our brilliant scientists in General Electric, Westinghouse, General Motors, or any other large concern makes a technological advance, that advance goes into the jungles and into the backward lands of the world. I have seen peons make shotgun barrels on a Warner-Swayze lathe. All they have to do is push buttons. We invented that device. Now it is used in Mexico. Those people are making gun barrels for their own use, on a machine invented in this country. They are making them, not for export, but for their own use.

Fifteen or twenty years ago persons could not live in certain parts of Mexico because of disease. Parke-Davis and the other great companies of this country developed medicines which made it possible for persons to live in certain parts of countries which were not theretofore habitable. Our Department of Agriculture has developed methods of fertilization whereby the people of the world can improve their productivity. Every time we take a step forward in this country we, in effect, take a whole step backward in our future standard of living, and I think we should consider that fact. Our foreign markets in many, many instances have been lost to us. There is a great question in my mind as to the value of an open market system in this country.

I can go into my State and find 3,000 men out of work because zinc and lead mines are closed. If the price of copper drops another 2 cents, thousands of copper miners will be thrown out of

work. All we have to do is stop stockpiling manganese, on the theory that we can bring it in from other countries, and thousands of workers will be out of work in this country. So I do not follow the argument that it is going to help us if we try to offset the imbalance in trade, when, by doing so, persons in a great many areas of this country will be thrown out of work.

Ultimately, as we grow older, and as the economy of the world becomes united, not in our own lifetime, but in the dim future, the world may become a great market place, not by law or by edicts, but by the fact that people will slowly learn to live together. I do not think the suggestion of eliminating trade barriers at the present time would result in putting more people to work in this country. I do not think that would be a step toward fuller employment, but would be a step in the other direction.

I hope that answers the question of the Senator from Tennessee, though I know that does not agree with his philosophy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Arizona has stated his viewpoint, but so far as that being a statisfactory answer is concerned, I think the philosophy of the distinguished Senator from Arizona is not in keeping with, and is not going to lead to, the ultimate result he would like to see, which is an increase in world trade. I think the Senator should point out that during the time the reciprocal trade program had a real chance of working, it operated for the domestic benefit of the United States. Also, the Senator does not seem to realize that if we can assist in building up the standard of living in other nations, while they may produce more, they will nevertheless purchase more articles from the United States as they increase their purchasing power.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to answer the statement of the Senator from Tenneessee by using Mexico as an example, because I am more familiar with Mexico than I am with any other foreign country.

Up to 10 years ago Mexico was an importing country. Today, although it still is, it has made great advances in production. We used to make steel rails and other equipment for Mexico. Today she makes her own. A very close friend of mine is president of the Sears, Roebuck Co. in Mexico. When he took the job 7 years ago, 93 percent of his merchandise was imported from the United States. I do not know what the percentage is today, but last year 85 percent of his merchandise was being purchased in Mexico, and comprised articles manufactured in that country.

We have contributed to that situation, and I am very proud of it. We are contributing to the uplifting of the standard of living of the world by our technological and scientific advancement.

My argument is that every time the Government hamstrings private enterprise and activities, we hurt the standard of living of the rest of the world. We do not help it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have not seen the figures, but, as I remember them the last time I saw them, there has been a general increase in the value of goods we have sold to Mexico. If that be true, would that fact not prove the philosophy I have been trying to discuss?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the old problem of volume.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator admit that there has been a general increase in our sales to Mexico during the past 15 years?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There has been a general increase in our sales to all countries during the past 100 years, as well as during the past 5 years, but that fact does not answer the particular question I am discussing. As we develop new items, Mexico and the other countries of the world want them. Germany is also selling products to Mexico. So is the rest of the world. It is only natural that we would be selling more to Mexico. I think Mexico is selling more to us than she did 10 years ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My statement was that as the standard of living in other countries is lifted, they are able to produce more goods, their purchasing power is increased, and that helps our domestic situation. The Senator from Arizona used Mexico as an example. I think we might well use Mexico as an example. The standard of living in that country has been increased by virtue of technological advances we have made and by virtue of products they have purchased from us. On the other hand, because of that increase in the standard of living, Mexico has been buying more and more products from the United States, which fact seems to repudiate the philosophy advanced by the Senator from Arizona that building up the standard of living in other nations does not help the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Tennessee misinterpreted my remarks if he interpreted them to mean that in helping those countries we did not help ourselves. Every time we invent a new gimmick or gadget, that helps us as well as other people. Where we differ is in the philosophy that we should drop all trade barriers today on the theory that that will materially increase our employment. I doubt that it will. There has been nothing to indicate that it will. We have gone through a period of two wars in which demand has been exceptionally high. In my own business I imported alligator shoes from the Argentine so that my business could survive during the war. War makes very strange bedfellows.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of course, no one is advocating that we drop all trade barriers, but almost everybody is advocating that there be a gradual working out, by negotiation, of trade barriers and an increase in our trade with other nations. I hope the Senator is in agreement with that philosophy, because I believe business, labor, and professional people, and almost everybody else favors that philosophy, but there have not been a sufficient number of Senators to put it over. They are in agreement with the philosophy of former President Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, the Randall Commission, and other groups and persons who have given the matter real consideration. I think it was a very dark day in legislative history when Congress refused to go along with the President's own program, even though the administration fought for that program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I may be anticipating the Senator from Tennessee a little, but I might say that earlier in my remarks I said we are tending toward free trade naturally. The time is going to come when there will be no trade barriers and no differences between the people of the world, but that is not going to be in the Senator's lifetime or mine.

I have about concluded referring to the little booklet which has been sent to all Senators; but I should like to read one more extract from it, to show the rather fallacious thinking of this little group who now propose to the Senate and to the country that we abandon completely the ideas and ideals of the free enterprise system and "let the Government do it." I read now from page 28:

> Similarly, a full-employment and full-production economy tends to promote a balanced Federal budget, except under conditions of total war or when defense outlays are rising rapidly toward abnormal peaks in a period of mobilization short of total war.

We do not know whether that is true or not. All we know is that through a period of two wars, with full employment and full production, our national debt rose to the highest level at which it has ever been in the entire history of our country. We know that today, with very high employment in the country, that debt continues to be added to; and only last week the Congress gave the Government authority to stretch its borrowing power by $6 billion.

Madam President, I have been disturbed by the tax on the economy of the country. I am very fearful that it is the overriding issue which will arise in the coming campaign, or certainly in 1956—the issue of whether the Government will be the dominant force in the daily business lives and family lives of our people, or whether the people of the United States will continue to be free in their enterprise and free in the full sense of the word, as our freedom has been handed down to us, under the Constitution.

We hear in the Senate proposals to put the cart before the horse. I refer now to the remarks of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who, I am sorry to say, is not on the floor at this time. We hear from him such proposals when he says:

> A group of us in Congress have been arguing for the past year and a half for stimulating consumption through increased purchasing power.

Madam President, how are we going to increase the purchasing power? Let us say the Government can do it. Yes, Madam President, the Government can do it; all it has to do is print more money and bring on inflation.

But there comes an end to that day, as occurred in Germany when a housewife who wished to buy a loaf of bread had to carry a bushel basket of reichmarks to the market. I do not think anyone

in the United States wishes to have that happen here. Yet, Madam President, as I talk to people on this subject, I am sorely afraid that too many Americans resort to the attitude, "Oh, it cannot happen in my lifetime. Let my children worry about it."

Madam President, where would we be now if our forefathers had said, "Let the Government print more money and run our lives"? If that had happened, we would not have a country today.

I wonder how free our economy is today. How far have we gone down the path of Socialist thinking? Have we gone so far that the average American businessman has not the stomach to turn back? Have we gone so far that the average family has not the courage to say, "We will tighten our belts and we will get back on the path that creates real business enterprise in this country"?

Madam President, much has been made of the fact that by the reduction of excise taxes in March, we now have a high income. But if we examine the condition of the firms whose excise taxes have been cut, we see there is a depression in their field. There has not been a boom in the sale of refrigerators or in the sale of pots and pans, because, I imagine, that almost every housewife who sits in the gallery today has all the refrigerators and deep freezes she needs. Until there is a demand for new things, we do not feel that surge.

Where can that demand come from in the free enterprise system? It can come as a result of better advertising or from creating a demand for such things. All of us can remember the day when there was one radio set in a house. Now the average house has three. Everyone can remember the day when there was one electric motor in the average house, whereas today there is an average of 22. What is the next step? It is to have television sets in different rooms of each house. We laugh today at such a suggestion, because of the high price of television sets. However, I remember that the first job I ever had was to build wireless sets, and we got $300 apiece for them. Today, one can buy a much better set for $9.95. That is what happens under the free enterprise system.

Because of the freedom that has been encouraged under the Eisenhower administration, we see some concrete evidences of the results; and I point this out to the "egg-heads" of the various organizations who say we must now change the horse in the middle of a very fine stream—and, I suggest, a very fine and strong horse. New construction in this country is at an all-time high. What does that mean? What does it do? What happens when General Motors or Ford Motors puts $1 billion into a building program? That means jobs for the people who live in Detroit, Mich.; and it means jobs for years to come.

Madam President, let us consider another part of our economy about which too little has been said. During the past year inventories have been adjusted. In the past year they have come down from $80 billion to approximately $79 billion—a drop of $1 billion. There is $1 billion that is available for purchases, and is now being used by the merchants to make purchases, as they ascertain their needs.

Personal income in this country in June was running at the rate of $286,400,000,000, as compared with $287,300,000,000 a year ago in June; but when we consider the deductions made by taxes and the other levies on the income of the people, we find they still are left with more money to spend at this time than they had to spend a year ago. In the second quarter of this year, per capita disposable personal income was running at the rate of $252,900,000,000, whereas a year ago it was $250,400,000,000.

It is said that we have to increase consumption. Yes, Madam President, we do. We have to do it through the free enterprise system.

I hear Senators speak on this floor about production for use. That is all our economy does; it produces for use. If we produced only for the fun of it, we would have conditions similar to one, in particular, which we observe over the Nation today, namely, used-car lots filled with new automobiles, because the automobile industry—unwisely, I feel—has loaded the dealers with too many automobiles, more than the people wish to buy.

Madam President, in concluding my remarks today, I wish to refer very briefly to an argument I used earlier this year, but which I fear some Members of this body may not have heard. It has to do with what the Federal Government can do in the event of a depression, either to prevent a depression or to pull us out of one, after we have gotten into it. I am a great believer in history. I think what has gone before can well tell us what will come in the future.

In the period from 1933 to 1939, 51 percent of the Federal budget went for props and crutches for the economy. Fifty-one percent of the total budget of that period was poured into the economy of this country, in an effort to pull our economy out of the depression it had entered in 1929. But, Madam President, that did not pull the country out of the depression. We never got out of the depression of 1929 until a war came along. So, Madam President, the other day I was very much amused to read in a Washington newspaper an article by a very prominent columnist, who wrote about "the jubilant days in the 1930's when people in Washington worked shoulder to shoulder, under President Roosevelt, to pull us out of the depression."

A war pulled us out of the depression. It was no economic magic of the New Deal, because for seven long years that system was tried and not one single index was brought up to the 1929 level.

Had the Government stayed out of business and had the Government entered only into the fields where it rightly should enter, the economy, being free, would have lifted this country out of that depression long before we went to war. I do not suggest war was employed to end the depression, but the depression ended with a war.

The Second World War ended, and we immediately started going down, because the Government stayed in with its meddling hands. Along came Korea and pulled us out again. So we had great prosperity.

Then along came the Eisenhower administration, which said what nobody in Government had said for 20 years, "This economy had gotten great because of the freedom of men and because of the freedom of markets. The Eisenhower administration, the Republican administration, is going to get Government out of the fields of commerce."

And they have done that. They have not gone the full extent, but if they go the full extent and if Government and industry and Government and business can become close partners in this enterprise, with Government working to create a good social and legal climate in which industry and the economy can work, then this country will continue to enjoy prosperity.

But, Madam President, I am not one who says we have suddenly discovered a magic formula that will end depressions, because we have not. We would first have to repeal the law of human nature and the law of supply and demand. If we can ever do that, then I think we can sit down with slide rules and barometers and a wet finger and figure out a way to level off this economy. But until we have those two essential things changed, the law of human nature and the law of supply and demand, we are not going to be able to stop the ups and downs in the economy. Some of them are going to be big, and some of them are going to be small. But let us remove the thought from the minds of the American people that the Federal Government can stop a depression.

If such a program took 51 percent of a rather small total in the 1930's, and after having spent that we experienced only failure, where are we going to get the money today to spend 51 percent of a budget which is now up close to $70 billion? Oh, we can print money; we can inflate, but I do not think we want to inflate.

I hope I have not burdened the Senate too long with my remarks. This matter has been on my heart for months and months. I am a businessman. I have lived with this intricate system of America all my life. I have seen the ups and downs.

I have great faith in American business people, and I would have greater faith in them if they would show a little courage and throw the Government out of business, instead of asking it to get farther in. I admire particularly the cattle people of my State, who did not ask for high supports and who did not insist on drought relief, but who held their heads high, weathered their troubles, and are making money today because of the free enterprise system.

It pains me to hear every segment of this economy come running to Washington to say, "I am in bad shape. You have to appropriate a couple of million dollars for me."

What is the end result of that? It is socialism.

I say, Madam President, that we are farther down that road in these closing days of the session than any American knows. And when I can see material such as I have exhibited today printed and distributed by a committee functioning in connection with the Committee on the Joint Economic Report, I think I have a right to be afraid. I think the American businessman has a right to be afraid, when Senators stand on this floor and talk about full employment and talk about pushing buttons and finding a tree with money on it to obtain full employment. There is only one answer and there is only one magic formula for the American free enterprise system, and that is hard work with lots of guts.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9936) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

(The legislative clerk read the report.)

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 17, 1954, pp. 14803–14808, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, what is the order of business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I should like to ask a question or two before the final vote is taken.

Mr. FERGUSON. May we proceed, so that we can take up the amendments?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. It is debatable.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask that the message from the House be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair advises the Senator that first the Senate should agree to the conference report. Debate is in order.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I thought the first order would be the consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has agreed to consider the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then, Madam President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my understanding that some language was put into the conference report authorizing money to be used for the purpose of moving the Office of Civilian Defense from Washington to Battle Creek, Mich.; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Where does that language appear in the conference report?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is a statement by the managers on the part of the House. It is on page 17, amendment No. 165. It appropriates $10,025,000 for "Operation, Federal Civil Defense Administration," instead of $8,525,000 as proposed by the House and $11 million as proposed by the Senate. There was a compromise in arriving at the figure of $10,025,000. It is understood that from available funds headquarters may be moved from Washington, D. C., to Battle Creek, Mich.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I inquire of the Senator if this is a move which is to be made at an early date?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is. They have partly moved now. The move was started prior to the time this matter came before the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wished to make a short statement about that matter, either by way of a question or on my own time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Whichever the Senator desires to do will be all right. I shall yield so that he may make the statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I ask that the Senator yield in order that I may make a statement with reference to this matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I shall not oppose the conference report, but I wish to point out for the consideration of the Senate, and particularly the Committee on Armed Services, which had jurisdiction over the civil-defense bill, some matters in connection with this proposal which I think should be considered.

When the civil-defense bill was originally before the Senate I had the privilege of being chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings on the bill and directing the bill on the floor of the Senate.

One section of the civil defense bill, I think it is section 409, states that it is contemplated that in civil defense, existing agencies and facilities of the Government shall be used.

Since that time, Madam President, in my opinion, the Civil Defense Administration has been sadly neglected. In view of the necessity for protecting the country against any possible attack, I think we have not done our duty in providing for civil defense. I believe civil defense has not been given the consideration by the Congress and by the executive departments to which it is entitled.

I particularly wish to point out the theory of the provision of the conference bill with reference to the proposal to move civil defense headquarters from the Washington area to Battle Creek. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I have a high regard for the people of Michigan, and I should like to see them have any governmental agency in Michigan. It makes no difference to me, so far as I am concerned, whether it is in Maryland or in Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not in Maryland now. It is in the District of Columbia, located in an apartment house on Columbia Road.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. But there is a training school at Olney, Md.

Mr. FERGUSON. The training school is not being moved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My understanding is that there was a proposal to move the headquarters of the Civil Defense Administration 25 or 30 miles from Washington, and perhaps if the Government had purchased the training school as was proposed at one time, the entire civilian defense training establishment could be located at Olney. But I have no preference as between the people of Michigan and Maryland or Virginia, and I wish to make that clear to the Senator.

Madam President, I believe that section 409 of the original Civil Defense Act provides that the Civil Defense Administration should do its principal work through existing agencies. As I understand, that is the main thing it is doing at the present time.

As an example, the Civil Defense Administration, I suspect, would be in touch with and would carry on negotiations with the Department of Agriculture in order to make food available in areas to which people might be moved in the event of catastrophe, so there would be an ample supply of food in those areas.

The Civil Defense Administration would also negotiate with the Public Health Service, with Mrs. Hobby's department, so as to make medical supplies available at places to which people might be evacuated.

Likewise, it would be very necessary to work out arrangements with the Interstate Commerce Commission in regard to truck or bus transportation in order to get people out of congested areas, and with the Defense Transport Administration with reference to trains and other facilities of conveyance, so they could be moved out of New York or Chicago or Washington.

It was also contemplated in this section of the Civil Defense Act that the administrators of civil defense would work in close cooperation with the Department of Commerce and with the Civil Aeronautics Board with reference to moving people by air transportation.

Practically every department of Government would play a part in civil defense activities in the event of a catastrophe.

In order to make plans to that end, Madam President, it seems to me to be highly desirable that the civil defense administrators should be able to work out face to face, in personal discussions with these administrators, the plans for the distribution of food, the distribution of medicine, the transportation facilities, radio activities with the Federal Communications Commission, and other things of that sort.

I am heartily in favor of decentralizing the agencies of the Federal Govern-

ment. I think the Atomic Energy Commission is making a good move in deciding to build its headquarters 25 or 30 miles out from Washington. Other agencies might very well be placed somewhere else away from Washington.

Battle Creek, Mich., would undoubtedly be a good location, and I understand there is a Government facility there which can be used.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a building available at the present time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my understanding that there is a building which is suitable for that purpose.

Madam President, of all executive departments or agencies in the Nation's Capital which it seems to me should be located in the vicinity of Washington, at least somewhere in this neighborhood, I should say that agency is the Civil Defense Administration.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will recall the discussion in the Armed Services Committee that the main job of civilian defense would be to work in consultation with, and to have representatives sit down with the heads of, various other Government departments to make plans for evacuating people, feeding them, treating them, and seeing that they have medical facilities and proper transportation. That can be done properly only on the basis of face-to-face discussion.

I would much rather see some other agency move out to Battle Creek than this one agency, which is effective only by virtue of the fact that it does operate through other governmental agencies. It seems to me that the Civil Defense Administration has already been treated very badly and inadequately. But this move, to my mind, is going to finish the job and place it in such a situation that it cannot even do the limited work which it is carrying on at the present time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to make just one statement, since the Senator was kind enough to mention my name.

As I understand, the top administrative force would be in Washington; but the general headquarters would move out to Battle Creek. Much of the warning system of the country is in the central part of the United States, and from the point of view of carrying on its work in conjunction with the National Government in my opinion the headquarters of Civilian Defense they would be just as well off in Battle Creek as they would be here in Washington, provided the top administrative forces remain here in Washington.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should be very happy if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who has studied this matter so much, would review again the hearings held before our committee, in which it was set forth how the Civil Defense Administration would operate.

It was stated at that time that one of the principal things the agency would do would be to have its personal representatives in Washington so they could be in constant consultation with the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Health, and other agencies through which it could operate. It would seem to me to be making matters doubly worse to have a part of the staff at Battle Creek and a part of the staff here.

The center of communications may be at Chicago or somewhere in the Middle West, but certainly the agency which directs and channels what will be done by the various media of communication—telephone, telegraph, radio, and television—emanates from Washington.

I should think that in the event of a catastrophe, the effort to coordinate what some part of the staff may be doing in Battle Creek with what another part of the staff may be doing in Washington, would lead to utter confusion and would substantially cripple the handling of the civil-defense activities in the event of an emergency.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Tennessee is aware, is he not, of the fact that the entire success in the application of civil-defense activities depends upon channeling responsibilities and duties in the several organizations in the 48 States of the Union. That is where the responsibility actually rests, not for the broad, overall policy, but for determining the strategy, the methods, and the media by which the actual work will be undertaken in the event the call goes out for that work to be done.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator is partially correct. I might say for the information of the Senator that our Armed Services Committee held very extensive hearings. At that time the late Senator McMahon was chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee. He was very much interested in civil defense, and his committee also held hearings.

The division of authority would be something like this: General directives and suggestions as to how civil defense would be operated throughout the United States would be promulgated from the central office.

Mr. PAYNE. Of the Civil Defense Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Of the Civil Defense Administration. Then those general directions would be carried out in the various States, as the Senator has suggested. But a very important part of the whole program would depend upon the activities emanating from the executive agencies in Washington, and that would necessarily be true, even though the responsibility for carrying them out would rest in the States.

The distinguished Senator should bear in mind that one cannot tell what State might be the victim of attack or where it might come. So it seems to me to be necessary that there be the closest cooperation with the central nerve center of the Federal Government, which is located in the agencies in Washington.

Mr. PAYNE. If the Senator from Tennessee will further yield, I am sure he is fully aware of the fact that those plans are all established. The nerve centers will be retained in their present status, but the essential work will be accomplished as a result of the directions which will go out from Washington and will eventually land in the centers in the respective States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Let me answer that statement. Of course, plans have been made, and in the event of an attack it would for some time be very, very important to have the top officials of the Civilian Defense Administration in Washington who could be in immediate consultation with agriculture, health, radio, television, and what not, to take care of the continuing emergencies which we cannot foresee in making long-range plans.

It should also be observed that during a time of disaster, the power of the Civil Defense Administrator becomes very, very great. He practically has a right to take over the operation of a certain place. So, if he is to have that great power and is to be called upon to exercise it, it seems to me it is very important that he not only be in Washington, but have his main staff in this area where they could operate through the other agencies.

Mr. PAYNE. I am not speaking from a theoretical standpoint. It so happens that prior to the Korean outbreak I had the privilege of serving as one of three State governors on the National Civil Defense Board.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I remember the distinguished Senator served on that Board.

Mr. PAYNE. So I had a pretty full opportunity, up to the time I became a Member of this body, to be in rather intimate touch with the planning of the civil defense work. I can assure the Senator from Tennessee that in each State which has undertaken its responsibilities there is a complete inventory of transportation facilities, available trucks, all methods of conveyance, all hospitals, all stores of medical supplies, which are either available in the States or at central locations. They are known and the files are kept up to date. The ability to transfer firefighting equipment, communicatitons equipment, and all activities in that related field are all definitely pinpointed, are inventoried, and are contained on master charts which are available at headquarters. But I am sure the Senator would agree with me that in the event we should confront a real emergency situation, it would not be advisable to have all those charts and all that information, which has to be handled at a moment's notice, here in what might be one of the first target areas the enemy might try to hit.

Going back to 1950 and 1951, during the period I served on the council, we were then undertaking a survey of the country in order to determine the location which might be chosen to which administrative officers could be moved, but not the top key people who will have to maintain liaison between the Armed Forces and other activities in Washington and those who will have to be called into action to relay the necessary information at the flick of a finger in order to see that the machinery is put into motion.

Last year we made a very definite step forward in supporting the civil defense activities. It was the first real, honest approach we made to giving the Civil Defense Administration some definite help to enable it to do the job necessary in the defense of the civil population in the event of an emergency. This year we have done a little bit better than that.

If the Senator will talk with those who were with the administration back in 1950, 1951, and 1952, when we were struggling, fighting, working, and trying to arouse just a little bit of interest and to obtain a little bit of help in order to be able to carry out the necessary functions properly to bring about the training and education of people in this field, I am sure the Senator would be very discouraged, as was the former Governor of Florida, Mr. Caldwell, who served as a civil defense administrator at that time, because no one would give him one little bit of hope or encouragement. There was some help indicated in the Congress, but I am sorry to say that nowhere else was there a bit of interest shown, the amount of funds given was a mere pittance, and the States were left on their own to carry out the program practically on a voluntary basis.

But I am happy to say that under this administration there has been a real recognition of the great value of civil defense to the Nation, not in time of war, but in time of emergency, where civil defense has played an important part in matters pertaining to floods, fires, and other things which have threatened human life.

It seems to me that the step being taken is a realistic one. It is one defined after a great deal of study and consideration being given to the question, and I firmly believe from what little I know of the situation through working with it, that it is a step which will lead to a more effective, better coordinated, and more perfect civil-defense structure in the interest of the Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If I may answer briefly the Senator from Maine, I appreciate very much the contribution he has made to the discussion, and I agree with a great many things he has said.

I should like to point out, in the first place, that Mr. Caldwell, for whom I have a very high respect and who tried to do a good job as Civil Defense Administrator, did have substantial backing during the time he was head of the Civil Defense Administration. He had substantial backing from almost everyone, but he did not receive sufficient funds from Congress to carry out his duties. I always did my utmost to try to enforce the effort of Governor Caldwell. I think the Civil Defense Administration was granted entirely too small an amount of money during the time Mr. Caldwell was Administrator, and I think the present administration is not giving an adequate amount to civil defense.

It was my understanding that last year approximately $46 million was appropriated. It is my understanding that this year the appropriation has been increased to $48,025,000. This, to my mind, is inadequate. Civil defense, if it is important, should be given more substantial backing than that, by way of appropriations.

Second, I understand that plans have been drafted as to what will be done in the various States and cities in the event of an attack. But I am certain the distinguished Senator from Maine will agree with me that no amount of original planning, or whatever may have been done as of this time, even though there may be some stockpiling and storing of medical supplies, and whatnot, would be able to take care of the needs of the people in the event one of the larger cities suffered a real attack. What has been done is not adequate. So in the event of a real attack, there would be an absolute necessity for immediate consultation and action together by the top officials of the Civil Defense Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and various other agencies in Washington.

Furthermore, under the bill it is envisioned that in such an emergency the Civil Defense Administrator will have the power, almost, of martial law or complete control over sections which may be thus afflicted. So it seems to me to be clumsy administration to have a part of the Civil Defense Administration in one place, at Battle Creek, and some of its liaison officers in Washington. The Civil Defense Administration needs to have more than liaison officers in the Washington area. It needs to have personnel who can be in constant consultation with the heads of departments which are planning, working, and acting together in the event an emergency should come.

I appreciate what the Senator from Maine has said to the effect that it would be undesirable to have the maps and plans concentrated in the city of Washington, where they might be destroyed. But Battle Creek, too, is a strategic center. What I think should be done is to have the plans and the headquarters located some distance from Washington, but close enough to enable personal consultation between the officials of the Civil Defense Administration and the officials in Washington. That is a plan on which the Atomic Energy Commission is working. The papers of the Civil Defense Administration would not be more valuable or secret, or would not be more destructive of the Government if they should be destroyed, than would the papers, plans, and programs of the Atomic Energy Commission, if they were destroyed.

It is my understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission has asked for $6,500,000 in order to build a headquarters some 25 or 30 miles from the city of Washington. That is what I think should be done with the Civil Defense Administration.

I wish to make it very clear to the Senator from Michigan that I have no objection to any agency being located at Battle Creek, but I think some other agencies could better be spared, agencies which operate on a more or less autonomous basis, than to spare an agency which necessarily must operate through other governmental agencies in order to be effective.

I merely desired to bring up the matter for consideration, so as to make certain that all these questions have been considered by the committee, and to let the public know at least another side of the question, so that there can be, perhaps, further consideration or discussion of the situation. I wanted to make certain that the Senator from Michigan and the other members of the committee had given full consideration to the matter before including the language in the conference report.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam President, I happen to be in a position to verify what the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] has said in regard to the stepped-up activities of the Civil Defense Administration in the past year or two.

I happen to be the Civil Defense Director in Omaha and Douglas County, and I have been for about 4 years. It is one of those no-pay jobs, and is probably one of the most frustrating jobs I have ever tackled. Probably there is no program of such national importance, concerning which there is so much apathy and indifference on the part of the people. But that is quite understandable. By analogy, I might point out that there are some very excellent accident-prevention programs in various sections of the country. Some of them have been very successful. But, I submit, who would be interested in an accident-prevention program if no one had ever had an automobile accident? Who would be interested in donating to a cancer-fund drive if no one had ever had cancer?

No one in this country has ever experienced a bombing attack, so the apathy and indifference on the part of the people is understandable.

The civil-defense program can be accomplished only on the local level, and on a voluntary basis. We in Omaha have had experience with such a program. The Omaha Civil Defense Agency is one of the few in the country which has had an opportunity to be put to work. A flood was threatened on the Missouri River in 1952. The Omaha civil-defense organization is given credit for whipping the flood. Omaha did not even get its feet wet, because of the planning and organization of the Civil Defense Agency, which afforded 3 or 4 days of needed time, without which the city would have been flooded.

I mention this because the activity on the Federal level during the past year or two, since Governor Peterson has been Federal Civil Defense Director, has stimulated activities throughout the country to the point where there is not quite so much indifference or apathy. Civil-defense programs must be built on the local level; they must be purely on a voluntary basis.

We in Omaha did things during the flood that no Federal agency could have done. It would have been impossible for a Federal agency to have come into the disaster area and to do the things which needed to be done in the city at 3, 4, or 5 o'clock in the morning, which the local citizens did.

Of course, it is necessary to have Federal coordination, Federal rules, and

Federal aid. But the increased activity and the apparent increased interest on the part of the Congress—and that interest is still not what it should be—has stimulated, to some degree, the interest in civil defense in the field. If civil defense is to be perfected, Congress must show more interest in it. But I wish to bear out what the distinguished Senator from Maine has said in regard to the increased activity.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Would not the Senator from Nebraska agree with me, however, that in the event of an emergency, practically all the agencies of the Federal Government would have to come into play in regard to transportation, food, communications, health, and many other factors, in order to provide very close consultation among the people in the distressed area and the agencies of the Government in Washington, through the Civil Defense Administration?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think the Senator is correct. I attended rather recently a civil defense conference in Washington. There has been far more cooperation on the part of all Government agencies within the past 6 months than there ever had been before. But the Department of Agriculture, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other Government agencies would not get into the picture until after the local organization was actually on the battleline.

Mr. KEFAUVER. At any rate, there must be a close working relationship in order to make the program effective.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There must be.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the Senator feel that the necessity for close and immediate working relationship could better be handled if the headquarters of the organization were not in the District of Columbia, but were located somewhere in the vicinity, 25 or 30 miles away? In other words, it would lead to much confusion if the authorities in Omaha had to communicate with Battle Creek, and Battle Creek in turn had to get in touch with the Civil Defense Administration in Washington. In Omaha it would not be known whether to call Washington or Battle Creek. One confusion would lead to another.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. We would know where to call. Civil Defense works through channels. There are regional offices. We would call Denver. Denver would call Federal headquarters, wherever they might be.

Mr. KEFAUVER. During times of emergency many calls are made. If one office is located in one place and another office in Washington, it seems to me that the efficiency of the working arrangements would be considerably lessened.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Any well-organized civil defense agency, whether local, State, or Federal, has to be organized in depth. No plan can be effectual unless there is a second plan ready. No headquarters is any good unless there is another headquarters available. So no definite planning can be made. We have 2 or 3 control plans in Omaha. I think the Federal Government has to operate in the same way.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Is it not true that in practically all the cases the Senator knows of, the various States have entered into compacts with one another?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. PAYNE. In the event of an emergency in one particular State, the governor of that State, because of compacts made with surrounding States, would automatically make contact. There is coordination with the Federal authorities, but the mechanics are already set up and ready to move in the event that conditions make it necessary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PAYNE. Referring to the flood which occurred in Nebraska, is it not true that the State authorities determined what should be done and that the State groups went into action before the Federal agencies moved in?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We went into action, and I do not know how Washington found out.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago, in the colloquy in regard to civil defense, I referred to a section of the original civil defense bill and the report from the Armed Services Committee, which I had the privilege of presenting to the Senate.

I now ask unanimous consent that section 405 of the Civil Defense Act, together with three sections of the report to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD immediately following the colloquy in connection with the civil defense matters. I wish to have this insertion made following the statement by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. REYNOLDS], I believe. The section 405, to which I have referred, is section 405 of Public Law 920, of the 81st Congress, 2d section; and the three paragraphs of the report are the ones I have marked in Report No. 2683 of the 81st Congress, 2d session, dated December 19, 1950. They are a part of the report submitted by the Armed Services Committee; and, as I have said, I myself made the report on behalf of the committee.

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

[From Public Law 920, 81st Cong., 2d sess.—H. R. 9798, an act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes]

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

SEC. 405. In performing his duties, the Administrator shall (1) cooperate with the various departments and agencies of the Government; (2) utilize to the maximum extent the existing facilities and resources of the Federal Government, and, with their consent, the facilities and resources of the States and local political subdivisions thereof, and of other organizations and agencies; and (3) refrain from engaging in any form of activity which would duplicate or parallel activity of any other Federal department or agency unless the Administrator, with the written approval of the President, shall determine that such duplication is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

[From report No. 2683, 81st Congress, 2d session, on the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950—to accompany S. 4268]

The bill contemplates that the Administrator of Civil Defense will utilize to the fullest possible extent existing governmental and private agencies. It provides that he may delegate certain of his responsibilities to appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government, but he must review and coordinate them one with the other and with the various States.

The bill provides that the Administrator, through existing Government agencies, or through the establishment of means if none exists, will make appropriate provision for adequate warning communication installations, health and sanitation measures, to control the effects of various types of attack; develop shelter designs, material and equipment for utilization in meeting the requirements of the problem; train key State personnel to supervise these activities in the various States; develop and disseminate educational material on the subject; encourage and assist the States to negotiate civil defense compacts among themselves; procure such materials, equipment, and facilities for civil defense as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the program; stockpile medical supplies and equipment, food, blood plasma, and other items which are necessary to meet the needs of civil defense, and through a carefully controlled program of financial contributions to assist the States in the procurement and construction of the necessary materials and facilities to meet their local requirements. This financing program will cover such items as communal shelters, mobile organizational equipment, and other supplies which the States and communities normally do not require in meeting their governmental responsibilities. This financing program will be explained in detail later in the report.

While the bill, as introduced, required the Administrator to utilize to the maximum extent possible existing facilities of the Government and private organizations, the committee believed that this should be made much stricter. Accordingly, the bill now requires the Administrator not to establish duplicate Federal activities unless the President approves such duplication in writing. It is believed that the many excellent organizations around the country, both governmental and private, will contribute their share and the Civil Defense Administration will remain a relatively small Federal agency. The committee has in mind such private organizations as the American Red Cross, public libraries, and so forth.

* * * * *

The committee deleted from the bill certain protection that was given to employees of the Federal Government in the event of disabling injury or death while performing civil defense functions. This is not to be construed as an indication that the committee does not believe such individuals should not be covered. Rather, the committee is of the opinion that through some type of war risk insurance, or other special compensation plan, all individuals engaged in civil defense activities should be uniformly covered and that employees of the Federal Government be not singled out for preferred treatment. The committee has requested that prompt action be taken to submit legislation which would meet the requirements of this particular need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad that the two distinguished Senators

have discussed the question of civil defense, because there is nothing remaining for me to say except that the party responsible, the administration, has decided upon this as a necessary move to carry out the policy not to erect new buildings, but to occupy those which already exist and to move certain offices to strategic areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 9936, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., *August 17, 1954.*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 34, 54, 55, 59, 72, 73, 93, 103, 105, 113, 114, 126, 152, 159, and 169 to the bill (H. R. 9936) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Automobile for the Chief Justice: For purchase, exchange, lease, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Chief Justice of the United States, $5,835."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'International Educational Exchange Activities', $300,000: *Provided,* That not less than $1,674,652 shall be used for Educational Exchange Activities related to the 'American Republics' from the total available to this appropriation for fiscal year 1955."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 31, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"PAYMENT TO FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

"For payment to the Federal Republic of Germany for the acquisition or construction of an Embassy in the District of Columbia, $300,000, to be paid out of any funds or other property or interest vested or transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to or with respect to the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment of legislation set forth in either H. R. 9988 or S. 1573, Eighty-third Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Construction, Washington National Airport: For an additional amount for 'Construction, Washington National Airport', including additional loading gate positions and related paving; $340,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 39, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That transfers may be made to the appropriation for the current fiscal year for 'Salaries and expenses' for administrative expenses (not to exceed $400,000) and for reserve fleet expenses in such amounts as may be required, and any such transfers shall be without regard to the limitations under that appropriation on the amounts available for such expenses: *Provided further.*"

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"REPAIR OF RESERVE FLEET VESSELS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

"For the payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the 'Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954', $12,000,000: *Provided,* That advances may be made from this appropriation to 'Salaries and expenses, maritime activities', for administrative expenses (not to exceed $150,000), and for reserve fleet expenses (in such amounts as may be required), and such advances shall be in addition to amounts otherwise made available for such expenses: *Provided further,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law during the 83d Congress of S. 3546."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 46, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$350,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment No. 49, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $12,500; and the amount made available under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1955, for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, is increased from $75,000 to $87,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 52, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$13,100,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9709, 83d Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 56, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"The two immediately preceding paragraphs in this act under the head 'Bureau of Employment Security' shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 9709, 83d Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 61, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

"Salaries, expenses, and grants: For carrying out the act of July 26, 1954 (Public Law 530), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $900,000, of which $700,000 shall be for grants to the States in accordance with section 2 of such act, except that the Commissioner of Education may establish the amount to be allotted to each State without regard to the limitation established by said section 2, but no State shall receive less than $5,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds granted to any State may be used to compensate any person for their personal services: *Provided further,* That a Conference Director may be appointed by the Secretary at a salary of not to exceed $12,500 per annum."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 62, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Grants to States and other agencies

"For grants to States and other agencies in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, $4 million, of which $1,500,000 is for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of said act; $1,500,000 is for extension and improvement projects under section 3 of said act; and $1 million is for special projects under section 4 of said act: *Provided,* That the amounts appropriated for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation under the head 'Payments to States' in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available, without regard to the limitations set forth therein, for the purposes of section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended: *Provided further,* That not more than $2 of the funds made available for special projects under section 4 of said act shall be expended for any project for each $1 that the grantee, or the grantee and the State, expends for the same purpose."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 71½, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $5 million, to be derived by transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 74, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$20,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 79, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$1,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 85, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Foreign Agricultural Service', including not to exceed $15,000 for representation allowances, $1,400,000, which shall be derived from the 'Salaries and expenses' appropriation available to the Department of State: *Provided,* That transfers shall be made under this authorization in lieu of any similar transfers which may be authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954 (H. R. 9680, 83d Cong.): *Provided further,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 9680, 83d Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 86 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In the last line, eliminate the reference to "S. 2313" and insert in lieu thereof "section 710 (a) of H. R. 9680."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 88, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In the second proviso of said amendment strike out the word "appropriation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "authorization."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 89, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In

lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the Solicitor', $45,000: *Provided*, That $35,000 shall be effective only upon enactment into law of either H. R. 8386 or S. 3137, 83d Congress."

The the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 91, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 99, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That $250,000 of the unobligated funds heretofore appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project shall be available for additional investigations on the Garrison diversion unit, the White River, and for emergency rehabilitation of the Willow Creek Dam in South Dakota."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 100, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the comma following the sum named in said amendment insert "of which not more than $175,000 shall be available for personal services."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 104, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike the sum which precedes the period in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof "$6,750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 110, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "the Commission is authorized to use not to exceed $100,000 of funds made available for administrative expenses of the War Claims Commission."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 115 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "credited to the fund from which rental payments are made during fiscal year 1955."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 116 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 9 of said amendment, in lieu of the sum named insert "$300,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 119, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, in lieu of the sum named insert "$1,100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 122, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of said amendment, in lieu of the sum named insert "$2,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 127, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, in lieu of the sum named insert "$75,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 128, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$6,500,000" named in line 5 of said amendment insert "$5,500,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$355,000" named in lines 6 and 7 of said amendment insert "$250,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$28,000,000" named in line 10 of said amendment insert "$26,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 129 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$7,750,000" named in line 6 of said amendment, insert "$7,350,000" and in lieu of the sum of "$580,000" named in line 8 of said amendment, insert "$540,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 132 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$200,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,500 of the funds made available for administrative expenses in this act under the head 'St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation' may be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 134 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000,000" and before the period insert ": *Provided further*, That the construction authorized by the act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325, 83d Cong.) may be accomplished prior to approval of title to underlying land, as provided by section 355, as amended, of the Revised Statutes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 136 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment No. 147 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed as paragraph (b) of said amendment insert:

"(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment No. 148 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment insert:

"SEC. 907. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to receive the sum of $500,000 in partial consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for educational purposes pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the Los Angeles City High School District of Los Angeles County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States to that portion of the Birmingham General Hospital tract now occupied by troops (consisting of 40.0 acres of land, more or less, and improvements thereon) located at Van Nuys, Calif., provided such sum is received by the Secretary of the Army on or before July 1, 1956. Upon receipt by the Secretary of the Army such sum shall be credited to the appropriation, 'Military construction, Army,' and shall be available for (1) the construction and other costs involved in moving to a suitable Government owned site not more than eight buildings to be selected by the Secretary of the Army to be excluded from the conveyance by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and (2) the construction of additional supporting facilities at such site as may be required for authorized defense construction, at a total cost of not to exceed $500,000.

"In addition to other terms, conditions, and restrictions contained in the deed whereby the Birmingham General Hospital is conveyed to such school district, the school district shall agree, as a part of the consideration for the conveyance to permit any buildings required by the Secretary of the Army to remain in place for continued occupancy by troops for a period of not to exceed 9 months after the date of conveyance of said property to the school district."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 151 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $5,985,000, to remain available until expended, of which $600,000 shall be available for advanced engineering and design by the Corps of Engineers for projects which have been authorized for development with participation by State, local government or private groups and for authorized projects which are under consideration for participation by such agencies."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 154 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

"Not to exceed $600,000 of funds previously appropriated under this head shall be available until expended for repairs to the north jetty at Yaquina Bay Harbor, Oreg."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 155 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Before the period in said amendment insert ", to be derived by transfer from 'Operation and maintenance, general.'"

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 164 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF TANKERS

"For construction of tankers as authorized by the act of August 10, 1954, Public Law 575, $30 million to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be transferred to such appropriation as the President may designate."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 168 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 187 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the section number named in said amendment insert "1313."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60, 71, and 130.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate with the exception of amendment No. 151, which will be considered separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate, with the exception of amendment No. 151, are agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the House amendments to the Senate amendments.

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

No. 27. Supreme Court—auto for the Chief Justice: House action amends Senate provision by referring to Chief Justice of the United States in lieu of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

No. 30. International educational exchange activities: Appropriates $300,000 in lieu of $900,000; and provides that not less than $1,647,652 shall be used for educational exchange activities related to the "American Republics" from the amount available for international educational exchange activities.

No. 31. Payment to the Republic of Germany: Provides that the $300,000 be derived from funds of the Alien Property Custodian.

No. 38. Construction, Washington National Airport: Allows $340,000 in lieu of $635,000 and provides that funds shall be used for additional loading gate positions and related paving. No funds for gasoline and baggage facilities.

No. 39. Ship construction: Provides $400,000 for administrative expenses in lieu of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 40. Repair of reserve fleet vessels: Allows $12 million in lieu of $18 million proposed by Senate.

No. 42. Bureau of Accounts, Division of Disbursements: Proposed $350,000 in lieu of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 49. Bureau of Labor Standards, President's Committee on National Employ the Handicapped Week: Proposes $12,500 in lieu of $25,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 52. Grants to States for unemployment compensation: Provides $13,100,000 in lieu of $30 million proposed by the Senate; and $4,600,000 as originally proposed by the House. Also requires $2 million shall be available only upon the enactment of H. R. 9700.

No. 56. Unemployment compensation for Federal employees: Eliminates the language which makes $896,000 contingent upon enactment of H. R. 9640 or S. 2759, since S. 2759 is now Public Law No. 565.

No. 61. White House Conference on Education: Makes an appropriation of $900,000 in lieu of $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the total $700,000 shall be available for grants in lieu of $1 million as proposed by the Senate. Provides that none of the funds shall be used for compensation for personal services, and limits the salary of the Conference Director to $12,500, in lieu of $15,000 proposed by the Senate.

No. 62. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, grants to States and other agencies: Provides $4 million in lieu of $6 million proposed by the Senate, of which $1 million is for special projects in lieu of $3 million as proposed by the Senate; and provides that the $1 million shall be matched on a basis of not more than $2 of Federal funds shall be expended for each dollar that the grantee or grantee and State expend for the same purpose.

No. 71. Social Security Administration, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: House insists on their disagreement to the Senate action in striking the language which prohibits the use of available funds to pay any costs of moving any group of employees from Baltimore to Washington.

No. 71½. Salaries and expenses: Provides $5 million in lieu of $6 million as proposed by the Senate; and eliminates the authority to transfer $59,300 to "Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services."

No. 74. Construction, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Provides $20 million in lieu of $22,290,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 79. Civil defense activities (HEW): Provides $1 million in lieu of $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 85. Foreign Agricultural Service: Provides $1,400,000 in lieu of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and provides that the entire amount shall be derived from salaries and expenses available to Department of State in lieu of $1 million as proposed by the Senate.

No. 86. Commodity Exchange Authority: Changes the citation for wool from S. 2313 to the appropriate section of the farm bill, H. R. 9680.

No. 88. Loan authorization: Perfecting amendment changing the word "appropriation" to "authorization."

No. 89. Office of the Solicitor: Provides $45,000 in lieu of $54,000 as proposed by the Senate and provides that $35,000 shall be available only upon enactment of H. R. 8386 or S. 3137 in lieu of $40,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 91. Appointment of hearing officers for Indian probate work: Eliminates the word "hereafter" from the Senate amendment.

No. 99. Bureau of Reclamation, Missouri River Basin: Provides that $250,000 shall be available for additional investigations on Garrison Diversion unit and White River, and for emergency rehabilitation of Willow Creek Dam in South Dakota in lieu of $375,000 as proposed by the Senate and strikes the language pertaining to the Sheyenne farm and the Oakes development tract.

No. 100. Bureau of Mines: Adds a proviso "of which not more than $175,000 shall be available for personal services."

No. 104. Limitation on personal services, Bonneville Power Administration: Increases the limitation from $6,250,000 to $6,750,000 in lieu of $7,450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 110. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Provides that the Commission is authorized to use not to exceed $100,000 of funds made available for administrative expenses of the War Claims Commission.

No. 115. General Services Administration, expenses, general supply fund: Limits the authority to credit the fund from which rental payments are made to the fiscal year 1955.

No. 116. Survey of Government records: Provides $300,000 in lieu of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 119. Housing and Home Finance Agency, salaries and expenses: Provides $1,100,000 in lieu of $1,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 122. Public facility loans: Provides $2 million in lieu of $18 million as proposed by the Senate.

No. 127. Office of the Administrator, Public Facility Loans: Provides $75,000 in lieu of $210,000 as proposed by the Senate.

No. 128. Federal Housing Administration: Increases the limitation on administrative expenses from $5,150,000 to $5,500,000 in lieu of $6,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; increases the limitation of travel from $175,000 to $250,000 in lieu of $355,000 as proposed by the Senate; increases the limitation on nonadministrative expenses from $25 million to $26,250,000 in lieu of $28 million as proposed by the Senate.

No. 129. Public Housing Administration: Increases the limitation of funds available for administrative expenses to $7,350,000 in lieu of the Senate increase to $7,750,000; and increases the limitation on travel to $540,000 in lieu of the Senate increase to $580,000.

No. 130. National Capital Planning Commission, land acquisition.

No. 132. Small Business Administration, salaries and expenses: Allows $200,000 in lieu of $350,000 proposed by the Senate. Also inserts a provision authorizing the use of not to exceed $2,500 of the funds available to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for administrative expenses, for emergencies and extraordinary expenses.

No. 134. Family housing: Allows $75 million in lieu of $175 million proposed by the Senate. Inserts a provision to authorize construction of the Air Force Academy prior to the approval of the title to the land.

No. 136. Army National Guard: Authorizes the transfer of $1,500,00 in lieu of the Senate amount of $3 million for additional State National Guard civilian employees.

No. 147. Section 906, roll-on roll-off vessels: Inserts a paragraph authorizing appropriations in lieu of the Senate paragraph authorizing the use of funds available to the Department of Defense for the purposes authorized in section 906.

No. 148. Section 907, transfer of land to the Los Angeles County High School District: Inserts a new section in lieu of Senate section 907 for the purpose of clarifying the section.

No. 151. Construction, general: Provides $5,985,000 in lieu of $8,415,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Item	Senate bill	Conference
Planning:		
Sacramento River	$150,000	
Coosa River	100,000	
Canyon Reservoir	50,000	
Markham Ferry	100,000	$100,000
John Day Reservoir	700,000	
Priest Rapids	350,000	350,000
Cougar Reservoir	150,000	150,000
Green Peter Reservoir	150,000	
Total, planning	1,750,000	600,000
Construction:		
Stockton Harbor	335,000	335,000
Hampton Beach	140,000	
Greenup lock and dam	2,000,000	2,000,000
Charleston Harbor	200,000	
San Diego River	750,000	750,000
North Adams	940,000	
Buffalo Harbor	1,100,000	1,100,000
Los Angeles	1,200,000	1,200,000
Total, construction	6,665,000	5,385,000
Grand total	8,415,000	5,985,000

In addition, the language making up to $2 million of unexpended funds available for projects certified as essential to the national defense program was stricken from the bill.

No. 154. Operation and maintenance: Provides for the use of $600,000 of available funds for Yaquina Bay in lieu of an appropriation of $840,000 for Yaquina Bay, Block Island, and Great Salt Pond.

No. 155. Mississippi River and tributaries: Provides for a transfer of $1 million from operation and maintenance in lieu of an appropriation as proposed by the Senate.

No. 164. Construction of tankers: Allows $30 million in lieu of $37,500,000 proposed by the Senate. Completes the citation to the authorizing legislation.

No. 168. Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission: Allows $100,000 in lieu of $170,000 proposed by the Senate.

No. 187. Section 1312, ratification section: Corrects section number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the House to amendment of the Senate No. 151.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should simply like to say that I signed the conference report with the exception of amendment No. 151. That involved an expenditure for preventing floods in North Adams, Mass. I was grievously disappointed that the House would not accept that as well as the other items which were contained in the civil functions bill.

In order not to take the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to file a brief statement at this point, together with a table showing what the Senate has done in the last 5 years on such projects.

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

Once again, the House of Representatives, in spite of the pleas by Congressman HESELTON, has refused to agree with the Senate to allow the flood-control project at North Adams to go ahead. They have once again taken lightly the safety of the people and the industries in this fine city in Berkshire County. I know the fear the citizens of North Adams have of a flash flood pouring down upon them from the steep hills above the city.

So far as the Senate is concerned, I am glad to say that in 1950, at my urging, they recognized the need for flood control at

North Adams and voted $500,000 for this project. Every single year since 1950, the Senate has voted money for this project. Twice they have voted money for this project. First, after the House refused to do so, $640,000 was passed by the Senate in the regular bill carrying funds for flood control. But the House refused to concur. At my request, and that of Congressman HESELTON, in conjunction with requests from the Army Engineers, the President, in a supplemental budget, requested $940,000. This request came to the Senate and the Senate promptly agreed to this amount. The supplemental appropriation bill went to conference between the House and Senate. Once again the House disregards the safety of North Adams and has just voted not to go along with the Senate on this amount or any amount. As a member of that conference, I protested vigorously and refused to recede on the amount which was passed by the Senate.

I wish to thank my colleagues in the Senate for supporting me as to the need for flood control in North Adams in every single year since the original appropriation in 1950 and twice this year. I want my friends in North Adams to recognize that the Members of the Senate have their welfare at heart and I shall continue to strive for help for them in continuing this worthy project. In the words of the senior Senator from Arizona—the senior Democrat on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate—"There is no more worthy project in the United States."

So that the record can speak for itself, I ask to have printed following my remarks, a table showing appropriations by budget estimate, House action, Senate action, and conference action in each of the last 6 years for the North Adams flood-control project.

Adams

	Budget estimate	House	Senate	Actual as result of conference
1950	0	0	$500,000	$350,000
1951 [1]	$500,000	$350,000	400,000	245,000
1952	225,000	210,000	225,000	225,000
1953	0	0	400,000	0
1954	390,000	0	370,000	0
1955	560,000	560,000	560,000	560,000

[1] All projects reexamined in light of Korean conflict. Finally allocated $350,000 to Adams from fiscal 1951 appropriation.

North Adams

	Budget estimate	House	Senate	Actual as result of conference
1950	0	0	$500,000	$350,000
1951 [1]	$500,000	$350,000	400,000	350,000
1952	0	0	400,000	400,000
1953	0	0	500,000	0
1954	875,000	0	830,000	0
1955 (regular bill)	0	0	640,000	0
1955 (supplemental)	940,000	[2] 0	940,000	([3])

[1] All projects reexamined in light of Korean conflict. Finally allocated $250,000 to North Adams from fiscal 1951 appropriation.
[2] Not considered by House.
[3] Disagreed to in conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts on this particular item, particularly in relation to the North Adams project. We had pictures and an analysis of that project. I think it was a worthy project which should have been included in the bill, but, after all, it is necessary at times to make compromises in these matters in order that a bill may be passed.

There are other items on which Senators may want to speak. The RECORD should be made clear as to their viewpoints. Certain Senators felt they were right as to certain items. After long arguments and a thorough examination of each item, the Senate conferees had to recede in the case of some items, and the House had to recede in the case of other items. In my opinion, it is unfortunate that we had to do what we did on amendment No. 151.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon, because he has great interest in one of these items.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the items in planning and construction involved in the amendment now under consideration, amendment No. 151, were items for advance engineering and design for the Sacramento deep-water channel in California, $150,000; and a series of multipurpose projects in various parts of the United States, where either there have been enacted into law provisions for partnership participation or with reference to which there is legislation pending looking toward that end.

The projects which were included by the Senate are six: The Coosa River project, Alabama; Canyon River Reservoir, Tex.; Markham Ferry Reservoir, Okla.; John Day Reservoir, in Washington and Oregon, on the Columbia River; Priest Rapids Reservoir, Wash., also on the Columbia River; Cougar Reservoir, Oreg.; and Green Peter Reservoir, Oreg.

Both of the last are on tributaries of the Willamette River in that State.

The amounts as passed by the Senate were: Coosa, $100,000; Canyon Reservoir, $50,000; Markham Ferry, $100,000; John Day Reservoir, $700,000; Priest Rapids, $350,000; Cougar, $150,000; Green Peter, $150,000.

The total was $1,750,000 for the group, including the Sacramento Channel work.

Very shortly after the conference opened, it was clear that the House had taken a very definite, firm, and fixed position with respect to the engineering funds to be allowed for certain of the projects. They receded and agreed with the Senate with respect to the Markham Ferry Reservoir in Oklahoma and Priest Rapids Reservoir in Washington, these projects having been authorized for partnership development by bills passed at this session of Congress; and with respect to Cougar Reservoir in Oregon, legislation for which has passed the House and is now pending on the calendar in the Senate.

The House refused to recede with respect to Coosa River; with respect to Canyon Reservoir; with respect to John Day Reservoir, and with respect to Green Peter Reservoir.

The opposition of the House rested on two grounds. One was with respect to certain of the projects because of lack of authorization. Two of these projects are included in the omnibus bill which passed yesterday, but which we had not passed at the time of the conference.

With respect to others, and particularly with respect to John Day Reservoir, the objection rested upon the fact that the item had been included in the regular civil functions appropriation bill and in conference the House had refused to recede. It should be pointed out that there were other important items in conference at that time. From the standpoint of the Northwest, the items of overriding importance involved maintenance of the accelerated schedule of construction on our great multiple-purpose projects which are now under construction. The House conferees agreed to language accomplishing that objective. Perhaps planning money for John Day could have been obtained if the Senate conferees had accepted a delay of a year in completion of the Dalles Dam and Chief Joseph Dam. It was one or the other and the Senate conferees agreed to the compromise which brought the greatest benefit to the Northwest. Therefore, they thought that was a closed book at this session of Congress.

The Senate took the view that while that principle was sound, it was not applicable in this instance, because here the request was for advance engineering funds for a series of projects, all predicated upon the partnership theory; all—if the partnership plan can be worked out—to be constructed only partly with Federal money, and at a very great saving in Federal investment.

The Senate took the position that in view of the attitude of this administration favoring the engineering funds for these specific projects and in view of the position of the Bureau of the Budget to the same point, all the items should be allowed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to his colleague?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that irrespective of whether we go ahead with the partnership principle or do not go ahead with the partnership principle in the case of these particular projects, these funds for planning would be needed, no matter who built the projects—whether they were built under the combined partnership arrangement or whether they were built by the Federal Government alone?

Mr. CORDON. My colleague is unquestionably correct in making that statement. The engineering must be done at some time or other.

However, in placing the items in this supplemental appropriation bill, the Senate took the view that changed conditions authorized a new consideration. That is the basis on which I submit the matter to the Senate.

Although the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I approved the conference report, we excepted from that approval of this particular amendment; and we feel that some statement on it should properly be made for the RECORD.

Mr. President, I wish to say—because I think it should be said at this time—that I am in agreement on the basic proposition the House advanced; namely, that once projects have been considered in a general bill, they should not thereafter come up for consideration in a

supplemental bill. However, I believe—as I argued at the conference meetings with all the force I had—that there will always be exceptions to that basic rule; that there are conditions in which subsequent requests are proper. I believe that condition existed and exists with respect to these projects.

I also understand, Mr. President, that legislation is compromise. I understand that the House conferees have the same rights to their views as I have or as the other Senate conferees have to their views. I understand that a bill of the importance of this one—amounting to something in excess of $2 billion, and containing not only a great number of most important appropriation items in relation to civil functions, but also items for the District of Columbia; the legislative branch and the judiciary; the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce; the Post Office Department; the Treasury Department; the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; the Department of Agriculture; the Department of the Interior; items for the Independent Offices; items for military construction; items for emergency programs and activities; items relating to claims and judgments, and so on—must pass; and I understand that there comes a time when a Member must use his judgment with respect to whether argument can longer be effective.

This particular conference continued over a period of 10 days. At its conclusion we had saved, out of this list, Markham Ferry Reservoir, in Oklahoma; Priest Rapids Dam, in Washington; and Cougar Reservoir, in Oregon. We lost the Green Peter Reservoir, in Oregon; John Day Reservoir, in Washington and Oregon; Canyon Reservoir, in Texas; and the Coosa River developments, in Alabama.

I regret that we were unable to get together. I have no criticism of those on the other side who differed with me and with my colleagues; and I join with my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, in expressing my deep appreciation of the loyal support which was given to us and to these projects by every one of the Senate conferees.

Mr. President, under the circumstances, although I realize that I might now move that the Senate refuse to accept the House action on this matter, yet I feel that should not be done under the parliamentary situation in which we now find ourselves.

So, much as I regret to do it, I shall support the conference report and the House action, in order that we may get the other legislation and appropriations necessary in this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in the case of amendment No. 151, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has very ably stated the case for the Senate conferees. All of us did our very best in that connection; but inasmuch as legislation is the art of compromise, the time came when we had to make this decision, and we made it.

Therefore, I now move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 151.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 60. I shall make an explanation in that connection.

Amendment No. 60 is pure legislation in this appropriation bill. After we had proposed this item, the Senate and the House agreed upon such legislation in a legislative bill, and therefore amendment No. 60 is not necessary.

I should like to give a brief explanation of amendment No. 71. This refers to language which was stricken out in relation to the moving of employees from Baltimore, Md. to Washington, D. C. When that amendment was taken back in disagreement, the Representative from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] moved that the House recede from its insistence on the amendment. That motion was defeated. Then the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, took up the question of insisting upon the House amendment. That motion was carried by the House. So today we find ourselves in a position where we believe it is well to recede. Otherwise, we would have to take this amendment back in disagreement, and spend more days in conference on this question. I am convinced that the House, after voting, would not recede.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senate recedes on this particular amendment, of course it will not be possible to pay compensation to the employees who have already moved from Baltimore to Washington, for their expenses of moving. Is that not right?

Mr. FERGUSON. So far as this legislation is concerned, that is true.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. When Congress reconvenes, in the next session, the question could be taken up at the time of consideration of the appropriation bill, as we study it in 1955?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it seems to be an injustice, when an executive or a department orders the transfer of certain employees to a new location, for such employee to be denied the compensation which applicable laws provide for such employee if he is requested to transfer from a certain location to another. Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. But the law is also clear that no legislative act is binding upon the next legislature. A bill has been passed authorizing certain acts, but if this Congress does not appropriate the money, there is no way to compel Congress to act.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I have another question. It is always recognized that a Federal employee is to be compensated if a bureau or agency transfers him from one location to another.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that is the rule.

Mr. THYE. That is the law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is in the law.

Mr. THYE. Yes; that is the law.

Mr. FERGUSON. That law does not apply to legislative employees.

Mr. THYE. It does not apply to legislative employees, but the matter under consideration does not deal with a legislative division.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. THYE. This happens to relate to the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Division. It refers to the personnel of the headquarters unit, consisting of about 450 employees.

My only concern is that this agency was transferred from the Washington, D. C., location to Baltimore at the outset of World War II, to provide additional office space and living quarters for the employees brought to the District of Columbia under the war emergency, with the specific understanding as I recall, that when the emergency was over the headquarters unit would be moved back to the District of Columbia, for the reason that they are in constant contact and communication with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is an inconvenient and inefficient method of administration if one agency is located in Baltimore, when its services are constantly in demand, so far as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is concerned, in connection with records, administrative policies, and other transactions which come under the administrative functions of the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Division.

Therefore, I feel that Secretary Hobby is justified in making the transfer of this Division from Baltimore to Washington. If we deny the funds, we place that agency in a very embarrassing position, from the standpoint of the employees involved.

My question is this: If we as Members of Congress deny by specific language in appropriation bills the right of the Secretary to compensate those employees, we are in a sense nullifying a public law which is on the statute books relative to paying compensation of employees ordered to be transferred from one location to another; are we not?

I feel very strongly that we are not only placing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, in an exceedingly embarrassing position, but we have placed the employees of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Bureau—the headquarters unit, consisting of some 450 employees—in a most difficult financial position, because they are directed to transfer from Baltimore to Washington, and are compelled to suffer the expense of transporting their household goods and canceling contracts for living quarters and disposing of their homes, in order to come to the District, where they must either acquire apartments or rent homes. In some instances these employees have purchased homes in the District of Columbia.

All this is now in a state of confusion, and financial hardship is being worked

on these employees, because there is language in the law which denies the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the right to do what has been done in previous years, to compensate the employees involved for the expenses incurred. These employees were paid when they were ordered transferred from the District of Columbia to Baltimore. Now, when they are supposed to be transferred back, the law we are examining here, in the form of this conference report, denies the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the right to reimburse these employees, as provided by law, for transportation and moving expenses incurred. That is the objection I have to this language.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will say for the RECORD that this money would be taken out of the trust fund of this organization.

Mr. THYE. Most certainly; but we have forbidden the Secretary to use the money in the trust fund to compensate these employees for this expense.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what our action does.

Mr. THYE. I believe it is absolutely indefensible, from the standpoint of Members of Congress. However, the House has absolutely refused to allow this payment, by a vote on the House floor. If we were to reject this amendment and send it back, such action would only involve us in many more hours, and possibly days, of further conference, with the end result the same. Therefore, I can only hope that we will give this question very careful consideration, and when we reconvene in the 84th Congress I hope we shall make amends for the errors we have committed in this particular supplemental appropriation bill.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I noted with great disappointment the action taken with regard to amendment No. 63. The bill now appropriates only $900,000 for the training and traineeship program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, instead of the $1,831,000 proposed by the Senate. This represents a cut of more than one-half in the original appropriation.

I believe every member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which considered this bill, felt, as I did, that the question of training and traineeship was one of the most important parts of the bill, if not the most important part—really the heart of the bill. It is a source of very great disappointment and disturbance to me to observe that that highly important appropriation has been reduced by more than 50 percent, leaving only $900,000.

I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan could present an explanation of that action.

Mr. FERGUSON. I can only say that this subject was given long and serious consideration.

The Senate conferees insisted upon the amount of $1,831,000. However, in order to have this item remain in the bill it was necessary to compromise. The original amount was put in the bill in the Senate. No figure was provided in the House bill. Therefore, in conference, we were negotiating from nothing to $1,831,000.

That was our difficulty. There was nothing in the House bill. Therefore we finally had to accept the $900,000. I have a note which states that the $500,000 appropriation was made on a matching basis of 66⅔-percent Federal to 33⅓-percent State, and that the $400,000 was for transfer to the Public Health Service for the training of physicians, which would be provided by Federal funds.

Therefore, when we are providing $500,000 on a 66⅔-percent basis, the Federal Government will be putting up 2 dollars for every dollar of State funds.

The $400,000 is for starting a new program. Therefore, it was felt that $400,000 would be sufficient with which to start the program.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have in this country today a backlog of at least 2,000,000——

Mr. FERGUSON. Handicapped people.

Mr. LEHMAN. Handicapped people.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I have the greatest sympathy with the Senator's stand on the subject, and I share his views. This was another instance where compromise was necessary. All legislation, of course, is the result of compromise. We had to recede on this item, as we had to recede on some other items, or get nothing. The House bill contained no figure. This is legislation to carry out a new program.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I realize we can either accept the conference report or reject it. I realize that is our only choice.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. At the same time we are trying to make a record of how we feel about it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I want to make the record, if I possibly can, by protesting as vehemently and as vigorously as I can against this reduction. As I have said, there are a minimum of 2 million handicapped people in the country today. That is the backlog as of today. That number is increasing by not less than 250,000 a year. The program will make a very small dent under any circumstances. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill will bear me out when I say that all of us feel that the training and traineeship program is really the core and heart of the whole program.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Without it we can accomplish very little.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. However, we must also realize that the House felt we were starting from scratch, and that with only 10 months remaining, the amount appropriated would be sufficient. There is the right, of course, to come back for a deficiency appropriation on this kind of program, beginning on the 1st of January 1955. It was felt that the amount would be sufficient for the present.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to know that the Senator from Michigan is in sympathy with our views.

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. I should like to join the distinguished Senator from New York in indicating what the effect will be on the training and traineeship program with respect to the comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program upon which we have embarked. It is not an entirely new program, I say to the Senator from Michigan; it is a new phase of an old program.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. As the Senator from New York has stated, the tooling-up period is an essential part of the whole program. I understood that during the tooling-up period there would be money available for training and traineeships which would not be on a matching basis.

Mr. FERGUSON. The $400,000 is not on that basis.

Mr. PURTELL. But the $500,000 is tied up on a matching basis of 2 to 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. I should like to have the RECORD show that I certainly hope next year the Senator from Michigan will join the Senator from New York and many other Senators to make sure that we permit the tooling-up period to proceed in connection with this very important rehabilitation program, without its being tied up on a 2-to-1 basis with respect to the $500,000 appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. We will certainly let the conferees or anyone connected with this matter know our feeling and ask them to bear that point in mind. We did so this time, but the House was insistent. In order to get the $900,000, we had to put the $500,000 on a matching basis of 2 to 1.

Mr. President, the next item is amendment No. 130. I merely wish to say that that was a question of appropriations for the purpose of buying a piece of land on one of the parkways in Virginia. It is an eyesore, because there is an oil refinery on it at the present time, and there has been a fire on it. The Senate provided $60,000 as the Federal share. The State of Virginia and Arlington County were to pay a certain amount. When the bill was returned to the House, the House insisted that it would not pay any amount. Therefore, it was essential to strike that out.

I understand the United States Government has foreclosed a mortgage on the property.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 60, 71, and 130.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Trevor Gardner to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to announce to the Senate that we will proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection. First, however, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last night when the conference report on the farm bill was under consideration, I announced, as is shown at page 14785 of the RECORD:

> Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota expects to vote against the conference report. He makes that announcement because of the fact that it is expected to have a voice vote, not a yea and nay vote. I am against the bill, and I desire the RECORD so to show.

Some time later that evening the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] said:

> Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason I sought recognition was that while I was acting as majority leader this afternoon the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] asked me specifically whether there would be a record vote this evening. I told the Senator from North Dakota it was my information that there would not be a record vote. Therefore the Senator left the floor. If we were to have a record vote, I would feel that I had erred greatly, that I had misinformed one of my colleagues, and that there would have been committed an error that should not have been committed.

I ask unanimous consent that my vote "nay" should appear among the other "nay" votes in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I feel in this situation that the minority leader should be present. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota has correctly outlined the situation. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] did make it clear that the Senator from North Dakota had spoken to him.

Both the rules and the precedents of the Senate are against changing the roll call once a yea-and-nay vote has been taken and announced. If the Senator has had the opportunity to read the RECORD, I think he will see that the majority leader was trying to recess the Senate until 10 o'clock this morning, which would have prevented the difficulty which the Senator has had.

It seems to me, under the circumstances, that the Senator's announcement as to his position, the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the colloquy which followed, prior to the recess last night, give ample reasons why the Senator was not present. I know he has been very diligent in discharging his heavy responsibilities.

I should like very much to be able to agree offhand, but I would have to explore both the precedents and the rules, because there might be other occasions.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator. Ordinarily I remain in the Chamber until the Senate adjourns or recesses no matter how late the hour, but as the Senator knows, there is very severe illness in my family.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know that; and I know that no one having a knowledge of the facts and having read the RECORD and the statement of the Senator has any doubt as to the Senator's very prompt and diligent attendance upon the duties of the Senate. There has been very serious illness in his family; and any Senator, in like circumstances, would have felt when he left last night that there would not be a yea-and-nay vote. I regret very much that the Senator missed it, but I am sure that his position in opposition which he has so ably announced from time to time, leaves no doubt in the mind of anyone that, had he been present, he would have voted against the conference report. I think the RECORD can stand on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that under rule XII a Member of the Senate would not be permitted to vote, even by unanimous consent, once the vote had been announced.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I was not clear on that point. Frankly, I wanted a little time to explore the situation.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a quorum call we may have a calendar call for unobjected-to bills, beginning with No. 19 on the calendar, page 5, and running through to where we ended last time, which was No. 2392, following with the bills which were placed at the foot of the calendar, which will be taken up seriatim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is granted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarthy
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bowring	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Bush	Humphrey	Neely
Butler	Ives	Pastore
Byrd	Jackson	Payne
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Potter
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Reynolds
Clements	Kefauver	Robertson
Cooper	Kennedy	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Saltonstall
Crippa	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ervin	Lennon	Symington
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	Williams
George	Mansfield	Young
Goldwater	Martin	
Gore	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed with the call of the calendar, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative

to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1857) to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1396) to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1806) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2413) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6648) to amend section 205 of the Small Business Act of 1953 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2404) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2244) to provide for promotion by merit of employees in the postal services and to establish uniform procedures for examination and appointment of candidates for promotion to supervisory positions was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 509) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. 207) requiring a yea and nay vote on the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of treaties was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 42) to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 692) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2910) providing for the creation of certain United States judgeships, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this is clearly not calendar business. For that reason, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 44) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2373) to limit in certain cases the power of a single justice or judge of the United States to grant a stay of execution or sentence in connection with a habeas corpus proceeding or other proceeding collaterally attacking the conviction of any person was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. By request, over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2020) to amend section 433 of title 18, United States Code, relating to exemptions with respect to certain contracts was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ARKANSAS — BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4017) to provide for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation has been requested.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee does not seem to be present on the floor. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 23) to make it unlawful for a member of a Communist organization to hold an office or employment with any labor organization and to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3915) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands

withdrawn or reserved for power development and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 144) requiring a yea and nay vote on the passage of joint resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3199) to authorize additional use of Government motor vehicles at isolated Government installations, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEO F. PINDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2876) for the relief of Leo F. Pinder, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4104) for the relief of Frank St. Charles was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5572) for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3158) to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associates was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3190) to amend section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3542) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communications facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3435) to amend the act relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport to incorporate the Washington National Airport Corp., and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7395) to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7815) to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Cougar Dam and Reservoir on the South Fork McKenzie River, Oregon, with participation for power by the city of Eugene, Oreg., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 880) to amend the license law of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2601) to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1797, Senate bill 2601. If consent is granted, it is my purpose to request unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, because I should like to speak briefly on the bill, in the hope that the Senators who have objected may withdraw their objections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] entered objection to the bill. The Chair does not see the Senator from Georgia on the floor at this time, but the Chair will ask whether there is objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, within the last 5 days, this is about the third time we have reached this bill on the calendar. Most Senators on this side of the aisle are very much in favor of the bill, and I think there are some on the other side of the aisle who are very much in favor of it. It is a matter of great importance to the school people all over the country.

It seems to me that, rather than aggravate this matter—and I say this in all kindliness, nonetheless—for political purposes, the fact is that the bill can be scheduled for debate and passage at any time that the majority leader decides to have that done.

So far as I am concerned, we have had this bill up on three different occasions. If the Senator from Kentucky wishes to submit a statement for the RECORD, well and good; we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has asked unanimous consent that the Senate return to Calendar No. 1797, Senate bill 2601, to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had entered objection.

Mr. COOPER. My purpose is simply to request unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, not that it be debated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the Senator from Kentucky make any statement he may see fit to make, under the rules, at the present time, but I know of no reason why the bill should again go to the foot of the calendar. I believe it has already taken that course on at least two other occasions, and perhaps more.

If the Senator from Kentucky wishes to make a further statement with respect to the bill, I have no objection to returning to the bill for that purpose; but I see no reason why the bill should be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that I did not wish to interrupt the call of the calendar at this time in order to make a statement on the bill.

However, the bill is important; and if it can be placed at the foot of the calendar, I should like to speak at that time to point out to the Senate why I believe the bill is important—and with the hope that the objection which has been made will be withdrawn, or that perhaps the bill will be placed on the schedule for passage at this session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In accordance with the very fair suggestion of the Senator from Georgia—who, as I understand, has no objection to returning to the bill at this point, so that under the 5-minute rule the Senator from Kentucky can make whatever explanation of the bill he wishes to make—then, I suppose, all Senators will be able to reserve judgment as to what statement of objection or what other statement they may care to make.

So I think we shall facilitate the handling of the matter if such consent is granted, so that the Senator from Kentucky may make his statement now.

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

Without objection, the Senate will now return to Calendar No. 1797, Senate bill 2601.

The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as we near the close of the session, and inasmuch as I feel very deeply about the importance of the bill, I wish to explain at this time the purpose of the bill, S. 2601, entitled the "Emergency Public School Construction Act of 1954."

The Senate will remember that 4 years ago the Congress directed that a survey be made of school facilities in the United States, and particularly of the availability of classrooms for the schoolchildren of the country. The survey was made, and the results of the survey should address themselves to every Member of the Congress. The survey shows that in the United States there is a deficit of classrooms needed to properly house at least 7½ million children—a deficit of approximately 250,000 classrooms. The survey further shows that the total cost of providing the needed classrooms would amount to approximately $10 billion or $12 billion. The survey indicates that local governments and local school boards are able to provide perhaps $5 billion or $6 billion of the $10 billion or $12 billion needed to make whole the deficit.

President Eisenhower, in his message to the Congress on the state of the Union last year, stated as one of his recommendations that the Congress should take account of this need, one which relates directly to the education of the children of the Nation, and should make provision for assisting in the construction of school facilities.

As a result of the President's suggestion, several bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. I introduced Senate bill 2601. Hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education and Public Welfare; and after comprehensive hearings and discussion by the committee, Senate bill 2601 was reported to the Senate by the unanimous vote of the members of the committee. I reported the bill, and there are joined as sponsors the distinguished chairman of our committee, Senator SMITH of New Jersey, and Senators UPTON, BOWRING, MURRAY, HILL, NEELY, CLEMENTS, DOUGLAS, KENNEDY, and MCCLELLAN. S. 2601 is an emergency bill. It authorizes for each of the next 2 fiscal years, ending July 1, 1956, an appropriation of $250 million for each of the 2 years. The bill provides that the money shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of a formula which is well known to the Senate; it is the Hill-Burton formula, used in the allocation of funds for hospital construction. One-half of the allocations to the States will be based upon the Hill-Burton formula, which takes into consideration both school population, and the relative per capita income of the States.

In order to be fair to all of the States, particularly those States in the North who believe the Hill-Burton formula too favorable to the lower-income States, one-half of the allocation takes into account the school population and school age, 5 to 17 years in all the States. Control is left entirely to the States. The States will submit to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a list of schools based on the priority of need for assistance—listing the school districts in greatest need. Then if the programs are approved—and approval is practically mandatory—40 percent of the cost would be supplied through use of Federal funds authorized by this act, and the remaining 60 percent would be paid by the local agencies. I will file later a complete statement showing the need for school rooms and the help that my bill would give to each State.

I believe this is a bill of importance. It affects all the school children in the country. It would help a deficit in classrooms and school facilities which has been ascertained by virtue of the report directed by the Congress itself. I have urged again and again that this bill be brought up for passage before the Congress adjourns. I ask that the Members of the Senate be given a chance to express themselves on this important bill. It is a bill for the school children, for the youth of the Nation, and will strengthen this country.

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

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for yielding to me for this statement.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Kentucky agree with me that this bill seeks to effectuate and implement the great educational tenet of one of the country's greatest Democrats, Thomas Jefferson, who said that the strength of a democracy can be no greater than the enlightenment of its people?

Mr. COOPER. I believe so.

I might say also that a Senator who just recently served among us in this chamber—one considered to be a great American conservative, one who was also one of the great American liberals, in his concern for individual freedom, and opportunity—the late Senator from Ohio, Robert A. Taft, again and again sponsored bills such as this; and urged and secured, with the help of other Senators, their passage by the Senate. I earnestly urge that we be given the chance to vote on this bill for the school children of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I rise to endorse the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considered a number of bills in this field. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was chairman of a very able subcommittee, which examined all those bills. We had the advice of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

While our committee is making an overall survey in connection with another bill with regard to the school needs of this country, we felt that it was imperative this year for us to meet the immediate emergency needs. This 2-year bill was therefore first reported from the subcommittee to our full committee, and then considered at length by the full committee. The formula was worked out, and we unanimously reported the bill to the calendar.

I am very hopeful that the desire of the Senator from Kentucky, who has been doing a yeoman's job in this connection, can be achieved, and that the bill can be debated and passed before Congress adjourns. It is a very important bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am somewhat familiar with the history of legislation of this type. I have considerable sympathy with the objectives of this bill.

Let me say that my position with regard to the bill is not an individual position. I think I can say with sincerity that my views coincide with the views of several Members of the Senate, when I suggest that this bill should not be passed on the call of the calendar. It involves many very complex questions. I am amazed to hear that the bill is brought here today as an emergency bill, which we should do something about immediately.

As I understand, the Committee on Education and Labor in the House of Representatives has not reported any companion bill. We all know well enough that even if the authorization were passed, another supplemental appropriation bill would have to be passed before the matter could be dealt with as an emergency. If there is any intention whatever of Congress adjourning at any time in the foreseeable future, it would be impossible to take any final action at this session of Congress.

We might go out and campaign by saying that we voted for the bill, but as a practical matter, to deal with this as an emergency, we would have to wait until we had received an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, and another appropriation bill would be necessary before we could benefit one single, solitary school district in the United States.

A bill of this importance, Mr. President, would, as I understand, require a still further increase in the public debt of around a half billion dollars, because we would have to borrow the money to do this. Even if we kept the Congress here for several weeks, in order to pass the authorization and get the budget estimates and pass the appropriation bill, this is too serious a matter to be considered in this way. I do not think the bill should pass on the call of the calendar. Therefore, not only for myself, but for other Senators, I interpose an objection to further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN USES OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 620) to provide authorization for

certain uses of public lands, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "authorized", to insert "under such reasonable terms and conditions as such head may determine"; and on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 2. The authority conferred by this act shall be in addition to, and not in derogation of, any authority heretofore conferred upon the head of any department or agency of the Government of the United States to grant permits, leases, easements, or rights-of-way.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the head of any department or agency of the Government of the United States having jurisdiction over public lands, national forests, and reservations of the United States is hereby authorized, under such reasonable terms and conditions as such head may determine, to grant permits, leases, or easements for a period not to exceed 50 years from the date of any such permit, lease, or easement to States, counties, cities, towns, townships, municipal corporations, or other public agencies for the purpose of constructing and maintaining on such lands public buildings or other public works. In the event such lands cease to be used for the purpose for which such permit, lease, or easement was granted, the same shall thereupon terminate.

SEC. 2. The authority conferred by this act shall be in addition to, and not in derogation of, any authority heretofore conferred upon the head of any department or agency of the Government of the United States to grant permits, leases, easements, or rights-of-way.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have two proposed amendments to Senate bill 620 to offer at this time. The first one proposes, on the first page, beginning with line 5, to strike out all through the word "easements" in line 8, and insert certain language in lieu thereof.

I call particular attention to the following language in my amendment:

to be fixed by such head of such department or agency through appraisal.

The second amendment proposes to strike out the word "fifty" on the first page, line 8, and insert in lieu thereof "thirty." That refers to the number of years which the bill presently providing a leasehold may extend. In lieu of 50 years my amendment provides a maximum of 30 years. I have discussed the bill and the proposed two amendments with the Senator from Oregon. I have been advised there is no objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senate that there is a companion bill to the pending bill, Calendar No. 2234, House bill 1254, to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands. It differs in language from the Senate bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. I had assumed that the parliamentary procedure would be that if the two amendments which I have offered to the Senate bill were agreed to, and there was no other objection to the bill, I would move to substitute the language of the Senate bill for the House bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question, but not on the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment proposed by the Senator from California.

The CHIEF CLERK. On the first page, beginning with line 5, it is proposed to strike out all through "easements" in line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "lands and national forests except national parks and monuments of the United States is hereby authorized to grant permits, leases, or easements, in return for the payment of a price representing the fair market value of such permit, lease, or easement, to be fixed by such head of such department or agency through appraisal."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I heartily support the amendment. I wish to express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from California, not only for his extreme fairness in regard to this matter, but for the fact that he went into it himself and conferred with the Bureau of the Budget. He did not raise any criticism about the action of the Bureau of the Budget. I say to the Senator from California that I am glad we were able to get together on the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator for his compliment.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe I understand the project involved as well as any other Senator, but I should like to ask the Senator from California, so far as this particular project is concerned, whether the water reserves for Pendleton Field, which belongs to the Marine Corps, are protected. The Santa Maria furnishes the water for Pendleton Field, the Marine Corps field.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I cannot think of a case in which this bill would apply to the Marine Corps reservation. The attorney general of the State of California has rendered an opinion that in the absence of a valid lease flowing to the State from the Federal Government, the State government cannot make any expenditures of public funds with respect to any area in which it and the Federal Government are parties.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from California; I had in mind the Santa Margarita, instead of the Santa Maria.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], on page 1, beginning in line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. At what point will a motion be in order to consider the companion House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is in order at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2234, House bill 1254.

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 (H. R. 1254) to provide authorization for certain uses of public lands.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of House bill 1254 be stricken out, and that there be inserted, in lieu thereof, the text of Senate bill 620, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1254) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 620 is indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

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 was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 904) to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3219) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3300) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago under the direction of the Secretary of the Army to help control the lake level of Lake Michigan by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The bill (S. 2317) authorizing the modification of the existing project for

navigation on the Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this bill should be indefinitely postponed. The project contemplated was taken care of in the public works bill passed yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey ask that the bill be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I make that request.

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

RADU FLORESCU AND NICOLE ELIZABETH MICHEL FLORESCU

The bill (H. R. 4813) for the relief of Radu Florescu and Nicole Elizabeth Michel Florescu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF THE GEO. D. EMERY CO.—RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The resolution (S. Res. 285) to refer S. 3730, a private bill to the court of claims for a report, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this matter should be handled by means of a bill, in my opinion, instead of a resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 3730, a bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3730.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 3730) for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co., which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Geo. D. Emery Co., of New York, N. Y., the sum of $250,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Geo. D. Emery Co. against the United States for reimbursement and compensation due for services performed between 1950 and 1953, in cooperation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies in connection with a project to establish for the Government an 8,000-acre abaca plantation in Ecuador: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause be stricken out and that there be inserted the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or any lapse of time, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the George D. Emery Co., of New York, N. Y., for expenses it has incurred and for services it has performed allegedly at the instance of and on behalf of the Government in connection with a project to establish for the Government an 8,000-acre abaca plantation in Ecuador between September 1950 and February 1953: *Provided*, That suit on such claim shall be brought within 6 months from the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that Senate Resolution 285 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is indefinitely postponed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2559) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DOROTHY KILMER NICKERSON

The bill (H. R. 3757) for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 286) referring S. 1613 for the relief of Tom Hellander Co., to the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1737) for the relief of certain former employees of the Inland Waterways Corp. was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3166) for the relief of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3214) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Monchen was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1370) for the relief of Guy H. Davant was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CLARENCE D. NEWLAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2032) for the relief of Clarence D. Newland, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 16, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3222) for the relief of Martin Luther Johnson was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

DAVID W. WALLACE

The bill (H. R. 4638) for the relief of David W. Wallace was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I heard the bill read, did I correctly understand that attorneys' fees are allowed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As amended, the bill provides for no attorneys' fees.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO PATENTING OF PLANTS

The bill (H. R. 5420) to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, relating to the patenting of plants was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3305) to authorize payment of certain war claims including payment of veterans' claims arising out of the sequestration by the Imperial Japanese Government of credits of members of the military and naval forces of the United States and other United States nationals in the Philippines was annouced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRAVEL EXPENSES OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES STATIONED OVERSEAS

The bill (H. R. 179) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3517) to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENT OF TAXES ON REAL PROPERTY TRANSFERRED FROM GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5605) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to provide for payment of taxes or payment in lieu of taxes with respect to real property transferred from Government corporations to other agencies of the Federal Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, broadly speaking, a very brief explanation of the bill is that when a plant is located in a city and is operated by a division of the Department of Defense, such as the Department of the Air Force, the locality loses its right to taxes. There is such a plant in Everett, Mass., which is operated by the General Electrict Co. When it was operated by the RFC, the city of Everett collected taxes on it. The RFC gave up the plant, it was transferred to the Department of the Air Force, and it is now being operated by the General Electric Co. under contract with the Department of the Air Force. As a result of the transfer, the city has lost the right to tax the plant.

I have for several years joined in introducing bills to cover such situations. It is my understanding that the Defense Department, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget object to bills of this character. I am informed that there are 93 similar instances throughout the United States.

I address a question to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I ask him if his objection is based on the fact that the Department of Defense does not like this type of bill and objects to the present method of dealing with such situations, which is a hardship on localities?

Mr. GORE. In reply to the able senior Senator from Massachusetts, I advise him that I believe the bill has a great deal of merit. I am not in sympathy with the situation which it seeks to relieve. I have no objection to the merits of the bill as such. I believe I would favor the passage of such a bill. However, as the able Senator has stated, since there are 93 instances parallel to this situation, and since it is a matter of considerable importance, and as general legislation which is objected to by the Department of Defense, I have serious reservations as to the advisability of passing such a far-reaching and important bill on the call of the calendar, because it is not possible to have adequate debate and consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I concede the force of the distinguished Senator's objection. My only observation is that it is unfortunate that the bill should come up at such a late date in the session.

Mr. GORE. I agree. The junior Senator from Massachusetts is likewise very much interested in the bill. I shall be glad to join the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts in a request to the majority leader to schedule the bill for consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am happy to yield, if I have the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill deserves considerable discussion on the floor of the Senate. We cannot possibly discuss the policy involved in this bill and all the implications of that policy in a short time on the floor of the Senate. I am open-minded about it, and if I can be convinced that this is a sound bill, I shall change my present position.

However, what we would be doing would be to open the whole question of whether to give communities in which the Government locates defense and military installations the right to collect taxes from the Defense Department. That is what it amounts to. When I think of all the interest in Congress with respect to getting military installations located in various localities of the country, I believe we would be adopting a very unsound public policy if we were to have the Government pay taxes for the privilege of locating such an installation within a locality.

I am sure that the city of Everett, Mass., has not lost so much as one cent by the location of this installation there. To the contrary, I believe the establishment has poured into the treasury of the city of Everett great sums of money which never would have gone into its treasury if the plant had not been located there.

Unless we could have a thorough discussion of the policy, which, as has already been brought out by the Senator from Massachusetts, is opposed by the Bureau of the Budget, I certainly would not agree to have it passed on the call of the calendar; nor would I, under terrific pressure for shortening debate in the dying days of the session, be willing to have such a bill considered under any agreement to limit debate.

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

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I withhold it.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to speak strongly in support of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts with reference to this bill. In response to the observations of the Senator from Oregon, I will say that in one town in my State certain property is subject to taxation which amounts to $68 million, and the property exempt from taxation because it belongs to the Government amounts to more than $80 million.

As I recall, this bill was introduced in the early part of 1953. I do not know what has happened to it. I testified on it last year in hearings held on it. I am greatly distressed that it is to be held up and not passed this year. It involves a very important matter, and it has been kicking around for a year and a half.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am advised that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] wishes to join in requesting the majority leader to schedule the bill for consideration.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall withhold my objection for a moment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I happen to live in one of the States which has a number of communities affected in the same way as the communities which have been referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Connecticut. I should like very much to see the bill pass. I only hope we can have an opportunity to pass it before we adjourn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection in order that the Senator from Minnesota may make a statement?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the time I have been a member of the Committee on Government Operations it has been my privilege to participate in some of the hearings held on this measure. Last year I served on the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. At the present time the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is giving very careful study to the entire subject of payments in lieu of taxes by the Federal Government to localities and political subdivisions of States. This question will be the subject of discussion the coming weekend before that Commission. I happen to be in agreement with the statement of the necessity for action being taken with reference to this subject. There are literally hundreds of communities in the

United States which today are seeing their tax base eaten away, so to speak, because of the immunity of the Federal Government from any local taxation or revenue-raising ordinances of States. While I realize that this is a question which requires considerable discussion, I think it should be crystal clear that for more than 5 years there have been bills on the calendar and before committees to approach a solution of this very urgent and pressing problem. I join with Senators who think the bill should be brought up again at this session, because we should take some action on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] renews his objection.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is very good policy, in the closing hours of the session, to take the stand which I have suggested.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not true that this bill would deal only with a segment of the problem, namely, property transferred from Government corporations, and would not reach the whole field of federally owned real estate, much of which is acquired by purchase or condemnation?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is that I do not know. That is one of the reasons why I think we should have a debate on the bill rather than try to handle the subject on a calendar call within 5 minutes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Maine advises the Senator from South Dakota that he is correct in his explanation of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of the trust association of H. Kempner was announced as next in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3423) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1555) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN FUNDS TO THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 288) to make certain funds available to the Committee on Government Operations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, at the last call of the calendar I registered an objection to this resolution by request.

Personally, I am strongly in favor of appropriating sufficient funds for the committee to make its investigation. I want the RECORD to show that my previous objection was upon request and in performance of my duty as a member of the calendar committee, and was not a reflection of my own position with respect thereto.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5407) to amend sec. 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I object. If the bill is to be considered, I have some substantial amendments to it which I should like to discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF GRANTING INCENTIVE AWARDS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 7774) to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have sent an amendment to the desk with reference to this bill. Frankly, the amendment is rather substantial, and I think that Members of the Senate who are interested in the proposed legislation should haye an opportunity to examine it. Senators know that House bill 7774, the Government employees' pay raise bill, was passed over at the last call of the calendar. I have a series of amendments which I have submitted to the bill.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I have been requested to suggest the absence of a quorum before the Senator makes any statement about his amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, I request that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1042. An act to abolish the Commission for the Enlarging of the Capitol Grounds;

S. 3017. An act for the relief of Thomas Barron;

S. 3304. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States;

S. 3494. An act for the relief of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey;

S. 3744. An act to change the name of Gavins Point Reservoir back of Gavins Point Dam to Lewis and Clark Lake; and

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution to approve the conveyance by the Tennessee Valley Authority of certain public-use terminal properties now owned by the United States.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 8498. An act authorizing construction of works to reestablish for the Palo Verde Irrigation District, California, a means of diversion of its irrigation water supply from the Colorado River, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9709. An act to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 9756. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; and

H. R. 9909. An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1665) for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; 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. FORRESTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2263) to authorize the Postmaster General to readjust the compensation of holders of contracts for the performance of mail-messenger service.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill

(H. R. 9924) to provide for family quarters for personnel of the military departments of the Department of Defense and their dependents, and for other purposes.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 6573) to provide for the promotion, precedence, constructive credit, distribution, retention, and elimination of officers of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, does it involve the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Yes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

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

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "1953" and insert "1954".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 108, line 8, after the word "effective", to strike out "on the first day of January or the first day of July next following the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later", and insert "May 3, 1955".

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 108, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "May 3, 1955" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a statement with regard to my amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

For many, many years I have been fighting for adequate and realistic measures for the Reservists of our country—for Reserve training pay, for Reserve coverage on death and disability while training, for Reserve retirement benefits, for Reserve recognition for such services in the form of a Reserve Medal.

I have made this fight—an extremely discouraging fight during which time I have felt alone like a voice in the wilderness—because I have sincerely believed that the only way our country can maintain the necessary defense without bankruptcy is through the largest possible, best trained Reserve backing up a small Regular establishment.

I have found that I had to fight every inch of the way over Pentagon resistance. The Pentagon opposed my bill for inactive training pay—but finally agreed to the principle and had a bill of its own ultimately introduced and passed. The Pentagon opposed my Reserve death and disability coverage bill but I finally got it passed over Pentagon opposition and it is now known as the Smith Act. The Pentagon opposed my bill for Reserve retirement but finally agreed to the principle and had a bill of its own ultimately introduced and passed. The Pentagon opposed my proposal that Army Reservists and Air Force Reservists be given Reserve medals for Reserve service just as Naval Reservists are—but finally agreed to the principle by creating an Armed Forces Reserve Medal.

Over 5 years ago I introduced Senate Resolutions 60 and 61 calling for investigations by Congress of the Departments of the Army and Air Force on their failure to develop adequate and realistic Reserve programs and on their administration of the Reserves. Studies have been made since that time and considerable progress has been achieved on improving the Reserve programs.

Now H. R. 6573 is my latest experience with the Pentagon in our differences on getting something done for reservists.

The Congress and the leaders of the executive branch of our Government have at long last come to my 8-year-old national defense thesis of a small Regular force backed by a large, well-trained Reserve and are agreed that the military strength of our country lies in a large and well-trained Reserve to support a relatively small but highly organized Regular Military Establishment. History records that we have won all the wars in which we have been engaged and that they have always been fought, in substantial part, by our civilian soldiers.

There have been many efforts over the years to improve the structure of our Reserve. A most significant step in that direction was the enactment of the Reserve Act of 1952 by the 82d Congress. This legislation established the base for the Reserves of the future and endeavored to solve many of the difficult problems encountered when the Reserves were mobilized for operations in Korea.

Recent newspaper stories indicate that the executive branch of our Government is again studying the problems of the Reserves, and we are informed that sometime in the next session of Congress appropriate legislation will be recomemnded. It appears, however, that these studies are designed primarily to solve the problem of securing necessary manpower in our Reserve structure to meet our military requirements. We have struggled with this problem in the past under such titles as Universal Military Training and Selective Service. They now call it the new look at the Reserves.

The legislation which we are discussing today is designed not to alter the shape of the Reserve but to solve a problem with which the Congress has been confronted for several years: How can we encourage and improve the officer structure for the Reserve so that the leaders of our civilian soldiers will remain active in the program and be so screened and handled as to give us a younger, more active, and more efficient officer personnel? One important part of this solution is, for the first time in the Army and the Air Force, to eliminate some of the present undesirable practices which bring about overage-in-grade officers, officers with low morale, and officers whose interest in our Reserve program is steadily decreasing.

Under the impetus of the Reserve Act of 1952, and by specific direction of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Department of Defense drafted the legislation which we are considering today. The House Armed Services Committee conducted careful hearings for a period of 8 weeks, during which the services helped perfect the language which is now before you.

In broad principle, this legislation writes into law those regulations developed as a result of the Reserve Act of 1952, which directed that promotion procedures for Reserves should, insofar as is practicable, parallel those of the Regular services. The services have no objection to this part of the legislation. However, this bill has 1 or 2 controversial points which would not exist but for the fact that the Army and the Air Force did not carry out fully the intentions of the 1952 act. Under present law and regulations, Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force earn no credit for precedence or rank except while serving on active duty. The net result is that many of our excellent Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force have seen themselves losing ground in relation to Regulars, and have therefore dropped out of the Reserve program. The morale of those officers who have remained has been adversely affected by this system.

This bill does not promote anybody. It does, however, establish a system whereby officers will be given credit for precedence and rank purposes for each year of satisfactory service, and guarantees that periodically Reserve officers will be considered for promotion. If qualified, they will be promoted.

Another point that the Regular Air Force alone objects to is the requirement that Reserve officers serving on active duty should serve in a grade no lower than their permanent Reserve rank. At the present time Reserve officers are serving on active duty in grades lower than their permanent Reserve ranks in both the Army and the Air Force. This bill, if enacted, will begin to solve that problem. In my opinion, it does not go as far as it should, but it is a significant step in the proper direction.

Those portions of the bill that deal with the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard will merely write into law present regulations, with perhaps one or two minor and insignificant deviations. These services have complied fully with the intent of the Reserve Act of 1952. Significantly, we have had few, if any, complaints from Reserves in these services. Unfortunately, the reverse is true in the Army and the Air Force.

Notwithstanding some of the objections from the Regular Establishment, I do not believe, Mr. President, that anyone can argue validly as to the need for the immediate enactment of general personnel legislation of this type for the Reserves. It will, of course, apply to any organizational structure that is established for the Reserve. It is quite customary for Congress to enact general personnel legislation for Federal employees. We certainly do not hold up such legislation because we do not know what the ultimate organization of the Federal departments will be. Furthermore, I recall quite well that in 1947, when we enacted a similar personnel bill for the Regular Establishment, it was at a time when the Unification Act was being debated in the Congress. Nevertheless, we went right ahead and enacted the Officer Personnel Act for the Regular Establishment, even though we knew that the entire form and shape of the military structure was about to be changed.

Therefore, to me, the suggestion of the Department of Defense that this bill be delayed has no substantive basis. They have based their arguments on such things as that the bill should not be passed until the New Look at the Reserves has been studied by the Congress. By innuendo, they have also tried to say that it is bad legislation. If it is bad legislation, Mr. President, then why did the services say in the House of Representatives that it was satisfactory to them? Yet all the services did so agree.

If it is bad legislation why should the service representatives not have said so before the Senate armed services on April 22, instead of arguing that it should be delayed pending the completion of the New Look at the Reserves?

In fact, Mr. President, why was even that argument used by Dr. John Hannah, the recently departed Assistant Secretary of Defense, who, having argued strongly that the bill should be delayed, stated in response to a question from me that the so-called "New Look at the Reserves" had nothing to do with promotion retirement, or pay? I would like to quote from the report of the hearings held before the Senate Armed Services Committee on July 20. Before the hearings were recessed, and with the approval of the Chair, the following conversation took place, and I quote:

"Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask Dr. Hannah one question?

"Senator SALTONSTALL. Yes.

"Senator SMITH. Dr. Hannah, do I understand that the so-called New Look at the Reserves does not include anything as to retirement, pay, and promotion?

"Dr. HANNAH. That is correct."

I personally believe that the reason why the Regulars are fighting this bill so hard is regrettably clear. They simply do not want officers with rank in the Reserves. It is a threat to their ability to accelerate the temporary promotion of Regular officers at a time of full mobilization.

This bill has powerful support by competent persons within the Department of Defense. The Reserve Forces Policy Board, which is a statutory board consisting of the Assistant Secretaries from the various Departments, Regular military personnel, and representatives from the Reserves, considered the bill presently before you, and recommended its adoption. Various policy boards that advise the Secretaries of the several services have also recommended substantially what is in this bill.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat that we are merely confirming by this legislation, those regulations presently existing within the services, and trying to establish a method whereby qualified Reserve officers will be able to keep pace with their contemporaries in the Regular military Establishment. In general, it writes into law for Reserve officers the same type of legislation given Regular officers in the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

I am sure that no Member of this body questions the absolute dependence on and need for our Reserve structure, or the need for qualified officers within that structure. Without this bill, we will continue to lose our Reserve officers from the Army and the Air Force at an alarming rate. The morale of the Army and the Air Force Reserves will continue to remain low. For them this legislation is vital. The other services will merely continue their present satisfactory systems.

On balance, there can be no other decision by this body than to enact into law this bill, which is opposed by only a few within the regular establishment, which is supported by our civilian components, which has passed the House of Representatives unanimously over a year ago, and which has been unanimously recommended to you by your Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 109, line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "1953" and insert "1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 110, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "1953" and insert "1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 111, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "1953" and insert "1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, there has arrived at my desk a letter which was sent to me under date of August 17, 1954. I understand it reached my office a few minutes ago, and came to my desk after the bill in question had been disposed of on the calendar. The letter refers to the bill (H. R. 6573), amending the Reserve Officer Personnel Act. It is Calendar No. 2030. I ask unanimous consent that, without my taking the time to read it, the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with attachments thereto.

I think it is only fair to say to the writer of the letter, who is Lawrence L. Gourley, legal counsel for the American Osteopathic Association, that after his letter arrived at my desk, I checked and found that had I received it in time, and had I offered the amendment he proposed to have made in the bill, the bill would not have passed on this call of the calendar.

The amendment which Mr. Gourley proposes to have made is on page 11, after line 21, to insert the following:

(g) effective on the date of enactment of this act, section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777), is amended by inserting immediately after the word "medicine" wherever used therein, the words "or osteopathy."

I know the amendment would not have passed on the calendar call had I offered it, because I have been so advised in discussions on the floor of the Senate. But come January I shall offer it as a separate bill by way of amendment to the law which was enacted today.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 17, 1954.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Contrary to your and our opinion, section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, for which you were Senate floor manager, did vitiate section 41 of the act of August 2, 1946, which authorized appointment of osteopathic graduates as medical officers in the Navy. See enclosed excerpt from Senate debate on July 23, 1947, and conflicting letter from Assistant Secretary of Defense, Dr. Frank B. Berry, to Dr. Kronisch.

Osteopathic physicians are now being drafted and required to serve as privates, because of the emasculating section 201, above mentioned.

Therefore we fervently hope you will insert the following amendment in the pending Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, H. R. 6573, to wit:

On page 111, after line 21, insert the following:

"(g) Effective on the date of enactment of this act, section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777) is amended by inserting immediately after the word 'medicine' wherever used therein, the words 'or osteopathy.'"

As a result of the enclosed testimony on H. R. 4495 of the 83d Congress, the enclosed bill, H. R. 5017, which contains a similar amendment, was introduced by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, but has received no action.

Gratefully yours,

LAWRENCE L. GOURLEY,
Legal Counsel, American Osteopathic Association.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1954.

Dr. DAVID H. KRONISCH,
Young Men's Christian Association,
Des Moines, Iowa.

DEAR MR. KRONISCH: I have been asked to reply to your letter to the President of January 18, 1954, concerning your desire to be commissioned as a medical officer in the Navy.

At the present time there is no legislative basis for the commissioning of doctors of osteopathy in the Army, Navy, or the Air Force. While the 76th Congress during 1946 passed legislation authorizing the commissioning of doctors of osteopathy in the Navy, legislation was passed in 1947 wherein it was specifically stated that medical officers would be doctors of medicine. The title of the legislation enacted in 1947 is 34 U. S. C. 21 (C).

The matter of possible utilization of doctors of osteopathy as medical officers in the Armed Forces has been a subject of study by my office and the Surgeons General. Because of the necessity for nationwide and worldwide acceptability of medical officers, changes in the existing policy regarding eligibility for commissioning of medical officers has not been considered advisable at this time.

Your concern in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK B. BERRY.

The legislative history of section 201 of the Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 shows that it was passed under a misapprehension that it would not vitiate the existing legislation. The Senate proceedings of July 23, 1947, includes the following:

"Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator recognize that the bill in its present form would vitiate the act of Congress that was passed last year (section 41 of the act of August 2, 1946, which expressly authorizes appointment of osteopathic graduates in the Navy Medical Corps)?

"Mr. MORSE. No; I do not think it would vitiate it at all if we take into account the conditions. After all, this is a piece of emergency legislation to cover a particular procurement requirement."

H. R. 5017

A bill to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777), as amended, is further amended by inserting immediately after the word "medicine" wherever used therein, the words "or osteopathy."

SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777), as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"A doctor of osteopathy to be eligible for appointment in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy must be a graduate of a college of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or surgery in a majority of the States, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia."

DOCTORS DRAFT ACT

(Extract from hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 83d Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 4495, to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, Saturday, April 25, 1953)

STATEMENT OF L. L. GOURLEY, WASHINGTON, D. C., LEGAL COUNSEL, THE AMERICAN OSTEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION

Mr. GOURLEY. My name is L. L. Gourley, of Washington, D. C. I am legal counsel for the American Osteopathic Association.

Personally and on behalf of the American Ostoepathic Association I wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity of presenting our views on the pending bill, H. R. 4495.

Although I am listed as the only witness representing the American Osteopathic Association, I am accompanied by Dr. Chester D. Swope, who is the chairman of the Washington office of the association, and Dr. Ralph F. Lindberg, superintendent of the Detroit Osteopathic Hospital. The three of us are available for answering any questions which may occur to you.

This legislation which extends the Doctor Draft Act for an additional 2 years, is necessary in order to meet the needs of the armed services according to the Department of Defense.

Congress has adopted two special expedients to meet the needs of the Armed Forces for medical officers. The Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777) offered incentive of $100 per month additional pay (sec. 101; 5-year period extended to July 1, 1953, by 66 Stat. 156), and provided for original commission grades commensurate with training and experience (sec. 201; permanent provision). The Universal Military Training and Service Act, including the so-called Doctor Draft Act of September 9, 1950, provides for a draft liability for physicians to age 51.

In order to further effect the common purpose of these two laws, we respectfully propose the following amendment to the pending bill, H. R. 4495:

"SECTION . (a) Section 201 of the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 777) is amended by inserting immediately after the word 'medicine' wherever used therein, the words 'or osteopathy.'

"(b) Doctors of osteopathy who are licensed to practice medicine or surgery in one of the States of Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia, when selected under the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, in lieu of induction thereunder, may apply for and upon qualification shall be eligible to receive appointment in the Reserve of the Army and Navy as medical officers and in the Reserve of the Air Force for designation as medical officers, and upon such appointment shall be subject to call for active duty in like manner as others similarly situated.

As amended by paragraph (a) of the above amendment, section 201 of the act of 1947 would provide that medical appointments shall be made from qualified civilian doctors of medicine or osteopathy who are citizens of the United States, and who shall have such other qualificatoins as the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe for their respective servcies. Copy of the section showing the proposed amendments in italic is inserted at this point, to wit:

"SEC. 201. Subject to any limitation of the commissioned strength of the Army and Navy prescribed by law, the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to make original appointments to permanent commissioned grades, with rank not above that of colonel in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Army, and not above that of captain in the Medical and Dental Corps of the Navy in such numbers as the needs of the services may require. Such appointments shall be made only from qualified civilian doctors of medicine or osteopathy and dentists who are citizens of the United States, and who shall have such other qualifications as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe for their respective services. The doctors of medicine or osteopathy and dentists so appointed in the Navy shall be carried as additional numbers in rank, but shall not increase the authorized numbers of commissioned officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of the Regular Navy. The doctors of medicine or osteopathy and dentists so appointed in the Army shall be credited for purposes of promotion with the minimum number of years of service now or hereafter required for promotion of officers of the Medical and Dental Corps to the grade in which appointed."

That the enactment of paragraph (a) of the proposed amendments is imperative if the professional services of osteopathic physicians are to be utilized in the armed services is clearly manifested in a ruling by the Deputy Department Counselor of the Army on March 13, 1952, that:

"The basic statute under which officers of the Army Medical Corps are commissioned is the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947. Section 201 of title II provides that "Such appointments shall be made only from qualified doctors of medicine." * * * It would seem that the matter of commissioning of osteopaths in the Armed Forces is now properly one for the cognizance of the Congress of the United States."

The adoption of paragraph (a) would make clear the congressional intent that qualified doctors of osteopathy shall be appointed as medical officers in the Medical Corps of the armed services, and incidentally eliminate the legal impediments to full exercise of authority previously granted by Congress for appointment of doctors of osteopathy as commissioned medical officers in the Navy (60 Stat. 858) and the employment of Army interns (56 Stat. 314; 67 Stat. 18).

Paragraph (a) was passed by the House during the 82d Congress as an amendment to S. 2552, but the House receded from the amendment before final enactment.

According to the conference report (H. Rept. 2169), House recession was due to two principal contentions which formed the basis for opposition by the Department of Defense, namely: (1) That there cannot be two standards of medical service in the Armed Forces, and (2) that doctors of osteopathy are not qualified in preventive medicine, neuropsychiatry, the treatment and management of contagious diseases, the prescription and administration of therapeutic drugs and biologicals, operative surgery, and public health and sanitation.

Those same objections were advanced by the Navy before this committee, and repudiated by this committee, at the time of enactment of osteopathic eligibility for medical-officer commissions in the Navy in 1946 (Public Law 604, 79th Cong., 60 Stat. 858). It may be of interest to the committee that shortly after the enactment of the 1946 act, the then Surgeon General of the Navy instituted preparations for commissioning osteopathic physicians pursuant to the act, but the project died aborning upon accession of a new Surgeon General.

Since these same issues have been raised before this committee on previous occasions, it is not my purpose to belabor the committee with an extensive recitation of the qualifications of osteopathic graduates. However, for record purposes it does seem appropriate to deal briefly with the oppositions assigned in the conference report and to which I have referred.

Opposition (1) asserts that two standards of medical service would result from appointment of osteopathic graduates in the Medical Corps. A similar question was posed in connection with appointments in the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration. Congress had passed a law in 1946 providing that any person to be eligible for appointment in the Medical Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration must "hold the degree of doctor of medicine or of doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia" (59 Stat. 676).

When we called on Dr. Paul R. Hawley, then Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, we were told that two standards of medical service in the Veterans' Administration could not be sanctioned, and that he must be satisfied that the training accorded in osteopathic colleges and intern-training hospitals was equivalent to that furnished in medical colleges and hospitals. After independent investigation on his part and submission of supplementary data on our part, General Hawley was satisfied of the necessary equivalence of the training institutions of the two schools of practice. He, thereupon, recommended for approval and the Veterans' Administrator approved the AOA approved schools of osteopathy and AOA approved intern-training hospitals, and arranged for appointment of qualified osteopathic graduates in the Medical Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and they were and are being appointed and are so serving. In doing so, General Hawley conscientiously carried out the intent of Congress.

It cannot be successfully contended that the Veterans' Administration is less solicitous of the welfare of veterans in its charge or less exacting in requirements of its medical personnel than is the Department of Defense for service personnel, and when a man of the recognized caliber of General Hawley in his capacity as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration found after investigation that the training furnished in medical and osteopathic institutions is so comparable that two standards of medical service would not result from appointment of osteopathic

graduates in the Veterans' Administration Medical Service, this objection of the Department of Defense becomes unrealistic and without foundation.

Two standards have not resulted from the appointment of allopaths and homeopaths in the Medical Corps of the service. In a number of the States osteopaths, homeopaths, and allopaths take the exact same State examination, and receive the same or equivalent licenses to practice, which certainly demonstrates the comparability of their professional training.

The fact is that the Army is now commissioning medical officers from among doctors of medicine whose medical-college training would disqualify them from licensure to practice medicine in most, if not all, the States, whereas, medical commissions are now being denied physicians of the osteopathic school of medicine whose osteopathic-college training is acceptable for qualification for licensure to practice medicine or surgery in some three-fourths of the States. I refer to the commissioning of doctors of medicine who are graduates of AMA unapproved medical colleges. I am not suggesting that the doctors so appointed are professionally unqualified, but merely citing the apparent discrimination.

Let us now pass to opposition (2), namely, that doctors of osteopathy are not professionally qualified in various subjects, the sum total of which comprise the training of a physician. Among the subjects listed is contagious diseases. The Commission on Licensure for the District of Columbia would hardly subscribe to that allegation, since for more than 20 years Dr. Chester D. Swope, as osteopathic member of the District of Columbia Board of Examiners in Medicine and Osteopathy, has been the designated examiner in the subject of diagnosis and prevention of communicable diseases in the case of doctors of medicine and doctors of osteopathy who are applicants for licensure in the District of Columbia.

It is worthy of note that in enacting the Healing Arts Practice Act for the District of Columbia in 1929, Congress declared:

"The degrees doctor of medicine and doctor of osteopathy shall be accorded the same rights and privileges under governmental regulations" (45 Stat. 1389).

Opposition (2) also challenges osteopathic qualifications in the prescription and administration of therapeutic drugs and biologicals. This subject is dealt with in medical and osteopathic colleges under the headings of pharmacology and materia medica. In this connection, a question raised and answered in an editorial which appeared in the January 26, 1952, issue of the Jackson County (Mo.) Medical Society Weekly Bulletin is in point, in part as follows:

"Are osteopaths studying the right subjects and enough hours to be practicing medicine and surgery (the same as M. D.'s) which they are doing right now? To answer this question we would like to quote the Wisconsin Medical Journal for December 1951.

	Hours
Kirksville College of Osteopathy, pharmacology and materia medica	126
Los Angeles School of Osteopathy, pharmacology and materia medica	228
Kansas City College of Osteopathy:	
Pharmaco-dynamics	120
Materia medica and prescription writing	36
Clinical pharmacology	28
Applied pharmacology	54
Chicago College of Osteopathy, pharmacology	190
University of Wisconsin, materia medica:	
Lecture	64
Lab	48–112
Philadelphia College, pharmacology and materia medica	180"

The editorial also asks: "What about the other subjects studied?" In that connection, it cites the comparable grades made by doctors of medicine and doctors of osteopathy in July 1951, before the Wisconsin State Board of Medical Examiners. The subject of that examination included all the subjects enumerated in opposition (2). The general averages of the M. D.'s and the D. O.'s definitely indicate the equivalence of their training in the various subjects. I ask that the report of the examination as excerpted from the editorial be inserted at this point.

Wisconsin State Board of Medical Examiners' report of examination at Milwaukee in July 1951

MARKS OF FIRST 5 MEDICAL DOCTORS EXAMINED IN JULY 1951

Number	Chemistry	X-ray	Bacteriology	Pediatrics	Medical jurisprudence	Dietetics	Principles and practice of medicine	Physics	Materia medica	Toxicology	Physical diagnosis	Neurology	Hygienics	Anatomy	Eye, ear, nose, and throat	Obstetrics	Gynecology	Surgery	Pathology	Practical	General average [1]
1	80.0	90.0	86.0	85.0	83.0	90.0	80.0	80.0	85.0	80.0	82	86.0	90.0	92.0	88.0	91.0	90.0	86.0	80.0	85.0	80.5
2	83.0	84.0	78.0	82.0	85.0	80.0	80.0	78.0	80.0	70.0	85	80.0	90.0	92.0	82.0	89.0	95.0	90.0	86.0	80.0	80.3
3	85.0	86.0	80.0	88.0	88.0	90.0	80.0	80.0	90.0	70.0	80	85.0	88.0	90.0	82.0	91.0	89.0	85.0	85.0	88.0	80.5
4	88.0	87.0	85.0	88.0	82.0	77.0	80.0	80.0	82.0	75.0	85	80.0	85.0	93.0	81.0	90.0	92.0	80.0	90.0	80.0	80.4
5	92.0	92.0	88.0	90.0	88.0	88.0	85.0	80.0	88.0	72.0	88	90.0	88.0	88.0	88.0	89.0	93.0	88.0	92.0	75.0	80.7
Average, medical doctors	85.6	86.6	83.4	86.6	85.2	85.0	81.0	79.6	85.0	73.4	84	84.2	88.5	90.1	84.2	90.0	90.5	85.8	86.6	80.4	80.4

MARKS OF FIRST 5 OSTEOPATHIC DOCTORS EXAMINED IN JULY 1951

20	83.0	88.0	80.0	81.0	80.0	83.0	80.0 86.0	80.0	83.0	70.0	83	86.0	85.0	81.0	82.0	94.0	94.0	85.0	85.0	88.0	83.7
51	83.0	84.0	85.0	90.0	77.0	75.0	85.0 80.0	80.0	75.0	70.0	80	77.0	80.0	83.0	88.0	87.0	93.0	92.0	86.0	80.0	82.4
55	84.0	88.0	88.0	70.0	85.0	80.0	80.0 85.0	78.0	90.0	70.0	82	80.0	90.0	82.0	93.0	88.0	92.0	88.0	82.0	86.0	83.8
77	89.0	90.0	90.0	84.0	80.0	75.0	78.0 90.0	90.0	87.0	70.0	90	90.0	90.0	82.0	92.0	92.0	93.0	89.0	92.0	89.0	86.8
81	90.0	93.0	92.0	75.0	80.0	85.0	90.0 85.0	80.0	86.0	73.0	90	90.0	86.0	82.0	91.0	90.0	94.0	93.0	88.0	90.0	86.8
Average, osteopathic doctors	85.8	88.6	87.0	80.0	80.4	79.6	85.2	80.4	84.2	70.6	85	84.6	86.2	82.0	89.2	90.4	93.0	89.4	86.6	86.4	84.7

[1] General averages for the 5 physicians were recalculated in the society's office and were found to be 85, 83, 85, 84, and 87, respectively.

Last year the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army conducted a survey of osteopathic training with the full cooperation of all the osteopathic colleges, intern training hospitals, and the American Osteopathic Association. In assessing the caliber of the teaching personnel in osteopathic colleges, the survey sought information as to any contributions made by faculty members to recognized scientific literature, exclusive of osteopathic publications. I have here a return made by the Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery which shows that 16 members of the faculty have contributed to nonosteopathic scientific literature. The scope of these contributions, I believe, would be of interest to the committee, and I ask that the report be included in the record of the hearings at the end of my testimony.

The survey also sought information regarding the graduate training program of osteopathic physicians. A letter was addressed to each of the teaching hospitals by Col. James Q. Simmons, Medical Corps, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, requesting the following information:

"Would you please give me information as to the size of your hospital, the relative size of the medical, surgical, and obstetrical service, the average number of beds occupied, and the annual patient load, both inpatient and outpatient? I would appreciate also information on the number of necropsies performed annually. Information as to the amount of material furnished to students under other items mentioned in the catalog will be appreciated."

As illustrative of the response made to that inquiry, I wish to insert at this point the report submitted by Dr. Lindberg for the Detroit Osteopathic Hospital.

Statistics, 1951

Total bed capacity:

Adult and children	260
Bassinets	60

	Admissions	Patient days	Average daily census
Adults	6,006	52,277	143.22
Pediatrics	1,611	4,702	12.88
Obstetrical	4,263	13,404	36.72
Newborn	3,755	14,375	39.38
Total	15,635	84,758	232.20

Statistics, 1951—Continued

Total deaths	255
Total necropsies	143
Autopsy percent	42.74
Total obstetrical admissions	4,263
Total live births	3,755
Total stillbirths	82

SURGERY

Total minor surgery	3,378
Total major surgery	2,879
Total surgery	6,257

Surgery by services:	
General surgery	1,606
Gynecology	1,292
Sections	104
Proctology	553
Urology	593
Orthopedics	430
Eye, ear, nose, throat, and tonsils	1,596
Thoracic	83
Total	6,257

OUTPATIENT SERVICE

"We do not operate an outpatient dispensary as a formal service. Service to outpatients is given by the X-ray and clinical laboratories. Outpatients are also cared for by the orthopedic department.

"Total outpatient admissions to X-ray service was approximately 12,000 in 1951. This figure includes both diagnostic and therapy services.

"Clinical laboratory gave service to approximately 7,500 outpatients in 1951.

"Orthopedic outpatient admissions was 1,348 in 1951."

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that these statistics were submitted by Dr. Lindberg, who is here now, and in view of the fact that they show the number of admissions in the Detroit Osteopathic Hospital, and show the surgery services, if it would please the committee I would like to have Dr. Lindberg say something about this report specifically as to what is included under surgery.

Mr. SHAFER. He may state it briefly. Our time is running out on us here. We must hear several more witnesses before 12 o'clock.

STATEMENT OF RALPH LINDBERG, D. O.

Dr. LINDBERG. The total admissions for the year were 15,600, and they were reasonably divided between the various services of adults, pediatrics, obstetrical, and newborn. I think it is important to realize that all these patients are teaching patients for interns and residents in the hospital. The total autopsy percentage is given and the total number of major and minor surgery. The surgery by service is broken down into general surgery, surgery of the gastrointestinal tract, which includes the gallbladder, the thyroid, and so forth; gynecology, which is the surgery of the female tract; proctology, which is the surgery of the lower intestinal tract; urology, which is the surgery of the kidney, the bladder, and the prostate; orthopedic, which has to do with bone surgery and reconstruction orthopedic; ear, nose, throat and tonsils, and thoracic surgery, which is the lungs and the heart.

The outpatient service, briefly, is primarily X-rays and clinical laboratory study. There is a large outpatient study.

Mr. SHAFER. You do not have any specialists in osteopathy, do you?

Dr. LINDBERG. We have specialists in all or almost all the major specialties. They are certified by their respective boards. There are specialists in eye, ear, nose, and throat and plastic surgery and thoracic surgery. There are specialists in gynecology, anesthesia, X-ray, and so forth.

Mr. RIVERS. There are specialists in the list that you just referred to?

Dr. LINDBERG. The list that I referred to was the number of patients in those categories.

Mr. RIVERS. Do you have specialists in those categories?

Mr. SHAFER. I think possibly you misunderstood me. What I wanted to determine was, does every osteopath have to know all these subjects which you have spoken of here, or do they specialize in certain subjects?

Dr. LINDBERG. Every osteopathic physician has had education, training, and experience in all these things. In our hospital service, the work in the various specialty fields is done directly by specialists; men confining their work to that special field.

Mr. RIVERS. Then there are specialists in those chosen fields?

Dr. LINDBERG. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the difference between an osteopath and a medical doctor?

Dr. LINDBERG. I think that I can answer that very briefly. I will attempt to. The osteopathic physicians trained today, the ones that I have had experience with, have training in the broad general field of medicine; they have experience and skills in the broad general field of medicine, and in addition to that they are given in their scholastic work, and it is amplified in the graduate work, the particular skill of manipulative therapy.

Mr. BENNETT. They do not believe that you can cure contagious diseases by a manipulation of the spine, do they?

Dr. LINDBERG. No.

Mr. DOYLE. What is the fact with reference to whether or not the osteopaths in their practice, before they can begin to practice under licenses from the States, must take the State examination in order to get their license that the M. D.'s take?

Dr. LINDBERG. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. They do, do they not?

Dr. LINDBERG. In most States; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. In my State of California, for instance, the doctors of osteopathy take the same examination as the doctors of medicine take.

Dr. LINDBERG. Correct.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to say for the benefit of the chairman who asked a question about specialists that I know for a fact in my State of California some of the outstanding specialists in medicine are doctors of osteopathy.

Mr. BLANDFORD. May I ask a question? Can an osteopath perform all types of medical services comparable to those performed by a physician in each State of the Union?

Dr. LINDBERG. By law, no, sir. There are some States in which he is restricted. Now, if you are asking as far as ability is concerned——

Mr. BLANDFORD. I am asking about the restrictions first of all.

Dr. LINDBERG. There are restrictions in some States.

Mr. BLANDFORD. You mention in the statement that there are some doctors of medicine who are being commissioned in the Army who would not pass the examinations for license in many States. Under existing law, can a doctor of medicine, who is commissioned in the Army, practice medicine in any State in the Union if he is in an Army installation?

Dr. LINDBERG. I do not know.

Mr. BLANDFORD. It seems to me the problem which has been with us for a long time always goes back to this: Can you take an osteopath, even though he is comparable to a physician, and assign him any place in the world and expect him to perform on a patient exactly the same type of medical work that a physician is qualified to perform? Is that not what the issue boils down to?

Dr. LINDBERG. Yes.

Mr. BLANDFORD. Your contention is you took any osteopath who has graduated from any osteopathic college in the United States and compare him to any physician who graduated from any medical college in the United States you could not tell the difference?

Dr. LINDBERG. On the same comparative basis that is correct.

Mr. BLANDFORD. An osteopath can perform exactly the same type of medical service that a physician can perform, and he might even go one step further. He may know more about the manipulation of bones than a physician.

Dr. LINDBERG. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. With these exceptions as to specialties which you related, you are speaking now of the general knowledge of medicine?

Dr. LINDBERG. That is correct.

Mr. RIVERS. I think it is pretty well recognized, Doctor, that the requirements of the modern osteopath are very high throughout the Nation. I think it is well recognized that you render a great service.

Dr. LINDBERG. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SHAFER. I might recall for Mr. Blandford's benefit that we had in the service of the Government the Director of Medicine of the Department of Defense, who was disqualified from practicing in most of the States of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS. His practice was on doctors instead of practicing on people.

Mr. SHAFER. Thank heaven we got rid of him.

You may proceed, Mr. Gourley.

STATEMENT OF L. L. GOURLEY—CONTINUED

Mr. GOURLEY. Sixty-nine to seventy percent of the matriculants in osteopathic colleges have baccalaureate degrees, and 93 to 94 percent have had 3 or more years of preprofessional college training before admission for professional training in colleges of osteopathy and surgery. No applicant is accepted with less than 2 years of preprofessional college training. The professional college training covers a period of 4 years.

Following completion of the 4-year professional course, the osteopathic graduate undertakes 1 or more years internship. Seventy-six hospitals are approved for intern training by the American Osteopathic Association. In addition, residencies in the various specialties of surgery, obstetrics, pediatrics, radiology, neuropsychiatry, and so forth, are available in 37 hospitals approved for resident training by the American Osteopathic Association. After resident training and upon further qualification and examination osteopathic graduates are certified by the respective American osteopathic specialty boards.

Unlike the doctor of medicine who has spent a similar time of 7 to 10 years or more in preparation for the practice of his profession, the osteopathic physician is denied the privilege of contributing his professional services in the Armed Forces, after which he could enjoy a modicum of security for the civilian practice of his profession without interruption—which brings us to consideration of paragraph (b) of our proposed amendment.

It seems patent to observe that assuming that doctors of osteopathy are qualified for service in the Medical Corps as we have demonstrated, then they should have an opportunity to obtain medical commissions in like manner as doctors of medicine. That is the purpose of paragraph (b). We seek no privileges not accorded doctors of medicine.

Under paragraph (b) of the amendment, if an osteopathic physician is selected for induction, he would have the privilege of application for, and, upon qualification, receipt of a commission for service in the Medical Corps. In addition to the ordinary mental, physical, and moral qualifications, he would be required to evidence licensure to practice medicine or surgery in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

In view of the fact that doctors of osteopathy who are nonveterans will have received occupational deferment during their professional training, they are liable for induction to age 35 under the basic law; or in the event of registration under the Doctor Draft Act their liability would extend to age 51. After the long and intensive training necessary to become an osteopathic physician, he ought neither to be required to have his professional skill rust during a period of 2 years' service as a private when he is equipped to render professional service needed by the armed services, nor required to practice his profession under a constant tension of impending induction as a private during such a long span of years when he is attempting to serve the civilian health in his occupation which is rated critical for civilian needs.

We believe our amendment is in the public interest, and we earnestly petition this committee for its enactment.

Mr. RIVERS. You said that the Navy started on a program of utilizing the skills of these osteopaths, and then during the transition from one Surgeon General to the other, the project died aborning.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. What happened during that period of gestation?

Mr. GOURLEY. We were called in just after Congress had passed the bill authorizing admissions for osteopathic graduates as medical officers in the Navy. It was because of that law we were called in, and we had a conference and were told that preparations were being made and recommendations were being studied, for commissioning doctors of osteopathy pursuant to the law. We were told, however, that we would probably be commissioned as assistant surgeons rather than acting assistant surgeons, the reason being that the acting assistant surgeon, which is the lowest grade, comes in as an intern, for intern training. They said they should not be taken in in that category because that might affect the standing of the training hospitals involved.

Mr. RIVERS. To make a long story short, no osteopath got any commission?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is what happened.

Mr. RIVERS. In either branch of the service?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. And they still do not get them?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. Despite the fact that you are licensed to practice medicine in many of the States?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is right.

Mr. SHAFER. Have there been cases where these men have been drafted into the Army as privates?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER. And then put to work right in the hospitals, and so forth?

Mr. GOURLEY. They have been put to work in places other than hospitals as privates.

Mr. PRICE. I wonder if they could give us a list of the States that issue licenses for the practice of osteopathy.

Mr. GOURLEY. Doctors of osteopathy are licensed in all States. Paragraph (b) of this amendment, Mr. Price, says that they must be licensed to practice medicine or surgery. There are about nine States where they are licensed to practice medicine expressly. Then there are a number of States where they are licensed to practice osteopathy or osteopathic medicine and surgery.

Mr. PRICE. I wonder if you could give us the identity of those States.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will be very glad to put those in the record. There are 37 States where they are licensed to practice surgery, whether it be medicine and surgery or osteopathy and surgery.

Mr. SHAFER. We will be glad to have that list in the record.

Mr. BLANDFORD. I would like to ask you to enlarge upon this statement that you made:

"The fact is that the Army is now commissioning medical officers from among doctors of medicine whose medical college training would disqualify them from licensure to practice medicine in most, if not all, the States, whereas medical commisisons are being denied physicians of the osteopathic school of medicine."

Do you know of any specific cases in which doctors have been commissioned in the Army, the Armed Forces, who would be denied the right to practice medicine in the vast majority of the States?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes; I do. They are graduates from unapproved medical schools, and since graduates from those unapproved medical schools could not be admitted to examination in the various States, they could not be licensed in those States, but they are, nevertheless, commissioned as medical officers in the Army.

Mr. BLANDFORD. I would like to ask General Armstrong to comment on that, please.

General ARMSTRONG. We require a license in the State. It may not mean that they have a license in many States, but they must have a license to practice in one State. In the specific reference to the question you pointed to Mr. Gourley, we have from time to time given commissions to individuals who are graduates originally of nonapproved schools of medicine, but who had sufficient graduate training approved by the American Medical Association that they became eligible to practice in a State and obtained a license and thereby had the blessing of the American Medical Association as far as commission in the armed services is concerned.

Mr. BLANDFORD. In other words, these doctors must meet two qualifications; they must not only be able to meet the requirements of the State in which they obtain the license, but then when they apply for a commission they must receive the blessing of the American Medical Association?

General ARMSTRONG. That is right, and each case is studied separately and we give credit to evidence they submit of postgraduate training in approved training institutions.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this question of the General: Why, if a college was not worthy enough to be approved, or have the blessing of the American Medical Association, would the American Medical Association bless a graduate of that college?

General ARMSTRONG. You are dealing now with a very broad problem, Mr. Doyle. As a matter of fact, at the moment there are no unapproved schools of medicine in the country. I think that is a correct statement. Therefore, you are dealing with some people who are practicing medicine in this country who originally graduated from schools which are no longer in existence, or which have become approved schools of medicine in the interim. And, as a general policy, the American Medical Association, dealing with individual cases, gives these people who graduated from the school at the time when it was not approved a certain amount of credit in individual cases if they received graduate and postgraduate training which would appear to make them more or less equivalent of a graduate.

Mr. DOYLE. I remember that our distinguished chairman, Mr. SHORT, of Missouri, discussed briefly this same question with you the other day. I think he discussed with you the question of commissioning osteopaths when you were a witness before this committee.

May I ask you this: Why is it that licensed osteopaths, doctors of medicine and surgery, are not commissioned by the Army? You need commissioned men in that field. Why do you not commission more of them?

General ARMSTRONG. The Congressman refers to the question by the chairman, and I should like to answer your question by referring to the same statement which Chairman SHORT brought out on 2 successive days. He coupled, if you recall, optometrists and osteopaths.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

General ARMSTRONG. We have the authority today to commission optometrists in the Medical Service Corps, and as a matter of fact, we have commissioned and have on active duty at the moment some 77 optometrists.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you not have authority to commission licensed osteopaths?

General ARMSTRONG. Not at this time.

Mr. DOYLE. Congress has not given you that authority?

General ARMSTRONG. That is correct.

Mr. BLANDFORD. You can commission an osteopath in the Medical Service Corps; can you not?

General ARMSTRONG. Yes; that is true.

Mr. RIVERS. If he brought you a license to practice in one of the respective States as a doctor of medicine and did not have the blessing of the American Medical Association, could you under this law give him a commission?

General ARMSTRONG. We could.

Mr. DOYLE. Would you?

General ARMSTRONG. It would be dependent entirely upon the case. We go over very carefully every individual case and if we feel the basic qualifications are not met we have the authority to not tender that individual a commission.

Mr. DOYLE. What authority do you need from Congress, more than you have, to commission a licensed doctor of osteopathy?

Mr. RIVERS. Do you need authority or a directive?

General ARMSTRONG. The authority could be put in very easily, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to get straightened out here. You are asking for an amendment to include osteopathy after the word "medicine" wherever it appears in this particular section?

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. Then I take it that you recognize or feel at the present time doctors of osteopathy are not provided the same opportunity for commissions as doctors of medicine?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is exactly so, sir. As was pointed out in the statement, the Deputy Counselor of the Army suggested they did not have the authority to appoint doctors of osteopathy unless that law be amended.

Mr. KILDAY. Then there is no issue between you and General Armstrong as to his authority? You do not complain of the administration of the existing law by the Surgeon General of the service?

Mr. GOURLEY. We are asking authority for it to be spelled out. We do not quarrel with him as to his authority. That is why we are asking for this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. That is the point. Logically, that would be necessarily true.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. So the question here is not as to the administration of the law by the Department, but is a matter of legislative policy as to whether we should supplement existing law by the addition of the word, "osteopathy"?

Mr. GOURLEY. That is exactly so.

Mr. RIVERS. I understood the counselor to say there was law existing as far as the Navy is concerned as far back as 1947.

Mr. GOURLEY. August 1946. It is still on the statute books, but the authority is emasculated by this 1947 act that we want to amend. We want to straighten it out.

Mr. SHAFER. We are glad that you have testified for the osteopaths.

RESOLUTION 304

RECOGNIZE OSTEOPATHS FOR MILITARY COMMISSIONS

(Submitted by department of Pennsylvania to Committee on National Security, National and Foreign Affairs)

Whereas adequate provision for national security requires the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's critical manpower resources; and

Whereas the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, and the Selective Service System list osteopathy as a critical occupation; and

Whereas the professional skills of osteopathic physicians are either wasted by failure to use them as military officer personnel, or diluted by constant tension of impending induction for service in nonprofessional capacities; and

Whereas the Legislature of Pennsylvania has passed laws exacting comparable standards and granting comparable privileges in the practice of the healing art, including major operative, surgery to graduate doctors of medicine and graduate doctors of osteopathy, thus evidencing a similar standard of qualifications; and

Whereas the chairman of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, Mr. SHORT, of Missouri, has introduced a bill, H. R. 5017, which has for its sole purpose the necessary authority and power for commissioning osteopathic physicians as medical officers in the armed services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House be respectfully petitioned to speedily effect the enactment of H. R. 5017.

(Adopted in Philadelphia, Pa., at the August 1–6, 1954, National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.)

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9987) to amend certain provisions of title 11 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6440) to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUSH. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada desire recognition?

Mr. McCARRAN. Before the bill was objected to, I had intended to offer an amendment. But if the bill is objected to, I shall not offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 26) to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 521) to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding published articles and broadcasts by foreign agents, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1708) to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9804) to authorize the the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3040) to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin irrigation districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6616) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights" was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. May I inquire what disposition was made of Calendar No. 2234, House bill 1254?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill had previously been passed. It was a companion bill to a Senate bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3708) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey certain Parker Davis transmission facilities and related properties in the States of Arizona and California, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7840) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the bill go over, because it is not calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN UTAH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3570) to authorize the sale of certain lands situated in Utah which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "as", to strike out "Said Indians shall deem satisfactory" and insert "the Secretary of the Interior shall approve"; in line 13, after the word "Indians," to insert "by majority vote"; and after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 5. Any action taken by majority vote of the adult members of said Indians, whether in public meeting or by referendum, but in either event, after such notice as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be binding upon said Indians for all purposes of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Indian Peak Paiute Indians of Utah are hereby authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to sell and convey to any purchaser deemed satisfactory to them any of the lands of said Indians situated in the State of Utah, particularly described as follows: Sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 29 south, range 18 west, Salt Lake meridian.

SEC. 2. Title shall be conveyed by issuance of patent in fee to the purchaser or purchasers reserving to said Indians the gas, oil, mineral, and all other subsurface rights.

SEC. 3. All such sales shall be made upon such terms as the Secretary of the Interior shall approve, except as herein otherwise provided, and may be made pursuant to bids or at private sale.

SEC. 4. All funds derived from such sales together with all income from said lands accrued before sale shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Indian Peak Paiute Indians pursuant to the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560), and may be expended or advanced for such purposes, including per capita payments, as may be designated by said Indians by majority vote and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. McCARRAN. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell some Indian lands belonging to a group of Indians in southwestern Utah.

The land is not used by the Indians. They have been leasing it for quite a while. They do not live on it. It has not been bringing them much income, and they felt they would be much better off if they were permitted to sell this particular piece of land. It is largely at their request that it is being sold.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the land all in the State of Utah?

Mr. WATKINS. I believe it is. I am not sure about that, but I think all the land is in Utah. The Indians all live in the State of Utah, and I am now advised that all of the land is in the State of Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3534) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was engaged in conversation at the desk when Calendar No. 2284, H. R. 3534, was called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] asked that the bill go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Will the Senator from Tennessee withdraw his objection, so that I may ask to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. GORE. I gladly do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

NATIONAL SALVATION ARMY WEEK

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) to authorize the President to proclaim the week of November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as "National Salvation Army Week" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas in October of 1879 a lone woman Salvation Army officer, Lt. Eliza Shirley, encouraged the formation of an official party, comprising seven women officers and Commissioner George Scott Railton, to extend the work of the Salvation Army in the United States; and

Whereas today the Salvation Army has grown into a huge operation with its 3,996 officers administering 6,400 centers of charitable and religious work assisted by 34,687 prominent citizens of all races and creeds who have formally associated themselves in the close relationship of lay leadership; and

Whereas the Salvation Army, acting under a charter issued by the State of New York in 1899, is an organization designed to operate as a religious and charitable organization with the following purposes: The spiritual, moral, and physical reformation of all who need it; the reclamation of the vicious, criminal, dissolute, and degraded; visitation among the poor and lonely and sick; the preaching of the Gospel and dissemination of Christian truth by means of open-air and indoor meetings: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is requested and authorized to officially proclaim the week beginning November 28, 1954, through December 4, 1954, as "National Salvation Army Week."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8898) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

COL. SAMUEL J. ADAMS, AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 6808) for the relief of Col. Samuel J. Adams, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 345) for the relief of Samuel Chalut was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

GUBBINS & CO.—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2564) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear the claims of Gubbins & Co., of Lima, Peru, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold his objection for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] asked that the bill go over.

Mr. MORSE. It was a natural mistake on my part, because the two States claim some of the same assets of climate. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, as I understand the bill, it seeks to give to the Court of Claims jurisdiction to try issues which I think it is in a much better position to try than we in the Senate would be, provided a private claims bill should come before us. The proponents of the bill are to be commended because they have presented their case, not by way of a private claims bill, but by way of a bill which seeks to transfer to the Court of Claims jurisdiction to try their case.

I do not see how there could be any serious objection to that procedure. I wonder if the bill may go to the foot of the calendar in order that I may confer with the Senator from Florida in the meantime to see if there is substantial objection to the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to follow that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3057) for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3375) for the relief of the Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3772) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the payment of appraisers, auctioneers, and brokers fees from the proceeds of disposal of Government surplus real property, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 310) to investigate the marketing of new cars (auto bootlegging) was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF MICHAUD FLATS PROJECT, IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 5499) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats project for irrigation in the State of Idaho was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Michaud Flats project is located in Power County, Idaho, and provides for the development of 11,035 acres of irrigated lands on the loess-covered valley and benchlands of the Snake River in the vicinity of the American Falls Reservoir. About 2,000 acres of these lands have been irrigated although water supplies, in some instances, have been inadequate. The remaining area would be developed as new irrigated units providing for the establishment of 100 new farms. The Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian project provides for the irrigation of 21,000 acres within the Indian reservation along the southeastern shore of the American Falls Reservoir east of the Michaud Flats project.

There is intense local interest in and support for the Michaud Flats project and the Falls Irrigation District was organized in 1949 for the purpose of contracting with the Government for construction of the irrigation facilities. The project is economically justified in that the expected benefits exceed estimated costs in the ratio of 2.83 to 1.

It is estimated that the water users on the Michaud Flats project can be expected to pay a total of $132,700 annually, or an average of slightly over $12 per acre. Of this total $74,900 would be required for operation, maintenance, and replacement leaving $57,800 to apply as repayment of the irrigation costs.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DWORSHAK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the passage of House bill 5499, a letter which has been received by me.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 11, 1954.*

Hon. HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DWORSHAK: As you know, the Indians at Fort Hall have certain rights in the Snake River and its tributaries which were awarded under State law and some which were purchased from owners of awarded water rights. In addition, the Indians have certain claims to water rights in streams adjoining the reservation under the doctrine of the case of *Winters* v. *United States* (207 U. S. 564 (1908)) which is that when the United States creates an Indian reservation it impliedly reserves all water

that might be necessary for the use of the Indians.

The Indians are particularly anxious that certain water rights in the Blackfoot River, a tributary of the Snake River, which they own but are not entirely using at the present time will not be waived or lost by an erroneous interpretation of the language of the bill. Also, they are concerned that the language of the bill might be construed to constitute a determination of whether or not they are entitled to pump water from the Fort Hall bottoms (adjacent to American Falls Reservoir) for the irrigation of about 2,000 acres of pastureland there.

It is my understanding that the bill would not waive any rights of the Indians in water but without going into the merits of certain conflicting claims to water or constituting a precedent in connection with those claims would require the Indians to make available from Palisades and American Falls Reservoirs 131,600 acre-feet of storage capacity in return for the right to pump ground water from the Fort Hall bottoms in an amount not to exceed 22,400 acre-feet and an amount equal to that produced by the exchange of 131,600 acre-feet. I believe this is clearly explained on pages 3 and 4 of Senate Report 2321.

This bill would not affect the rights of the Indians in purchased or awarded water rights in the Snake River and its tributaries, including but not being limited to the water purchased from the Idaho Canal Co. by the United States for the Indians in 1908, the water rights of the Indians in Grays Lake, the water rights of the Indians in the Blackfoot River and Reservoir, and water rights awarded the Indians under State law.

ROBERT W. BARKER.

INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR ALLOCATION OF WATERS OF MISSOURI RIVER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2821) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, to enter into a compact for the allocation of waters of the Missouri River was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. CASE. I do not know the basis for the Senator's request to have the bill go over, but I point out that the bill has been requested by a committee of governors of the several States in the Missouri River Basin. The bill is purely permissive, granting the consent of Congress for the States concerned to enter into the negotiation of a compact. The compact would have to be submitted to Congress before it could become effective. I wonder if the Senator who asked that the bill go over will accept this explanation and permit the bill to be passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee further withhold his objection, to permit the Senator from Minnesota to be recognized?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been concerned about the bill under discussion for several calendar sessions, because I think it is imperative that Congress act on the bill, not only for the reasons so ably stated by the Senator from South Dakota, but I have a letter from Gov. C. Elmer Anderson, of the State of Minnesota. The Governor sets forth very clearly in the letter the reasons why the bill should be considered at this session. With the indulgence of the Senate, I should like to read the letter, which is not a lengthy one:

DEAR SENATOR: At a recent meeting of the Missouri States Committee held in Yellowstone Park, the 10 States there represented were unanimous in their support of the Butler bill now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This bill authorizes the States in the Missouri Basin to work with a Federal representative in drafting a compact under which the Missouri Basin projects can be administered on a cooperative basis.

It was agreed that such legislation should be enacted during the present session in order that the 1955 State legislatures could move in authorizing their States to participate in such compact formation. It was also the unanimous agreement of the group that such a compact, when and if drawn and agreed upon by the Federal and State authorities, was far preferable to anything in the way of an MVA based upon the TVA pattern.

We believe that the position taken represents your own point of view, and that you can and will lend leadership with the other Members of the Minnesota delegation so inclined to urge proper action during the closing weeks of the 1954 session of the Congress.

Yours very truly,

C. ELMER ANDERSON,
Governor.

This proposed legislation is permissive. If the bill were passed it would enable the States, when their respective legislatures convened, to give further consideration to the matter. Congress would have to act upon anything which might be agreed upon before the compact could take effect, insofar as it relates to the Missouri River. I hope the objection to the bill will be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection so the Senator from Wyoming can be recognized?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the bill not only has the support of the Governors of the States in the Missouri Basin, but, in addition, it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, which represents the executive arm of the Government. In addition, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has unanimously approved the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not sure whether the Senator from Wyoming is familiar with the fact, but this is one of the bills which I called to the attention of the policy committee at the last meeting. I stated that, so far as the majority leader was concerned, if the bill did not pass on this calendar call—and I was hopeful it would be passed, for the reasons given by the various Senators who explained the bill—it was a bill that I would strongly recommend be called upon on motion so it would be considered at this session. I hope it will be passed on a call of the calendar, but, if not, it will be called up on motion.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the majority leader. I should like to point out that the bill provides that there shall be a Federal representative in negotiations looking toward execution of a compact between the States. After all, if a compact is agreed upon, it will still have to come back to the Congress for action.

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

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I rose to mention. I am glad the Senator from Wyoming mentioned it. What is proposed by the bill is not the giving up of the congressional right to review the matter. Congress simply would be authorizing the States to enter into a compact. This is the kind of partnership principle I highly endorse. It seems to me we ought to let the States work out their water differences, just as they have done in other State compacts. Unless they are extremely bad, I think such compacts should be approved. At least we ought to encourage the States to go ahead and negotiate compacts, as long as Congress has the final authority to pass judgment on them. I think it would be greatly discouraging to the States if Congress did not give to them authorization to negotiate. I do not know how we are going to be able to work out a workable partnership between the Federal Government and the States if we cannot adopt the principles of the bill under discussion.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is entirely correct. It seems to me that all those who profess to believe in the principle of States' rights should be in accord with the proposed legislation. All it would do is give the States an opportunity to protect their interests in their own waters and agree as a community of States.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that we of the Midwest and the West have had much experience in working out compacts between States. They have been very successful. We have come to Congress and received approval. I have helped in securing approval of certain compacts. I helped in getting approval of a compact between the States of Colorado, Missouri, and Kansas, and one between Colorado and Kansas. Such compacts have worked out very well. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not feel constrained to object.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, the entreaties of my colleagues have been quite persuasive. In fact, if I had a personal objection to the bill, I would be inclined to be overwhelmed and yield. However, since I am not in a position to withdraw the request, I shall have to insist that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN UTAH

The bill (H. R. 6451) to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the bill was introduced in the House by my colleague, Representative STRINGFELLOW. Many years ago many of the pioneers who went into the area around great Salt Lake settled on the shores of the lake. As the waters were taken from the streams which fed the lake, the lake receded from some of the lands adjacent to the lake which were used as farms. A number of years ago an act was passed permitting the farmers to get the lands, which are known as accretion or relliction lands. A few farmers in and around Ogden, at the great Salt Lake, failed to take advantage of that opportunity. They did not have the money available to pay the necessary fees and they let the opportunity pass by. The bill would provide that the farmers could obtain the land. The total value, along with the improvements the farmers put on the land, is about $3,500. As a matter of fact, there is grave doubt that the Federal Government ever had title to the land, because at one time the land was at the bottom of Great Salt Lake, which is not navigable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think there should also be stressed in connection with the Senator's statement that it would be most unfair to deny to this small group of farmers the land in question, because other farmers in the same area were in a better financial position to act when the Federal Government made the offer some time ago, and they were able to take advantage of the offer. These particular farmers put improvements on the land. I think the bill should be passed.

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

There being no objection, Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6451) to provide for the conveyance of certain public lands in Utah to the occupants of the land, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 16, after the word "Utah", to strike out "If any of these lands are needed by the United States for the said project, the Secretary may declare the lands forfeited and return to the United States upon tender of payment for such lands of the amount paid by the occupant to the United States under this act plus the reasonable value of the improvements in place at the time the land is patented." and in lieu thereof to insert "Any patent issued under this act shall contain a reservation granting to the United States the right to repurchase the patented land, if the Secretary should find that such land is needed by the United States and the Weber Basin project, upon tender of payment for such land of the amount paid by the patentee to the United States under this act plus the reasonable value of the improvements thereon in place at the time the land is patented."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIMS ARISING FROM ACTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 3844) to provide for a reciprocal and more effective remedy for certain claims arising out of the acts of military personnel and to authorize the pro rata sharing of the cost of such claims with foreign nations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at this time the question is whether there is objection to the present consideration of the bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection to consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as acting chairman I wish to make a brief statement with regard to this bill; and then, at the request of some of my colleagues, I shall offer very moderate amendments which I shall presently send to the desk.

Mr. President, this bill will implement a number of treaties and other international agreements which provide a reciprocal and pro-rata method of settling claims arising out of the line-of-duty acts of military personnel or civilian employees of the Armed Forces in a foreign country. The treaties and agreements in question provide that these claims are to be settled by the host government in the same way that it settles claims arising from line-of-duty acts of its own military personnel. The government of the state sending the forces abroad will then reimburse the host government for an agreed percentage of the settlement. In most cases, the host government for an agreed percent-the cost; and the sending government, 75 percent.

For example, if an American soldier driving a jeep, and while on duty in France, injures a Frenchman, the claim will be settled by the French Government as though the injury had been inflicted by a French soldier. The United States will reimburse the French Government for 75 percent of the settlement.

Conversely, if a French soldier driving a jeep, and while on duty in the United States, injures an American, the claim will be settled by the Defense Department as though the injury had been inflicted by an American soldier. France will reimburse the United States for 75 percent of the settlement.

This bill simply authorizes the Secretary of Defense to participate in this method of settling such claims. The bill authorizes the Secretary to make payments in reimbursement to foreign governments, and to settle claims arising from line-of-duty acts of foreign military personnel in the United States.

The bill should result in substantial savings to the United States, because previously we have been paying the full amount of this type of foreign claims, whereas under the bill we shall pay only 75 percent to 85 percent. The bill should also provide a more effective remedy for American citizens who are damaged by line-of-duty acts of foreign military personnel in the United States.

The bill has the approval of the Defense Department and the Foreign Relations Committee, and I urge favorable action by the Senate.

Mr. President, the bill was originally objected to by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. I discussed the matter with both Senators, and the Senator from Ohio was entirely satisfied with the explanation of the bill, but suggested that there be some slight amendments by which, instead of using the word "settle," we would use the word "adjudicate." He did not want to have it implied that these claims would be settled arbitrarily and then we would be "stuck" with such an amount. So he made the suggestion that we insert the word "adjudicated" at certain places in the bill. I send to the desk the amendments, and ask that they be read by the clerk, so as to indicate where those slight changes will be made in the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "settled" and to insert in lieu thereof "adjudicated"; and in the same line to strike out "or adjudicated."

On page 2, in line 22, it is proposed to strike out "settled" and to insert in lieu thereof "adjudicated."

On page 2, in line 23, it is proposed to strike out "or adjudicated."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3844) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to the terms of those international agreements to which the United Sates is now or may hereafter be a party which provide that certain claims against the United States arising out of acts or omissions in the performance of official duty in a foreign country of civilian

employees of the Armed Forces, or military personnel, of the United States may be adjudicated by such foreign government in accordance with the laws and regulations of such foreign government, the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized—

(a) to reimburse such foreign government for the agreed pro rata share of such sums as may be expended by such foreign government for the payment of such claims; or

(b) to pay to such foreign government an agreed pro rata share of claims arising out of damage to the property of such foreign government,

including costs of settlement or arbitration: *Provided*, That no claim arising out of any action by an enemy of the United States or resulting directly or indirectly from any act by the Armed Forces of the United States, or any member thereof, engaged in combat shall be considered or paid under this act.

SEC. 2. Whenever the terms of an international agreement to which the United States is now or may hereafter be a party provide that certain claims against a foreign government arising out of acts or omissions in the performance of official duty within the territory of the United States of civilian employees of the Armed Forces, or military personnel, of such foreign government, be adjudicated by the United States in accordance with the laws and regulations of the United States subject to an agreed pro rata reimbursement, such claims may be prosecuted against the United States or settled by the United States under then existing laws and regulations as if such acts or omissions were performed by civilian employees of the Armed Forces or military personnel of the United States in performance of official duty.

SEC. 3. Whenever a dispute arises in the consideration, adjustment, settlement, compromise, or adjudication of a claim asserted under section 2 of this act as to whether or not an act or omission of a civilian employee or military personnel of a foreign country was in the performance of official duty, or as to whether or not the use of any vehicle of the armed forces of such party was authorized, such disputed question or questions shall be decided in accordance with the terms of the international agreement with such foreign country, and such decision shall be final and conclusive. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to pay the United States portion of costs arising in connection with the securing of such a decision as provided by such international agreement.

SEC. 4. Any pro rata reimbursement or payment by the United States with respect to a settlement, award, or compromise made pursuant to this act shall be made by the Secretary of Defense out of appropriations for that purpose, which appropriations are hereby authorized, and such appropriations may be used for the purchase of foreign currencies necessary for any such reimbursement.

MEMBERSHIP OF UNITED STATES IN PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 565) to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, and authorizing appropriations therefor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSMITTAL OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS TO SENATE WITHIN 30 DAYS AFTER EXECUTION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3067) to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Senate within 30 days after the execution thereof, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

The way to deal with this situation respecting executive agreements is along the lines proposed jointly by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the senior Senator from Nevada, in Senate Joint Resolution 2, which has been pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations since January 7 of 1953. After the Senator from Michigan introduced S. 3067, I renewed my request, previously made on a number of occasions, for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2 by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know what consideration was given to Senate Joint Resolution 2. It is my intention, however, to move amendment of S. 3067, Calendar No. 2365, by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

Senate Joint Resolution 2, the text of which I am now offering as an amendment, is based on the proposition that Congress now possesses power to limit the effectiveness of many types of executive agreements; and that by invoking established principles of constitutional law, Congress can regulate their use by means of legislation.

In support of the authority of Congress to take this action, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a short memorandum prepared by Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe, of Seattle, one of the oustanding constitutional lawyers of the country.

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

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

It is believed that Congress now has the power to regulate executive agreements. That is the effect of the *Steel Seizure* cases (343 U. S. 579, 588, 589), and of *Ex parte Quirin* (317 U. S. 1, 25–27, 29). (See also 1953 Senate hearings on S. J. Res. 1, Proposing a Constitutional Amendment Relative to Treaties and Executive Agreements (pp. 67, 1229–1230, 1244–1245).) At those Senate hearings Chief Judge John J. Parker of the fourth circuit agreed that executive agreements "are subject to control by Congress under present constitutional provisions" (pp. 711–712). Chief Judge Orie L. Phillips of the 10th circuit is of the same view (pp. 995–996).

The rule of *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203, 228) (Justices Jackson and Reed not participating, and Chief Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Roberts dissenting) is that an executive agreement made by the President alone, without the approval of the Senate, is, like a treaty, the supreme law of the land and supersedes the fifth amendment as well as the law of New York. This highly dangerous rule of the effect upon the laws of the country of agreements lying in the files of the White House or of the State Department can only be overcome by constitutional provision that executive agreements, as well as treaties, shall have no effect as domestic law within the United States unless implemented by act of Congress.

In the Pink case the majority of the Court said, "The fifth amendment does not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment."

This holding was criticized by Dr. Philip Jessup in 36 American Journal of American Law, 282 (1942) in the following language: "From the point of view of our constitutional law, the decision may well mark one of the most far-reaching inroads upon the protection which it was supposed the fifth amendment accorded to private property.

Thus, under the Pink case, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by his letter of acceptance of the Litvinov assignment, set aside the fifth amendment, as well as the law of New York.

By the same reasoning, the President by executive agreement could set aside an act of Congress. The contrary has been held by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in *U. S.* v. *Capps* (204 F. (2d) 655 (1953)). (Whether this view will ultimately prevail is of course not known.)

The most comforting expression in this respect is Mr. Justice Jackson's statement in the *Steel Seizure* cases (343 U. S. 579, 636, footnote 2; also 637, 655). In footnote 2 Mr. Justice Jackson said "It was intimated that the President might act in external affairs without congressional authority, but not that he might act contrary to an act of Congress." The logic of both the Quirin case and the Steel Seizure cases support Mr. Justice Jackson's statement.

Congress has, in fact, often exercised the power to authorize and regulate executive agreements. See reciprocal trade agreements which rest on congressional legislation.

ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator may misunderstand the intent. The Senator from California was one of the joint authors of the bill, and, as the Senator may recall, I happen to be one of those who voted for Senate Joint Resolution 2.

It seems to me that by not passing this bill, we shall be foreclosing the Senate of the United States from having information which now is filed with the United Nations. All this bill is meant to do is to give to the Senate of the United States the information relative to the executive agreements within 60 days of time when the executive agreements are entered into, rather than for the Senate perhaps to have to wait a full year, until the agreements are published in the normal process.

At the present time they are filed with the United Nations. It seems to me to be almost absurd that the law should not require that the Senate of the United States be given the information while it is still current.

This bill is not intended to affect adversely, or one way or another, the so-called Bricker amendment or the McCarran amendment or any of the others. The purpose of the bill is merely to get the facts for the Senate. It seems to me every Senator should at least want to get that information.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in order to save time, I may say that it is the opinion of the calendar committee on this side that this measure is of the type of legislation which, while it may be good, and certainly is very important, is controversial in nature, and should not

be passed during the call of the Consent Calendar.

A moment ago I talked to the majority leader about this measure, and he advised me that he thought he would try to have it brought up as the order of business later this afternoon, at which time the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada would then be in order, and the whole matter could be gone into.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may do so, by unanimous consent, I should like to be permitted to complete by statement; it will take me perhaps a minute and one-half to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall withhold any objection until the Senator from Nevada completes his statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the proposal contained in my amendment recognizes the sole power of the President to negotiate, and it leaves personal undertakings reached as an executive head of the Government to remain the personal commitments of the incumbent.

Adoption of this amendment would place all nations, as well as citizens of the United States, on notice not only with regard to congressional attitude and policy, but also with respect to congressional power to set aside or terminate the treaties and executive agreements other than in a few limited areas.

Let me make it clear that the language which I proposed would accomplish these things:

First. It would require all executive agreements to be published in full in the Federal Register, in order to be effective either as laws or as authorizations.

Second. It would reaffirm the power of the Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, to supersede an executive agreement by legislative action.

Third. It would make all executive agreements terminable not later than 6 months after the end of the term of the President during whose term they were negotiated, unless extended by proclamation of the succeeding President. The effect of this would be to force all long-term agreements, intended to bind this country through successive presidential terms, to be presented to the Senate as treaties.

Fourth. It would require that secret agreements with foreign nations be either submitted to the Senate as treaties or be deemed the mere personal undertaking of the Chief Executive negotiating them.

I now move, Mr. President, that the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2, beginning with line 3, on page 2, and continuing through line 8, on page 3, be substituted for all the material now following the enacting clause in S. 3067.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must advise the Senator from Nevada that amendments are not in order until the bill is under consideration.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] made objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what I understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2975) to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Customs Court was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1813) to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to extend the privilege of trial by jury to certain cases arising within the special maritime jurisdiction of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3131) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 960) to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGES SUSTAINED IN EXPLOSIONS AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 9785) to provide a method for compensating claims for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Texas City, Tex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will withhold his request?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may not be able to be present later, and I should like to give the explanation now.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. McCARRAN. The explanation will require only 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. President, Calendar No. 2390, H. R. 9785, is one of the largest private claims bills ever to come to the Senate. The Judiciary Committee was not scared off by the fact that a great deal of money is involved. I hope the Senate will not be scared off, either. This claim involves the question of doing justice to a great many private individuals who suffered serious injuries and staggering losses, and many whose loved ones suffered death, as a result of the explosions and fires which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947.

The evidence seems clear, and the Judiciary Committee found, that the basic cause of this disaster was the responsibility of the United States Government. The Government was responsible, through its agents, for placing in commerce an inherently dangerous article, without any marking or warning respecting its dangerous attributes. This was a powerful explosive, being handled in large quantities, which by Government order was packed in paper bags and marked simply as fertilizer. When it was loaded in the hold of a ship, and packed down by its own weight, and confined under pressures, the result was a spontaneous explosion which caused one of the greatest disasters in the history of this country.

The committee has amended this bill so as to eliminate all provision for payment of the subrogated claims of insurance companies. Perhaps that is not fair; but it appeared that the bill could not be reported out, or passed, with such provisions included; and the committee wanted to move toward granting relief for the individuals concerned. The bill has also been amended to eliminate all provision for attorneys' fees. Perhaps that, also, is unfair; but it is in line with the position taken by the committee and by the Senate in recent months.

In one further important respect, the bill has been amended: as it comes from the Senate committee, it no longer authorizes the payment of claims by the Secretary of the Army, but instead merely directs the Secretary to bring back to the Congress a report on the amount due each claimant. It would then be up to the Congress to pass on the claims in the final analysis and enact such legislation as it might see fit to pay them. This is in line with the way the Congress handled the claims growing out of the Port Chicago disaster.

It may be, Mr. President, that the amount eventually involved in these claims will exceed $50 million. That will be for the Secretary of the Army to determine, initially, under this bill, and for the Congress to determine, finally. However, that figure should never be considered standing alone; it should always be considered in connection with 2 other figures: the figure 570, which represents the approximate number of persons who were killed in this disaster; and the figure 3,500, which represents the approximate number of those who were injured. I cannot give the Senate a figure on the amount of private property damage; but under this bill, the Secretary of the Army will provide that figure also.

Mr. President, this bill does not provide for hasty action; it does provide for getting before the Congress, as speedily as may be, the precise facts, carefully evaluated, with respect to each individual claim which is involved here. I think the Senate can do no less than approve this bill.

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

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that these claims were the basis for a trial in the district court of the United States?

Mr. McCARRAN. All these claims were the basis for a trial in the district court of the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it not true that the case finally went to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. McCARRAN. The case finally went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. And the claims were rejected?

Mr. McCARRAN. The claims were rejected, but the reason for their rejection was a technicality.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is it true that the bill could, if enacted, cost the Government of the United States considerably more than $50 million?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, and it might be more, if we took into consideration the subrogation, but that is not in the bill as it comes before the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I preface my next question by saying that I know this bill was very carefully considered, first by the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and then by the full committee. There are great equities involved in the bill. Those equities were recognized by the subcommittee and by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

I should like to say for the record that when the bill was considered by the full committee, I felt constrained to vote against the bill on the ground that I have consistently taken the position that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary must find another way to handle private claims bills, particularly money bills. This is a matter of principle with me. My vote was not directed particularly at the issue involved in this bill, but I feel that we must find some other way to solve these questions involving equities, when there is no remedy at law.

I ask the Senator one question: Under all the circumstances, does the Senator feel that the Senate is justified today in passing the bill on the calendar call?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the amount involved is nothing as compared with the suffering and disaster which befell individuals in the terrific explosion which took place. There is no question in the mind of the Senator from Nevada that the fault lay with the Government of the United States. It was an unfortunate thing, but it did occur. Those who were left destitute by reason of the death of the relatives, providers, or heads of families, and those who were maimed and left maimed for life deserve reasonably expeditious consideration. The bill will not move very rapidly even now. The Army must make the appraisal and then bring it in to the Congress for final determination.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished majority leader had intended to call this bill up for consideration in any event. In the light of the equities and in the light of the statement made by the senior Senator from Nevada, the junior Senator from New Jersey, acting as a member of the Republican calendar committee, withholds any objection.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Army shall investigate all claims against the United States for damages for property loss, death, and personal injuries proximately resulting from the disaster at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, and report to the Congress recommended awards with respect thereto.

SEC. 2. Claimants shall not be required to submit their claims to the Secretary of the Army, but the Secretary shall consider any such claim which was a part of a civil action filed against the United States in a United States district court prior to April 25, 1950.

SEC. 3. (a) It is the intention of the Congress that no attorneys' or agents' fees shall be allowed or paid out of any award recommended pursuant hereto and hereafter authorized.

(b) The Secretary shall not include in any recommended award any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for any loss payment made by such company or fund.

(c) The Secretary of the Army shall limit himself to the determination and recommendation of (1) the amount of award to be paid, and (2) the persons entitled to receive the same.

(d) Except as otherwise provided herein, in carrying out the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall be guided by the law of the State of Texas.

SEC. 4. Awards based on death claims shall be recommended to be made only to persons or their legal representatives authorized to sue for wrongful death under the revised statutes of the State of Texas. No such award under this section shall be recommended by the Secretary of the Army in an amount in excess of $20,000.

SEC. 5. In determining the amounts of awards to be recommended for property loss, death claims, or personal injuries, the Secretary of the Army shall reduce any such amount by an amount equal to the total of insurance benefits previously paid with respect to such loss, death claim, or injuries.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Army shall, within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, transmit to the Congress a statement of each claim considered by him in accordance with this act showing succinctly the nature of such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount of award recommended, if any.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to commend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] for the attitude he has taken with respect to House bill 9785. We all know the view of the Senator from New Jersey with respect to the desirability of having the Senate find a better way of handling the so-called money-claim bills. He could have objected, in keeping with his long-established point of view on that subject.

What we have seen demonstrated is something highly commendable. He recognizes that, after all, the bill did not call for any grant of money at the present time, but merely for an opportunity for the Department of the Army to make an investigation for the Congress, so that it might know at some time in the future how much money is owed, if we are to do equity to the very unfortunate people who suffered, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has pointed out, because of the fault of the Federal Government.

This display of statesmanship on the floor of the Senate is deserving of commendation. In my judgment the equities involved, justice to these people, and the humanitarian principles involved certainly justify the bill, to permit the Army to prepare for us an accounting as to what the Federal Government owes, if we are to accept the obligation and responsibility which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has pointed out.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I cannot let the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon go unnoticed. I feel that I must make some comment. I deeply appreciate the tribute paid to me by the junior Senator from Oregon. I do not feel that I deserve any tribute, because what I did was a clear matter of duty.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President I also wish to say a word about the bill passed a few moments ago by the Senate. It is probably one of the largest money bills the Judiciary Committee has ever considered. I commend the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. He came before our committee and withheld nothing. The distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the rest of us went into this subject very thoroughly, with the greatest of care. We spent many hours in the consideration of it. Anyone who looks into the case will find that we eliminated the provision with respect to the insurance companies and the provision for attorneys' fees. I think it is one of the finest acts that has been performed on the floor of the Senate.

I particularly appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] at that time was in the midst of a campaign. He let his own personal affairs wait during his appearance before the subcommittee. We went into the case in the greatest detail. I think we ought to commend him for taking care of the people of Texas City in connection with the great catastrophe that overtook them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am deeply touched by the usual generosity of my friend from North Dakota. I am entitled to very little credit, if any, for the work that was done on the bill. I merely presented the case as I saw it.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and my beloved colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] spent many days on the case. If the bill finally comes to a good end and the suffering people of Texas City are remunerated for the losses they sustained, it will be due largely to the work of the chairman, the Senator from Nevada, and my junior colleague, who did so much work on the bill.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 29) to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the supervisors of certain employees or contractors with the United States during World War II, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the call of the calendar. The Secretary will state the first bill placed at the foot of the calendar.

J. A. VANCE CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1107) for the relief of J. A. Vance Co. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$7,341.53" and insert "$7,368.67"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "act", to strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS V. COMPTON—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4281) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the other day I filed an objection to this bill. Thereafter the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] made a very eloquent appeal in behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Compton. He told us about the equities in the case. I must say that I was very much impressed by what he said, and that he certainly generated in me, as he wished to do, considerable sympathy for the people involved.

However, a reading of the report on the bill makes clear that if we permit this bill to be passed it will set a precedent which will require, whenever the Federal Government sees fit to build a dam or to erect a highway, which, in some respects, leaves people who lived on the highway out of the line of traffic and thereby causes them to suffer by reason of not having the business which they had previously, the Federal Government will have the responsibility of compensating such people for the loss of their business, even though the building of the dam or the erection of the highway may be in the general public interest.

I filed an objection previously, and I still feel this is bad legislation, and that it should not be passed in this way. However, before I again file an objection, I should like to hear what the Senator from Colorado may have to say.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator. In the West, where we build a great many reservoirs, allowances are usually made for moving railroads, telephone lines, and other utility properties from land that is covered with water.

In this particular case the store building of these two old people, about whom the Senator from Virginia told us the other day, was not covered by water, but was surrounded by water.

As a result, it was impossible for these two old people to use their store and their property. Six thousand dollars was allowed by the committee as against a claim for $18,000, to enable them to move out of the area inundated by the building of the dam.

I do not think a new principle is established, because in many cases—and I could cite a great many cases in which reservoirs have been built under similar conditions—the Federal Government has taken care of moving railroads and other utilities out of a reservoir area.

Mr. SMATHERS. The report on this particular case states:

> The highway was therefore relocated to avoid the water, although the old highway remained usable up to and beyond the Compton property, and a short connecting road was built to the new highway in order to provide continued access to the Compton and other properties. There is no indication that the Compton property was physically damaged in any way by the Government project. Whatever losses were suffered by claimants in this case would appear to have resulted solely from the relocation of Highway No. 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, I agree with the Senator that we can not compensate people for the moving or changing of a highway. On the other hand, if their property was damaged, if the property of the little business which these old people had was damage by the reservoir, not by the removal of the highway, that involves another point. But it seems to me that they are entitled to some compensation. The Senator will recall that the Senator from Virginia stated that these are the only people in the reservoir area who were not compensated for their loss. The proposed compensation has been reduced from $18,000 to $6,000, which would be sufficient to enable them to move their property out of the damaged area.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Colorado. This case might well involve a misunderstanding of fact. I am sure the Senator would agree that if the damage resulting to these people occurs only because of the relocation of the highway, it would be a bad precedent for the Government to compensate them because they happen not to be located on the new highway.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; that would be a very bad precedent.

Mr. SMATHERS. So it appears that the case involves a question of fact, as to whether the property is merely surrounded by water or whether the water has covered the property.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have had a long discussion of the bill——

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask that it go to the foot of the calendar, and I shall be glad to discuss it further.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object to placing the bill at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon objects to the request that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Department of the Army, while acknowledging that the claimants have been damaged, takes the position that such damages constitute a burden which must be borne by the property owner as one of the risks of ownership, and that such damages are in the same category, legally, as damages arising as the result of the construction of many types of Government projects with respect to which there is no actual physical taking by the Government of the property. That is fundamental law, Mr. President. Such damages are not compensable by the Government, as a matter of law. The Department of Justice takes exactly the same position. It is difficult for me to see how the Senate can continually overrule the departments when they are supported by law.

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

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ALIEN SHEEPHERDERS

The bill (S. 3813) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I assume the main qualification of a sheepherder is that he shall not desert his sheep but it matters not that he deserts the ship.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3813) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santiago Hormaechea, Jose Lecanda, Rufino Merino Jimenez, Panagiatis Demitreos Zeras, Fernando Macuaga Madariaga, Manuel Lopez Trabazo, Luis Uriarte Otaolea, and Antonio Yrigoyen Arrachea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the

United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE PERMITTING ORAL PRESCRIPTIONS FOR CERTAIN DRUGS

The bill (S. 3447) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the filling of oral prescriptions for certain drugs, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I inquire what happened to Order No. 2481?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is proceeding with the call of bills which went to the foot of the calendar at the last calendar call.

Mr. BUTLER. Will Calendar No. 2481 be called in due course?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill did not go to the foot of the calendar. It was objected to, and was passed over.

Mr. BUTLER. On this very call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not be called on this call of the calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. Was that at the last previous call or on this calendar call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present call started with Calendar No. 19, on the first page, going through to Calendar No. 2392, on page 16. Following the regular call of the calendar it was the order to proceed to the call of those items which went to the foot of the calendar at the previous calendar call, and we are now proceeding under that order.

Is there objection to the consideration of Calendar No. 2500, Senate bill 3447?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3447) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the filling of oral prescriptions for certain drugs, and for other purposse, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, after the word "Code", to insert "of 1939"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "Code", to insert "of 1939"; on page 4, line 23, after the word "Code", to insert "of 1939"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 14, to insert "of 1939"; in line 19, after the word "Code", to insert "of 1939"; on page 6, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 6. Section 4705 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Use of drugs in professional practice: To the dispensing or distribution of narcotic drugs to a patient by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722, in the course of his professional practice only: *Provided*, That such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed, showing the amount dispensed or distributed, the date, and the name and address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed, except such as may be dispensed or distributed to a patient upon whom such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of 2 years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in section 4773."

At the top of page 7 to insert:

SEC. 7. Section 4705 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Prescriptions: (A) To the sale, dispensing, or distribution of narcotic drugs by a dealer to a consumer under and in pursuance of a written prescription issued by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722: *Provided, however*, That (i) such prescription shall be dated as of the day on which signed and shall be signed by the physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner who shall have issued the same; (ii) that such dealer shall preserve such prescription for a period of 2 years from the day on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 4773.

"(B) In lieu of a written prescription for such narcotic drugs or compounds of a narcotic drug which the Secretary or his delegate, in his discretion (after considering any views expressed on the subject by the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; the Commissioner, United States Food and Drug Administration; the respective heads of State narcotic law enforcement agencies; and the respective secretaries of national associations representing (i) narcotic drug manufacturers, (ii) physicians, and (iii) pharmacists), shall find and by regulation designate to possess relatively little or no addiction liability, the sale, dispensing, or distribution may be made by a dealer to a consumer upon oral prescription of a duly registered physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, which oral prescription is reduced promptly to writing, and the writing filed and preserved by the dealer for a period of 2 years from the date on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 4773. In issuing an oral prescription, the prescriber shall furnish the dealer with the same information as is required by law or regulation in case of a written prescription for narcotic drugs or compounds of a narcotic drug except for the written signature of the prescriber, and the dealer who fills such prescription shall be required to inscribe such information on the written record of the prescription made, filed and preserved by him, and shall inscribe on the label of the container of the narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug the same information as is required in filling a written prescription. An oral prescription shall not be refilled.

"(C) If the Secretary or his delegate shall subsequently determine that a narcotic drug or a compound of a narcotic drug, to which the oral prescription procedure described in the preceding subparagraph has been made applicable, possesses a degree of drug addiction liability that, in his opinion, results in abusive use of such procedure, he shall by regulation publish the determination in the Federal Register. The determination shall be final, and after the expiration of a period of 6 months from the date of its publication, the oral prescription procedure described in the preceding subparagraph shall cease to apply to the particular narcotic drug or to the particular compound of a narcotic drug which is the subject of the determination."

On page 9, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 8. Section 4704 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Prescriptions: To any person having in his or her possession any narcotic drugs or compounds of narcotic drug which have been obtained from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written or oral prescription referred to in section 4705 (c) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722; and where the bottle or other container in which such narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug may be put up by the dealer upon such prescription bears the name and registry number of the druggist, and name and address of the patient, serial number of prescription, and name, address, and registry number of the person issuing said prescription; or."

On page 10, after line 3, to insert:

SEC. 9. Section 4773 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "prescriptions required" and inserting in lieu thereof "prescriptions, including the written record of oral prescriptions, required."

After line 7, to insert:

SEC. 10. Section 4724 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) to any person carrying any narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug which has been obtained by the person from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written or oral prescription referred to in section 4705 (c) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722, if the bottle or other container in which such drug or compound of a narcotic drug is carried bears the name and registry number of the druggist, serial number of prescription, name and address of the patient, and name, address, and registry number of the person issuing such prescription."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2554 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Use of drugs in professional practice: To the dispensing or distribution of narcotic drugs to a patient by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, registered under section 3221, in the course of his professional practice only: *Provided*, That such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practictioner, shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed, showing the amount dispensed or distributed, the date, and the name and address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed, except such as may be dispensed or distributed to a patient upon which such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of 2 years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in section 2556."

SEC. 2. Section 2554 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Prescriptions: To the sale, dispensing, or distribution of narcotic drugs by a dealer to a consumer under and in pursuance of a written prescription issued by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, registered under section 3221: *Provided, however*, That (1) such prescription shall be dated as of the day on which signed and shall be signed by the physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practi-

tioner, who shall have issued the same; (2) that such dealer shall preserve such prescription for a period of 2 years from the day on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 2556.

"In lieu of a written prescription for such narcotic drugs or compounds of a narcotic drug which the Secretary, in his discretion (after considering any views expressed on the subject by the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; the Commissioner, United States Food and Drug Administration, the respective heads of State narcotic law-enforcement agencies, and the respective secretaries of national associations representing (a) narcotic drug manufacturers, (b) physicians, and (c) pharmacists), shall find and by regulation designate to possess relatively little or no addiction liability, the sale, dispensing, or distribution may be made by a dealer to a consumer upon oral prescription of a duly registered physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, which oral prescription is reduced promptly to writing, and the writing filed and preserved by the dealer for a period of 2 years from the date on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 2556. In issuing an oral prescription, the prescriber shall furnish the dealer with the same information as is required by law or regulation in case of a written prescription for narcotic drugs or compounds of a narcotic drug except for the written signature of the prescriber, and the dealer who fills such prescription shall be required to inscribe such information on the written record of the prescription made, filed and preserved by him, and shall inscribe on the label of the container of the narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug the same information as is required in filling a written prescription. An oral prescription shall not be refilled.

"If the Secretary shall subsequently determine that a narcotic drug or a compound of a narcotic drug, to which the oral prescription procedure described in the preceding paragraph has been made applicable, possesses a degree of drug addition liability that, in his opinion, results in abusive use of such procedure, he shall by regulation publish the determination in the Federal Register. The determination shall be final, and after the expiration of a period of 6 months from the date of its publication, the oral prescription procedure described in the preceding paragraph shall cease to apply to the particular narcotic drug or to the particular compound of a narcotic drug which is the subject of the determination."

SEC. 3. Section 2553 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Prescriptions: To any person having in his or her possession any narcotic drugs or compounds of narcotic drug which have been obtained from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written or oral prescription referred to in section 2554 (c) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 3221; and where the bottle or other container in which such narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug may be put up by the dealer upon said prescription bears the name and registry number of the druggist, and name and address of the patient, serial number of prescription, and name, address, and registry number of the person issuing said prescription; or."

SEC. 4. Section 2556 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is amended by placing a comma after the word "prescriptions" in the first sentence thereof and interpolating immediately following said comma, the phrase "including the written record of oral prescriptions."

SEC. 5. Section 3224 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) to any person carrying any narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug which has been obtained by the person from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written or oral prescription referred to in section 2554 (c) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, registered under section 3221, if the bottle or other container in which such drug or compound of a narcotic drug is carried bears the name and registry number of the druggist, serial number of prescription, name and address of the patient, and name, address, and registry number of the person issuing such prescription."

SEC. 6. Section 4705 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Use of drugs in professional practice: To the dispensing or distribution of narcotic drugs to a patient by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722, in the course of his professional practice only: *Provided*, That such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall keep a record of all such drugs dispensed or distributed, showing the amount dispensed or distributed, the date, and the name and address of the patient to whom such drugs are dispensed or distributed, except such as may be dispensed or distributed to a patient upon whom such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall personally attend; and such record shall be kept for a period of 2 years from the date of dispensing or distributing such drugs, subject to inspection, as provided in section 4773."

SEC. 7. Section 4705 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Prescriptions: (A) To the sale, dispensing, or distribution of narcotic drugs by a dealer to a consumer under and in pursuance of a written prescription issued by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722: *Provided, however*, That (i) such prescription shall be dated as of the day on which signed and shall be signed by the physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner who shall have issued the same; (ii) that such dealer shall preserve such prescription for a period of 2 years from the day on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 4773.

"(B) In lieu of a written prescription for such narcotic drugs or compounds of a narcotic drug which the Secretary or his delegate, in his discretion (after considering any views expressed on the subject by the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service; the Commissioner, United States Food and Drug Administration; the respective heads of State narcotic law enforcement agencies; and the respective secretaries of national associations representing (i) narcotic drug manufacturers, (ii) physicians, and (iii) pharmacists), shall find and by regulation designate to possess relatively litle or no addiction liability, the sale, dispensing, or distribution may be made by a dealer to a consumer upon oral prescription of a duly registered physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner, which oral prescription is reduced promptly to writing, and the writing filed and preserved by the dealer for a period of 2 years from the date on which such prescription is filled in such a way as to be readily accessible to inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 4773. In issuing an oral prescription, the prescriber shall furnish the dealer with the same information as is required by law or regulation in case of a written prescription for narcotic drugs or compounds of a narcotic drug except for the written signature of the prescriber, and the dealer who fills such prescription shall be required to inscribe such information on the written record of the prescription made, filed and preserved by him, and shall inscribe on the label of the container of the narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug the same information as is required in filling a written prescription. An oral prescription shall not be refilled.

"(C) If the Secretary or his delegate shall subsequently determine that a narcotic drug or a compound of a narcotic drug, to which the oral prescription procedure described in the preceding subparagraph has been made applicable, possesses a degree of drug addiction liability that, in his opinion, results in abusive use of such procedure, he shall by regulation publish the determination in the Federal Register. The determination shall be final, and after the expiration of a period of 6 months from the date of its publication, the oral prescription procedure described in the preceding subparagraph shall cease to apply to the particular narcotic drug or to the particular compound of a narcotic drug which is the subject of the determination."

SEC. 8. Section 4704 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Prescriptions: To any person having in his or her possesion any narcotic drugs or compounds of narcotic drug which have been obtained from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written or oral prescription referred to in section 4705 (c) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722; and where the bottle or other container in which such narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug may be put up by the dealer upon said prescription bears the name and registry number of the druggist, and name and address of the patient, serial number of prescription, and name, address, and registry number of the person issuing said prescription; or."

SEC. 9. Section 4773 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "prescriptions required" and inserting in lieu thereof "prescriptions, including the written record of oral prescriptions, required."

SEC. 10. Section 4724 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) to any person carrying any narcotic drug or compound of a narcotic drug which has been obtained by the person from a registered dealer in pursuance of a written or oral prescription referred to in section 4705 (c) (2), issued for legitimate medical uses by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 4722, if the bottle or other container in which such drug or compound of a narcotic drug is carried bears the name and registry number of the druggist, serial number of prescription, name and address of the patient, and name, address and registry number of the person issuing such prescription."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS BY SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

The bill (H. R. 7881) to validate a conveyance of certain lands by Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and its lessee,

Southern Pacific Co., to Morgan Hopkins, Inc., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I conferred with my colleague who had charge of this bill after the last call of the calendar and after it was agreed that it go to the foot of the calendar, and I satisfied myself that the inquiry I raised in regard to the title to the land involved is met by the committee report, and, therefore, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7881) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The bill (H. R. 7785) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY TO STATE OF MINNESOTA

The bill (S. 2153) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the State of Minnesota was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, this bill relates to the Indian school and hospital building, buildings located near Pipestone, Minn. The property has not been used during the past year for the care of Indian children. The State of Minnesota, in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has developed a foster-home-placement program, furnishing foster-home care for Indians who are orphans or whose parents are separated. We have found this system more desirable. The Indian child has a much better opportunity in life.

The Pipestone property involved is now standing idle. I have seen the property a number of times in recent years. There is some good agricultural land in connection with it. That land is not involved in this bill. The land will go to the General Services Administration to be handled under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act.

The bill relates only to the school and hospital buildings, and approximately 60 acres of land. If the school were converted to State use for mentally retarded children, the 60 acres would be ample for that purpose.

That is all that is involved.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. This is the bill to which I took rather strong exception with reference to its original language, is it not?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. And it has been revised to meet all objections raised in the committee?

Mr. THYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is also true, is it not, that what is proposed is the provision of facilities which were intended for Indian use, and now the State will be furnishing facilities, services, and education for those Indian children which otherwise would be furnished by the Federal Government?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. The studies of our Public Welfare Department, the State administration, and the Indian Bureau developed that it would be far better to put the Indian orphans in private homes under the foster home care program than to segregate them in this Indian school or agency until they reached the age when they would be old enough to go back to the Indian reservations or to begin their adult vocations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is also true, is it not, that because of the small number of Indian children in this particular region, it is not economical to maintain a Federal Indian school for them, so the children who are of normal mentality go to public schools, and it is proposed that this particular property, which was originally made available for Indian use will now be used by the State which will provide other services for Indian children—as the Senator pointed out in this instance, an institution for children who are not of normal mentality, including Indian children?

Mr. THYE. The Senator is entirely correct, Mr. President. I think far better use would be made of this property as a State institution under the program we have discussed, which includes the foster-home care for Indian children, their education in the public schools, and use of the Pipestone property for a State institution in which Indian children requiring such care, as well as white children, would be admitted. I hope the objections may be withdrawn and that the bill may pass.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection, because I have studied the bill with sufficient care to satisfy myself that the Federal Government is receiving adequate consideration for this transfer of property in terms of the service the State of Minnesota will render in connection with taking care of what, after all, are Federal wards.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer to the State of Minnesota, to be used for school or other institutional purposes only, the right, title, and interest of the United States to not more than 60 acres of the Pipestone School Reserve, together with all the improvements thereon, and the buildings known and designated as the Pipestone Indian School and the Pipestone Indian Hospital located near Pipestone, Minn. Upon a finding by the Secretary that property so transferred has ceased to be used for the purposes specified, title to such lands, together with all improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States, but any such findings shall be subject to judicial review by any court having appropriate jurisdiction. The remainder of the Pipestone School Reserve, together with all improvements thereon, in the discretion of the Secretary, shall be transferred to the Administrator of General Services for disposal as surplus property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U. S. C., 1952 ed., sec. 484).

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I addressed to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

AUGUST 16, 1954.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: In view of the many complex matters which have been considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs upon receipt of delayed departmental reports on various pending bills before the committee, I greatly appreciate the consideration given to S. 2153, to transfer the buildings of the Indian school and hospital at Pipestone to the State of Minnesota to assist the State in meeting its institutional needs.

The school and hospital property, including the agricultural land in the 532-acre school reservation at Pipestone, has not been in use during the present fiscal year, in line with the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to discontinue the school as no longer needed in its program. An agreement has been reached between the Bureau and the Minnesota Division of Social Welfare whereby the Federal and State governments are cooperating in a program of foster home care for the Indian children who would otherwise attend the school, and these children are being educated in the public schools. This is part of a program of integration of our Indian people in our common life, and I am pleased to tell you that we have had marked success in Minnesota in this progressive development.

Meanwhile, the State has great need for additional State institutions. The legislature in 1953, as stated in the committee report on S. 2153, adopted enabling legislation to provide for use of the Pipestone school and hospital buildings if they become available. The legislature meets again in January 1955, and if necessary funds are to be made available for rehabilitation of the property and for its activation as a State institution, it would be extremely helpful if the intent of Congress could be made known at this time.

The amount of land that could be utilized in connection with a State institution at Pipestone has been a question considered by the committee. I was informed by the Commissioner of Public Welfare in Minnesota that if the institution is used for the care of mentally retarded children, 60 acres will be sufficient for providing a campus and playground area. This is the amount of land provided in the bill as amended. I should point out, however, that if the institution were to be used for rehabilitation of alcoholics, the State officials believe there should be an area of 250 acres to provide a suitable work program for these people.

There is immediately adjacent to the school property, and in fact part of the original Indian Reservation of 1 square mile, the Pipestone National Monument of approximately 115 acres. I had included a provision in S. 2153 as originally introduced to provide for transfer of 250 acres to the Pipestone National Monument, for its development and protection, as this is 1 of 2 historical national monuments in Minnesota. The committee has felt that it would be more in keeping with the policy of Congress to provide for transfer of all the land except 60 acres now in the school reserve to the Administrator of General Services for disposal of surplus property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

The amendments now proposed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to S. 2153 are acceptable to me as the author of the bill. I believe the adoption of S. 2153, as amended, would be in the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

HOSPITALIZATION AND CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8009) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. I do.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the withholding of the objection by the Senator from Tennessee, because it is my understanding that an objection may be interposed by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has held hearings on the bill. The Senator is not in the Chamber at this moment.

Will the Senator indicate whether he is objecting on behalf of my friend from Washington? There is some hope that he may withdraw his objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the minority calendar committee has not made a practice of revealing the names of Senators for whom they enter objections. I am glad to inform the Senator from California, however, that the request did not come from the junior Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the bills which were placed at the foot of the calendar on this call.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Chair be kind enough to state the numbers of the bills so we may have them in advance?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first is Calendar No. 1511, House bill 4017.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Are Calendar Nos. 2520, 2521, and 2522 to be called?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, when we have completed the call of items at the foot of the calendar, the majority leader will ask for an order covering those three bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills which went to the foot of the calendar are: Calendar No. 1511, House bill 4017; Calendar No. 1986, House bill 951; Calendar No. 2010, House bill 7774; Calendar 2284, House bill 3534; and Calendar 2313, Senate bill 2564.

The clerk will state the first bill.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ARKANSAS

The bill (H. R. 4017) to provide for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I asked that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, so that I could study it. I have studied it, and, in my judgment, the bill in no way violates the Morse formula. This is a case in which property was conveyed originally for school purposes. There has been a consolidation of country schools. It is now desired to make use of the value of the property in order to buy fixtures for the new consolidated schools. In my opinion, this is completely in line with the original grant. I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the foot of the present calendar?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At the foot of the new calendar to be called. I understand the majority leader intends to call up a new order of bills. I ask that this bill go to the foot of that call.

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

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF GRANTING INCENTIVE AWARDS

The bill (H. R. 7774) to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is the postal-pay-increase bill. An amendment which I have had prepared is at the desk.

I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] desires to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from California desire to complete action on the other bills?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should prefer to have this bill considered now, because I must attend conferences later.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Hayden	McCarthy
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bowring	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Cooper	Kefauver	Reynolds
Cordon	Kennedy	Robertson
Crippa	Kerr	Russell
Dirksen	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Duff	Knowland	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kuchel	Smathers
Ellender	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Lennon	Stennis
Frear	Long	Symington
Fulbright	Magnuson	Thye
George	Malone	Watkins
Goldwater	Mansfield	Williams
Gore	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there has been placed at the desk a copy of the amendments which I have prepared to the bill. I have also given a copy of the amendments to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a point of order. The bill has not been stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was stated before the quorum call.

Mr. GORE. It was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, it was stated, and I was reserving the right to object. The Senate knows that H. R. 7774, the Government employees' pay-raise bill, was passed over on the last call of the calendar. I have a series of amendments which I intend to submit to the bill en bloc, but before I do so, I wish to make a few remarks in explanation of the administration's policy on the pay-raise bill. As the Senate knows, the House of Representatives——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair apologizes for interrupting the Senator from California, but there must be order in the Senate Chamber. The Chair does not think the Senator can be

heard. Those who are conversing will kindly cease to converse.

The Senator from California will resume.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Chair, because my voice is still a little hoarse from a cold. It may be my fault as much as the noise in the Senate.

The Senate knows H. R. 7774, the Government employees' pay-raise bill, was passed over on the last call of the calendar. I have a series of amendments which I intend to submit to the bill en bloc, and then I wish to make a few remarks in explanation of the administration's policy on the pay-raise bill subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the series of amendments proposed to be offered by me printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no ojection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 7 beginning with line 13, strike out over through line 5 on page 8, and insert the following:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	$2,500	$2,580	$2,660	$2,740	$2,820	$2,900	$2,980
GS-2	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
GS-3	3,000	3,080	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400	3,480
GS-4	3,250	3,330	3,410	3,490	3,570	3,650	3,730
GS-5	3,600	3,725	3,850	3,975	4,100	4,225	4,350
GS-6	4,000	4,125	4,250	4,375	4,500	4,625	4,750
GS-7	4,440	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900	5,025	5,150
GS-8	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300	5,425	5,550
GS-9	5,300	5,425	5,550	5,675	5,800	5,925	6,050
GS-10	5,800	5,925	6,050	6,175	6,300	6,425	6,550
GS-11	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	
GS-12	7,500	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300	8,500	
GS-13	8,800	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	
GS-14	10,200	10,400	10,600	10,800	11,000	11,200	
GS-15	11,600	11,850	12,100	12,350	12,600		
GS-16	12,800						
GS-17	13,800						
GS-18	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	$1,810	$1,870	$1,930	$1,990	$2,050	$2,110	$2,170
CPC-2	2,420	2,490	2,560	2,630	2,700	2,770	2,840
CPC-3	2,552	2,632	2,712	2,792	2,872	2,952	3,032
CPC-4	2,750	2,830	2,910	2,990	3,070	3,150	3,230
CPC-5	3,000	3,080	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400	3,480
CPC-6	3,250	3,330	3,410	3,490	3,570	3,650	3,730
CPC-7	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,200
CPC-8	4,000	4,125	4,250	4,375	4,500	4,625	4,750
CPC-9	4,400	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900	5,025	5,150
CPC-10	4,800	4,925	5,050	5,175	5,300	5,425	5,550

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $2,700 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of $2,840 per annum."

On page 9, lines 8 and 9, strike out "as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive basic compensation", and insert, "he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the maximum longevity rate of his grade as provided in this section, or his existing rate, whichever is greater."

On page 9, lines 20 and 21, strike out "as provided in this section, he shall continue to recive basic compensation" and insert, "he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, or his existing rate, whichever is greater."

On page 10, line 11, strike out "5 percent" and insert "3½ percent."

On page 10, lines 12 and 13, strike out "$440 per annum or less than $170 per annum", and insert "$410 per annum."

On page 11, line 1, strike out "5" and insert "3½."

On page 11, beginning with the comma in line 10, strike out down through the words "per annum" in line 12.

On page 11, line 15, strike out "$12,086" and insert "$12,056."

On page 11, line 20, strike out "$2,160" and insert "$1,380."

On page 11, line 22, strike out "$2,400" and insert "$1,620."

On page 11, line 25, strike out "$3,120" and insert "$1,860."

On page 12, line 3, strike out "$3,180" and insert "$1,920."

On page 12, line 10, strike out "$6,180" and insert "$6,060."

On page 12, line 11, strike out "$7,620" and insert "$7,560."

On page 12, line 12, strike out "$8,640" and insert "$8,580."

On page 12, line 20, strike out "5" and insert "3½."

On page 12, line 21, strike out "$440 per annum" and insert "$410 per annum."

On page 12, strike out line 22.

On page 13, line 8, strike out "5" and insert "3½."

On page 14, line 2, strike out "$14,240" and insert "$14,210."

On page 14, line 8, strike out "5" and insert "3½."

On page 14, lines 9 and 10, strike out "$440 per annum or less than $170 per annum" and insert "$410 per annum."

On page 14, line 13, strike out "$13,240" and insert "$13,210."

On page 14, line 16, strike out "5" and insert "3½."

On page 14, line 17, strike out "$440" and insert "$410 per annum."

On page 14, line 18, strike out line 18.

On page 15, strike out lines 10 to 23, inclusive.

Renumber sections 202 to 207, inclusive, as sections 201 to 206, respectively.

"SEC. 207. (a) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation and study of various methods for the classification of positions and the determination of salaries in the postal field service and all matters relating thereto (including personnel and pay benefits and administration), in order to provide a plan (to be submitted by the Postmaster General to, and to be subject to review by, the Congress, in accordance with the provisions of this section and section 10) for the establishment of a uniform, integrated, and equitable classification and pay system for all postmasters, officers, employees, and positions in the postal field service. Such classification and pay plan for the postal field service shall provide a method for determining the rates of basic compensation which postmasters, officers, and employees shall receive under which—

"(1) the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work shall be followed; and

"(2) variations in rates of basic compensation paid to different postmasters, officers, and employees shall be in proportion to substantial differences in the difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of the work performed and to the contributions of postmasters, officers, and employees to efficiency and economy in the postal field service.

Such plan shall contain compensation schedules which set forth the various grades to which positions in the postal field service are to be allocated and provide the rates of basic compensation, and the ranges of such rates, which are to be applicable to such grades. Such plan also shall contain provisions which—

"(A) grant to personnel in the postal field service the right to obtain appropriate review by the Civil Service Commission of all classifications of their positions:

"(B) prohibit reductions in the rates of basic compensation of personnel on the rolls on the date such plan (or any part thereof) becomes operative, by reason of the institution and operation of such plan (or any part thereof);

"(C) prohibit reductions in rates of basic compensation of any personnel, by reason of any classification actions taken at any time under authority of such plan with respect to the positions occupied by such personnel, so long as such personnel remain in the same positions and are assigned to perform and do perform work of the same level of difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements as the work which they were performing in such poistions; and

"(D) preserve for personnel in the postal field service on the rolls on the date such plan (or any part thereof) becomes operative the increases in rates of basic compensation provided by this act.

Such plan also may contain such provisions and proposals consistent with the purposes of this section as the Postmaster General deems advisable in the light of the needs of the Post Office Department, the best interests of personnel in the postal field service, and the public interest.

"(b) In the light of and pursuant to the investigation and study made under subsection (a) and in accordance with the purposes of such subsection, the Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before March 15, 1955, a classification and pay plan for the postal field service. Such plan shall be prepared with due regard for the legislative forms and procedures of the Congress and shall be accompanied by an appropriate written explanation of the provisions, objects, purposes, and effects thereof. The delivery of such plan and explanation thereof shall be made to both Houses on the same day.

"(c) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (e) of this section, the provisions of such classification and pay plan for the postal field service shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which such plan is transmitted to the Congress; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such period of sixty days there has not been passed by either of the two Houses, by affirmative vote of a majority a quorum being present, a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such plan.

"(d) For the purposes of subsection (c) of this section—

"(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the 60-day period, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain.

"(e) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"(f) If such classification and pay plan becomes effective, such plan shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

"(g) Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the institution and operation of such classification and pay plan for the postal field service shall not be considered as an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in the case of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service who transfer or are transferred to positions within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"SEC. 208. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress:

"(1) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in subsection (b) of this section); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"(b) As used in this section and section 207, the term 'resolution' means only a resolution of either of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the _____ does not favor the postal field service classification and pay plan transmitted to Congress by the Postmaster General.', the blank space therein being filled with the name of the resolving House.

"(c) All resolutions with respect to the posal field service classification and pay plan shall be referred, by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, only to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"(d) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to such postal field service classification and pay plan has not reported such resolution before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction, it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such postal field service classification and pay plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(e) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed or disagreed to.

"(f) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the plan.

"(g) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to the plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(h) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(i) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to the plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(j) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to the plan shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 209. In the exercise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to adopt the postal field service classification and pay plan, or any part thereof, made operative pursuant to sections 9 and 10 of this act, as of the date or dates such plan, or any part thereof, becomes operative, for postal employees of the Canal Zone Government. The Postmaster General shall make available to the Governor of the Canal Zone copies of such matter relating to such plan as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including descriptions of positions and rates of compensation provided for therein."

On page 23, beginning with line 7, strike out over through line 23 on page 24, and insert the following:

On page 24, line 24, strike out "Sec. 209" and insert "Sec. 210."

On page 25, line 3, strike out "Sec. 210" and insert "Sec. 211."

On page 25, line 4, strike out "Sections 206 and 208" and insert "Section 205."

On page 25, line 6, strike out "202, 204, and 205" and insert "201, 203, and 204."

On page 25, line 9, strike out "203 and 209" and insert "202 and 210."

On page 25, line 12, strike out "207" and insert "206."

On page 25, after line 15, insert the following:

"TITLE III—POSTAL RATES

"FIRST-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 301. (a) The rates of postage on mail matter of the first class (other than postal cards and private mailing or post cards) shall be as follows:

"(1) 4 cents for the first ounce or fraction thereof, and 3 cents for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, when mailed for delivery at any destination other than the office of mailing;

"(2) 3 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof, when mailed for local delivery at the office of mailing, except as prescribed in paragraph (3) of this subsection; and

"(3) 2 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof, when mailed for local delivery at post offices where free delivery by carrier is not established and when the matter is not collected or delivered by rural or star route carriers.

"(b) In the case of first-class matter mailed without prepayment of any postage or without prepayment of the full amount of postage due, the Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe by regulation the conditions under which such matter shall be delivered to the addressee or returned to the sender. The conditions so prescribed shall be stated in such manner as to permit delivery of such mail to the addressee whenever it is practicable to do so consistent with the collection of the charges prescribed in accordance with subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) The Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe by regulation from time to time the charges to be collected on delivery in the case of any matter of the first class mailed without prepayment of any postage or without prepayment of the full amount of postage due. In determining such charges, the Postmaster General shall take into consideration the postage actually due, and, to the extent practicable, the additional expense incurred by reason of the failure to pay the applicable postage and the desirability of minimizing the incidence of such mailings.

"(d) Regulations issued by the Postmaster General under subsections (b) and (c) shall, to the extent prescribed therein, supersede existing laws, regulations, and orders governing the subject matter covered thereby.

"(e) Section 12 (a) of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C., sec. 246f (a)), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following:

"'(9) for returning undeliverable letters and parcels of the first class from the dead-letter office to the senders.'

"SECOND-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C., sec. 289a), is amended by striking out the word 'and' immediately following 'April 1, 1953' and by inserting before the colon immediately following 'April 1, 1954' a comma and the following: '(4) by an additional 10 per centum, based on rates now in force, beginning on April 1, 1955, (5) by an additional 10 per centum, based on rates now in force, beginning on April 1, 1956, and (6) by an additional 10 per centum, based on rates now in force, beginning on April 1, 1957'. The term 'rates now in force', as used in the amendments made by this subsection to section 2 (a) of such Act of October 30, 1951, means the rates in force immediately prior to April 1, 1952.

"(b) The rates increased by subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to a minimum charge of one-fourth of 1 cent computed on each individually addressed copy or package of unaddressed copies.

"(c) The rates of postage on copies of publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents, sample copies mailed by the publishers in excess of the 10 per centum allowance entitled to be sent at the pound rates, and copies mailed by the publishers to persons who may not be included in the required legitimate list of subscribers, shall be, in the case of publications weighing 8 ounces or less, the applicable rates now or hereafter prescribed by law on third-class matter, and, in the case of publications weighing in excess of 8 ounces, the applicable rates now or hereafter prescribed or authorized by law on fourth-class matter.

"THIRD-CLASS MAIL

"SEC. 303. (a) The rates of postage on third-class matter shall be 3 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 1½ cents for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including 8 ounces in weight, except that on matter mailed by religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private

stockholder or individual, the rates shall be as follows:

"(1) 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof on books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants not exceeding 8 ounces in weight; and

"(2) 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof, and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, on all other third-class matter.

"(b) Upon payment of a fee of $50 for each calendar year or of $15 for each quarter of a calendar year and under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe for the collection of postage and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails, separately addressed identical pieces of third-class matter in quantities of not less than twenty pounds, or of not less than two hundred pieces, may be mailed at pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time. The rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under this subsection shall be 16 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents, except that in the case of books and catalogs of twenty-four pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants the rate shall be 10 cents for each pound or fraction thereof with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents. The rate of postage on third-class matter mailed in bulk under this subsection but without individual addresses for delivery under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General shall be subject to a minimum charge per piece of 2 cents. The rates of postage prescribed by this subsection shall not apply with respect to matter mailed by religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, and the existing rates of postage shall continue to apply with respect to such matter.

"(c) Pieces or packages of third-class mail of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing throughout shall be subject to a minimum charge of 5 cents each.

"CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

"SEC. 304. The rate of postage on the publications defined in section 203 of the act of July 3, 1948 (39 U. S. C., sec. 291b), when mailed by the publisher and regardless of the weight of individual copies, shall be 11 cents for each pound or fraction thereof, computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but not less than 1½ cents per piece, which rate shall remain in effect until otherwise provided by Congress: *Provided*, That the rate of postage on copies of such publications when mailed by other than the publishers, or when forwarded to the addressee or returned to the sender, shall be 3 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1½ cents for each additional ounce.

"DOMESTIC AIRMAIL

"SEC. 305. The rate of postage on domestic airmail as defined in section 2 of the act of August 14, 1946 (39 U. S. C., sec. 462a), weighing 8 ounces or less (except postal cards and private mailing or postcards) shall be 7 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof.

"DETERMINATION OF CLASS OF POST OFFICE AND COMPENSATION OF POSTMASTER AND CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 306. (a) On and after January 1, 1955, 85 percent of the gross postal receipts of all classes of post offices shall be counted for the purpose of determining the class of the post office or the compensation or allowances of postmasters or other employees whose compensation or allowances are based on the annual receipts of such offices. Nothing contained in this subsection shall operate to decrease the compensation or allowances in effect on the effective date of this subsection for postmasters and other employees in the postal field service on such date whose compensation or allowances are based upon the annual receipts of such offices.

"(b) In the case of the post office at Washington, District of Columbia, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, add to the gross receipts of such office counted for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section not to exceed 75 percent of such gross receipts.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the salaries of postmasters at fourth-class post offices, as fixed by law, shall be deemed and taken to be full compensation for the clerical labor in the issuance of money orders at such offices.

"REPEAL OF EXISTING PROVISIONS OF LAW

"SEC. 307. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

"(1) Section 202 (a) (4) of the act of February 28, 1925, as amended by section 4 of the act of May 29, 1928 (39 U. S. C., sec. 283);

"(2) Section 204 of the act of February 28, 1925 (39 U. S. C., sec. 288);

"(3) Section 2 (d) of the act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C., sec. 289a (d)).

"(b) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed or modified to the extent of such inconsistency.

"APPLICATION TO GUAM

"SEC. 308. This title shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possesions of the United States.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 309. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1955, except that section 302 (a) and (b) shall take effect on April 1, 1955."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the House of Representatives, through the means of a discharge petition, sent to the Senate a pay-raise bill for postal employees alone which amounted to a 7-percent increase for those employees. This action was taken despite the clear indication that the President would not sign any pay-raise legislation unless legislation was also enacted to provide for the increased revenues to the Government to pay for such increases.

The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported a general pay-raise bill to the Senate, H. R. 7774, which provides for a 5-percent pay increase for all classified and postal workers as well as for legislative and judicial employees. This bill while in line with administration policy as to percentage of pay increase for postal employees does not provide for any Government revenues and, therefore, does not meet with the specifications that would assure the President's approval.

Without taking the time of the Senate to explain all of the amendments I am submitting to H. R. 7774, I want to say in general that the amendments provide for a 5 percent average increase for postal employees, and a 3½ percent average increase for classified, legislative, and judicial employees. In addition, the amendments provide for a job reclassification for postal and classified employees. The amendments also provide for postal rate increases in first-, second-, and third-class mail.

If these amendments are adopted by the Senate I intend to ask unanimous consent to have the bill reprinted with the amendments attached so they would be available for study tomorrow.

I wish to assure the Senate that if the amendments are agreed to the bill will be called up on motion sometime either tonight or tomorrow. For the bill to become law amendments are needed which would provide for revenues offsetting the expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, data pertaining to postal salaries and rates.

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

Postage rate on letters is the same as it was in 1932—22 years ago.

In the meantime there have been five general wage increases and another is under consideration.

All postal costs have gone up 100 percent.

If the letter rate was fair in 1932, it is obviously too low now.

Postal cards were increased from 1 cent to 2 cents in 1952.

In 1951 the Senate (S. 1046) approved an increase from 3 cents to 4 cents on the 1st ounce of 1st-class mail. This was later amended in conference.

First-class mail is the premium postal service and because of its preferential treatment has always paid more than its out-of-pocket cost.

In 1945 this margin of revenue was over 60 percent. Now it's down to less than 10 percent.

There is an actual loss in the handling of the first ounce of non-local first-class mail. The margin of revenue is provided by local mail and extra postage on heavier letters.

An increase of 1 cent on first ounce only of nonlocal first-class mail will produce $159 million of additional revenue.

AIR MAIL

Increase from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce to preserve relationship to ordinary letters.

Increase will produce $15.6 million of additional revenue.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL

Loses $247 million a year.

Pays only 22 percent of its cost.

Does not pay the cost of transportation alone.

Second-class rates are only about 3 percent higher than in 1932.

Increases since 1951 only restored decreases made in 1934.

Proposed increase will produce only $13 million a year.

This will recover only about 5 percent of the present loss.

After this increase second-class mail will still be losing over $233 million a year.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

This is business mail.

Consists mostly of advertising circulars and small merchandise.

It is losing over $162 million a year.

It pays only 58 percent of its cost.

There is no reason why the taxpayer should pay private advertising and business expense.

The proposed increase will produce $44 million additional revenue.

After this increase third-class mail will still be losing $118 million.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator give a further explanation of his phrase "if we may have amendments in the bill"? Does the Senator mean that the committee must act again?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I recognize from the practical point of view that this is a rather complex subject, and there may be Senators who are on perfectly sound ground in not wanting to

adopt under the unanimous-consent procedure, amendments which are fairly complex.

What I have in mind is that in view of the fact we are getting close to the end of the session, I believe there is a desire on the part of the Senate and of the Congress to have a postal pay increase. I am sure that the administration would like to see a postal pay increase provided there could be offsetting revenue to take care of the increased expense.

There was some objection, as I understand—and I can fully understand it—on the part of some of the postal organizations, to the original plan proposed by the Postmaster General for a classification arrangement by which he would have the final and, we might say, the exclusive authority.

In the Rees bill, I believe it was, in the House, that was changed and it was provided that such classification arrangement would have to come back to the two Houses of Congress, and one or the other House by majority vote would have to approve any such classification. So the Congress would be given control over that situation in case they felt any inequity was being done.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is section 207 of the Senator's amendment what is commonly known as the Summerfield reclassification?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. As I understand, that is the original reclassification plan of Mr. Summerfield, except as changed and modified by the House committee, I believe under the chairmanship of Mr. REES of Kansas and other Members of the House who felt that the Congress itself should have a voice in the matter and, we might say, almost a veto over what was done.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand, it is the same proposal as originally submitted by the Postmaster General, with the exception that there are two clauses which require final approval by the House and the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should say that is correct, but the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and I am sure the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who have lived with this problem for many years, would be able to throw more light on the subject than the majority leader.

I have stated the general objective of the amendments which I have offered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as I understand the situation at the present time, the distinguished majority leader has now submitted some amendments, to be reprinted as a part of the original bill which our committee introduced, providing a pay increase for postal and classified workers. No action will be taken at this time, but the majority leader has assured us he plans to take up the bill later today or tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, the bill when it comes back from the printer, so every Member may see how the amendments fit into the postal pay and the classified pay bill which was reported.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I do not see any reason for discussing the amendments at this time, because we shall take them up as we come to them when the matter is before the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I correctly understood, as I attempted to follow the distinguished majority leader, if the procedure which he is now advocating is permitted, the bill (H. R. 7774) will not come to the Senate as it was reported unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee; is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I follow the distinguished majority leader, we shall then be asked to vote not on the bill as reported to the Senate, but on a bill which has been modified by unanimous consent on the consent calendar, to incorporate the so-called Knowland amendments, which not only change the pay scale for some nearly 2 million civil service workers who were given a 5 percent increase in the bill reported by the Senate committee, but which give the $10,000 civil service workers an 8 percent increase amounting to $800, give the 2 lowest grades, which are most in need of this cost-of-living increase, absolutely no increase, and give grade 3 only a 1.7 percent increase, or $50 a year, and GS-4 an increase of only 3.2 percent. But the 8 percent goes to the $10,000 workers and gives them a $800 increase in pay.

Now we are being asked, as I understand the proposed procedure, to completely revise, completely reverse, and completely tear up, with the possible exception of the 5 percent given to the 600,000 postal workers, the 5 percent increase the Senate has voted. As I understand, we are also being asked to accept an amendment which violates the traditional, historic, and emphatic position of the House of Representatives and of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, namely, that all revenue-raising bills must originate in the House of Representatives, and, in the case of revenue-raising bills which relate to postal revenues, in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That is because of the prerogative of the House, under the Constitution, to originate all revenue-raising legislation.

During the years in which I was privileged to serve in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the House refused even to sit in conference with the Senate to consider any postal-rate-increase measures which had not originated in the House of Representatives. That objection was made on the basis that in such case the Senate would have presumed to arrogate to itself the prerogative of the House to originate all revenue-raising measures.

Consequently, the proposed amendment of the distinguished majority leader, no matter how well intentioned it may be, would reverse, in my opinion, the time-honored and respected prerogative of the House of Representatives and its Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

In the Senate committee we took testimony from numerous witnesses; we have had the bill before us since the first of last year. In view of the fact that we recognized we had no jurisdiction over revenue-raising provisions unless they originated in the House of Representatives, we took no action on such phases of the bill.

After the hearings we reported a bill; and that bill, with the exception of the provision in regard to the 600,000 postal workers, is as different as day is from night from the——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must apologize for interrupting, but the Chair must call attention to the fact that the Senate is now considering the Consent Calendar. The Chair suggests that if this colloquy is to continue, unanimous consent be obtained for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass too much on the Consent Calendar. However, I ask unanimous consent that 20 minutes be allowed for discussion of the amendments. In that way, I think we can at least clear up some of the points.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the Consent Calendar procedure is a very special one. I also recognize that the present situation is not only a very special one, but an extraordinary one.

I shall not object; but it would appear to be the more orderly procedure if the bill were to be called up in the regular way and the amendments were then to be offered. At that time each Member of the Senate who addressed the Chair could be recognized, whereas under the rule, during the call of the Consent Calendar, each Senator is entitled to only 5 minutes on any measure on the calendar.

However, if at this time we give unanimous consent for one Senator to have 20 minutes, shall we grant unanimous consent for another Senator to have 20 minutes, and then for another Senator to have 20 minutes, and perhaps for another Senator to have 1 hour; or will all other Senators be limited to 5 minutes?

I shall not object; but——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from California is withdrawn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before the request is withdrawn, I wish to say that, while we are faced with some very complex amendments, we should dispose of this question before the Senate adjourns. I think the majority leader's request was an intelligent and wise one, for the reason that in 20 minutes there could be placed before this body some of the fundamentals in connection with the bill, and thereafter, during the remainder of the calendar, we would have an opportunity to study them. After the calendar call, we could resume consideration of the bill, under a motion to take it up. In that way I believe we would approach

the bill in a manner by means of which we would understand what we were doing.

I did not understand the relief amendments at the moment they were explained; I did not even understand what we were faced with.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I share the view of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. When we are on the Consent Calendar, I think we should continue with it, and hold to its ground rules.

So I would object to such a unanimous-consent request, during the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is it desired to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold his request, until I can propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold my request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has withheld his request.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the majority leader intends to bring up the bill by motion, anyway, and that he desires to have the amendments sent to the desk and printed.

Is there any reason why the majority leader could not, while the bill is still on the unanimous-consent calendar, send the amendments to the desk and request that they be printed, so that they will be available to the Senate at the time when the Senator from California moves to have the Senate consider the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me at this point, let me say that the amendments themselves have been printed. They are identified by the letter "I," and are marked "Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. KNOWLAND to the bill (H. R. 7774)." So the amendments have been printed and are available to all Senators.

What I had in mind is not an unusual procedure during the call of the Consent Calendar. It is done in regard to bills which some Senators might consider to be lesser measures, and I am frank to admit that perhaps they are of lesser importance.

When the distinguished Senator from Oregon endeavors to have the so-called Morse formula included as a part of a bill, that is the procedure which customarily is followed; and when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] rises to object because of the inclusion in certain bills of provisions calling for the payment of attorneys' fees, and states that he will object unless that provision is stricken from the bills, unanimous consent is frequently given to permit an explanation to be made during the calendar call.

From a practical point of view, although of course the House could pass the postal pay bill, I believe—and I say this in all frankness—that unless revenues are provided for in that connection, such a bill would not be signed into law.

I have been endeavoring to ascertain—and in that connection I have consulted insofar as I could—whether a formula could be devised, so that at this session of Congress the postal pay bill could be acted upon in such a way that pay increases would be provided, but at the same time there would be provision for offsetting revenues, so that the President would feel justified in signing the bill into law. I take that position, even though the bill may not provide for all the postal workers or employees may wish to have provided for them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question is whether there is objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California.

The Chair understood objection to be made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the majority leader has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I will yield for a question in the time of the Senator from Rhode Island, if that is permissible.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, my point is——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please resume their seats until the Chair can ascertain which Senator has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PASTORE. I am trying to determine whether it is the intention of the majority leader that unless the Senate accepts his amendment by unanimous consent, he does not propose to have the bill considered during the call of the Consent Calendar. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not say that. But I say we have a number of bills, many of them of substantial importance, in which many Senators have expressed an interest. How many of the bills can be scheduled for consideration by the Senate after we have concluded action on the last of the conference reports, will depend to some extent at least on the amount of time and debate which will be involved, and on whether in the judgment of the Senate and the judgment of the policy committee, it will be possible to have such bills enacted into law, instead of merely being passed as more or less an empty gesture.

I believed that if we could amend the bill, so that sufficient revenues would be provided, so as to assure that the postal pay bill would be signed into law, then, instead of merely taking up a considerable amount of time, we might be able to pass the bill and thus provide for a postal-pay increase.

Mr. PASTORE. Does that not put us in such a position that unless we vote on this as a package deal, accepting the amendments of the Senator from California to the bill which was reported by the Senate committee, we shall either have them both or none at all?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think that would be the situation at all. I have tried to be helpful, despite the fact that I know my efforts could be misconstrued and subjected to considerable objection. I am willing to take that responsibility.

The Senator knows, in the first place, that on the call of the calendar any Senator may object either to amendments being adopted or to the bill being taken up. That is the customary procedure.

The Senator also knows that the Senate itself has control over its own destiny. Any Senator may move to take up any particular bill, if he determines so to do, and he may succeed or may not succeed in having that done. Even assuming it were done, and the bill were passed and the amendments were not adopted in the normal way we adopt them, after considerable debate, there is merit to having revenue, in the situation which now confronts the Government of the United States. I am merely saying that I believe that under those circumstances if a bill went to the President without providing revenue, when we recently made a temporary increase in the national debt ceiling, we would not have a postal bill enacted into law.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that we have had no hearings in our committee on the postal increase?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. PASTORE. We have had hearings on the pay increase.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. PASTORE. We had an understanding that we would not deal with this question until we had extensive hearings; and we have not had them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am aware of that fact; and I am also aware of the fact that from time to time on very important pieces of legislation, including tax bills, appropriation bills, and other bills, matters of considerable importance are presented as amendments by Senators on the floor; because, in the final analysis, while we give and should give great weight to the judgment of our committees, we also have individual responsibility, as 96 Members of the Senate of the United States. So the procedure in that regard is not unusual. I am not misleading the Senate. I am quite aware of the fact that so far as the Senate is concerned, we have not had hearings on the rate increase.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to say only one thing in conclusion to the distinguished majority leader. If we follow the usual order it strikes me it would not take very long to vote on the amendment proposed by the distinguished majority leader. If that amendment should carry, it would become a part of the bill and we could vote on the bill as amended. If it should not carry, we could vote on H. R. 7774 in the form in which it was reported by the Senate committee. That strikes me as being a simple procedure which would not take very long, especially in view of the fact that yesterday we passed 5 or 6 very important bills in a period of 5 or 6 hours.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I think what the Senator from Rhode Island has stated is most sound, and he approaches this problem in a manner I can follow. I personally feel that the postal employees and the Federal employees, especially those in the low-income category are faced with extreme hardship. A salary increase bill must be and should be passed before Congress adjourns. If the bill also involves postal rate increases, that is a highly controversial question. Hearings have not been held.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to be recognized? He may be recognized on his own time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may I be recognized on my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, we should enact legislation which would increase the salaries of postal workers and other Federal workers. More especially am I concerned about workers in the low-income brackets. They are faced with a hardship. Therefore, I am anxious that we approve this salary increase bill.

The majority leader has submitted amendments to H. R. 7774. We can take those amendments up in an orderly way, reject them or accept them, and then proceed. If the so-called substitute bill is not acceptable to us as a body, we can make our wishes known.

I have as much responsibility to my constituents to act upon the committee bill before us as anyone in this legislative body, aside from the committee members and the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who are charged with that responsibility.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if this is to be charged to my time, I shall not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator that he is really speaking on the time of the Senator from New Jersey, because the Senator from New Jersey has been withholding objections to further consideration of the bill, and the Chair understands that the Senator from New Jersey desires to speak.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is quite clear from all this discussion that the bill is not a subject to be considered on the calendar call. Therefore, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I shall not. I shall attempt to have the calendar call finished this afternoon, and then we can have all the discussion we wish as to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to further consideration at this time?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Speaking with respect to the amendment which has been offered, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate how far-reaching it is.

First, let us consider the GS–1 grade. The salary is $2,500 now.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to no one.

Those employees receive no increase.

The GS–2 grade has a salary of $2,750, which remains $2,750. They are given no increase.

The GS–3 grade has a salary of $2,950. That is raised to $3,000. They are given a $50 increase.

The GS–4 grade has a salary of $3,175. They are raised $75, to $3,250.

Then let us see what else is in this bill. When we get to the higher brackets, after we reach the GS–15 grade, they are all raised $800, without any hearing by the committee.

There is another thing in this bill we are going to find—we have a rate increase. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we have never had an increase to my knowledge—and I have looked up the record—in postal rates passed by the Senate, unless we had as much as 30 days held open for the people who would be affected thereby to come in. Let us see what we are doing here. We would increase the rates on first-class mail from 3 to 4 cents. However, certain businesses within a city would not have their rate increased; their first-class rate would remain 3 cents.

Then we come to second-class mail, and we would increase that rate. That rate affects all newspapers and magazines. Some of those newspapers, if they were thus penalized, would be put out of business. The third-class rate would be increased, too. Third-class mail consists of packages. Those rates would all be increased without any hearings at all.

The amendment would do something else. It would give the Postmaster General the right to make reclassification plans. He makes his plans, and he says, "These people are to be paid this much, and those people are to be paid that much." His reclassification plans are then sent to Congress. His plans become law unless either House of Congress rejects his plans. We have rejected some plans that have been sent to Congress. There are also some other plans in the reclassification field.

The floor of the Senate is no place to pass on such an amendment. I, for one, have experienced a great many headaches, so to speak, from sitting in hearings day in and day out, trying to work out this problem. Yet we find an amendment on the floor of the Senate which would make all these changes without the amendment first being considered by the committee. I say on behalf of the chairman of this committee that it is not right to proceed in this way without consulting the chairman or the other members of the committee, particularly after we had already reported a bill which we thought was right and just under the circumstances.

If we proceed in this manner we might as well do away with our committees. We might as well do away with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service if we legislate in this manner. I for one would be in favor of doing away with that committee if we are to legislate like this. I do not know who prepared this amendment, but I can imagine where it came from. I know exactly where it came from.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader on H. R. 7774, I believe we had better face the fact that Congress has done very little for Federal employees, with the exception of the one bill known as the fringe-benefits bill. We must be aware of the fact that the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished majority leader—and I agree with him that such an amendment is in order and can be presented at any time—with reference to first-class mail will cost the American people $150 million, which is exactly 50 percent of all the tax savings in the tax bill as they apply to people who earn $5,000 a year or less.

The total amount of savings to all American taxpayers, exclusive of all corporations including every conceivable special treatment that we gave in the tax bill for people who earn $5,000 a year or less, representing 80 percent of the taxpayers of this Nation, was less than $300 million.

Now it is proposed in 1 amendment, by 1 rate increase, to increase the cost—and a postage stamp represents a kind of tax—by $150 million.

That rate increase may be necessary. However, I think the facts ought to be made crystal clear. I served for 2 years on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I served on that committee with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and other Senators, including the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. We held hearings for months on the subject of rate increases. We passed a rate increase bill. We brought one to the Senate. The only part of the Postal Service that makes a profit aside from special services, such as c. o. d. and registered mail, is the first-class mail service.

I think the facts will reveal that the Government receives something like $50 million a year net profit for first-class

mail. Yet, there is a proposal to increase those rates by 33⅓ percent.

When we come to the mail which involves the general distribution of pamphlets and advertising matter, there is very little increase. When we come to second-class mail, a very small increase is proposed. Whatever may be the merits of the increase, it seems to me it is rather technical; it involves business costs, and very careful planning with newspaper publishers and magazine publishers; and there are problems of subscription rates as related to postal charges. We should not proceed without having an opportunity to debate the amendment.

I thought the Senator from Rhode Island was eminently correct when he said we should proceed by way of offering such amendments as are necessary, debate them, and vote them up or down. But let us not penalize our Federal employees on the basis of a decision which has been made to try to tie to a Federal-employee bill a rate-increase bill. It would establish a most unusual precedent. Every person in America who pays an extra postage rate will say, "We have to pay this rate because the postal employees wanted some more money", when the fact is that they are entitled to an increase. The civil service employees and the classified employees, are entitled to a fair and reasonable increase in salary. The Government of the United States is a very difficult disciplinarian when it comes to private industry. We require private industry to live by the Fair Labor Standards Act, pay time and a half for overtime, 40 hours a week, double time, and so forth. We impose upon private industry many disciplinary actions if they fail to meet those standards; but when we come to the Government itself, its own employees, it sets a very poor example of fair labor standards.

We have done a great deal for others. We increased depletion allowances for people engaged in mining and in the oil business. We have passed a tax bill which gives corporations what we call accelerated depreciation and fast write-offs. We should do something for people who are appealing to the Congress for a little sample of equity.

I hope we shall bring the bill up and pass it. I am unalterably opposed to trying to tie a rate bill to a salary bill.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PATENTS

The bill (H. R. 3534) to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the objection?

Mr. GORE. I withhold the objection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At the last call of the calendar I raised objection to this bill. Since that time I have had an opportunity to contact some of the agencies. I find, for example, that the Department of Commerce has removed any objection it had to the bill. The Bureau of the Budget still has reservations, but I do not think they are well taken; nor do I think any of the other objections are well taken.

I wish to remove from the RECORD, at least, my objection to the bill.

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

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

Mr. GORE. Is it not a fact that this bill, if passed, would give new life to certain patent rights which, under the statute of limitations, have expired?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is possible.

Mr. GORE. Does not the able Senator construe that as possibly a dangerous precedent?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I would say that it would not be, on the basis of the restrictions contained in the bill. That is only the opinion of the junior Senator from New Jersey.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. THYE. I have had a great deal of interest in this bill, because it was called to my attention earlier in the session. We are doing an injustice if we do not give consideration to this proposal.

On page 2 of the report there appears an explanation of why it is urgent that we give consideration to the bill. If I may have the indulgence of the Senate for a moment, I should like to read from the report:

> To justify legislation for the extension of the terms of patents on the ground that national emergencies such as World War II and the Korean conflict resulted in the substantial loss of opportunities for the exploitation of such patents, the fundamental distinction must be recognized between the loss of such opportunities for patent exploitation and the numerous kinds of other economic losses suffered by various classes of citizens as a result of such emergencies. The measures taken by the Government in the interest of national defense necessarily caused indirect losses of varying degrees on numerous groups of citizens, creating situations for which there can be no compensation or other remedy provided by Federal legislation.

That is why I hope the legislation will be given fair consideration and that it will be enacted, because we are working a hardship on certain groups. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] desired to be heard on this matter. However, he is unable to be present at this time, and he has asked that a statement prepared by him be printed in the RECORD at this point. I make the unanimous-consent request.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

This bill provides for a correction of reductions in the limited 17-year terms of patents heretofore issued and outstanding which reductions were caused by actions of Government agencies during specific periods of national emergencies or by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces.

Fundamentally the enactment of this legislation affords us the opportunity to restore to the inventor and patent holder the rights granted to him under our laws by issuance of the patent in the original instance. In fact, I go so far as to say that it is the consensus of your Committee on the Judiciary after careful deliberation, that the Government is at least morally bound to grant extensions of terms of patents under the conditions specified in this bill.

Essentially the rights granted to an inventor by the issuance of a patent under our laws are analogous to those which arise out of the simple contract principle. In consideration for public disclosure and for an agreement of dedication of his invention to the public welfare, the Government of the United States solemnly undertakes to secure the inventor in the exclusive rights to the use and exploitation of his invention for a full period of 17 years. That is the inducement which has been held out to inventors by the Government under the law and upon which inventors have relied and which has encouraged our creative minds to produce and dedicate to the Nation the technological advancements which have made our country great.

I feel sure you will agree that the intent of the law was not to issue grants with 2 or 3 or even 4 years taken out. It was a grant for a full net 17 years and if the Government deemed it necessary during periods of public emergencies to suspend these rights, we in equity and justice have the obligation to restore that part of the 17-year period of any patent where Government action prevented or substantially curtailed the use and development of the patent possibilities.

Inherent in the rights to the exclusive use of a patented invention for the full period of 17 years are the characteristics of the right of private property. When the Government expropriates private property for public use it is required by the Constitution to pay just compensation therefor. It is refreshing to note that the restitution called for in this bill will require no outlay of public funds but merely repayment in kind—it gives back to the patent holder only an equal number of months or years as were taken out of the 17 years originally promised to him.

Under the provisions of this bill three classes of applicants are covered:

1. Patent holders whose patent rights were substantially affected by reason of honorable service on active duty in the Armed Forces.

2. Patent holders whose rights were substantially affected by orders of Government agencies.

3. Patent holders who granted a royalty free or a nominal royalty license to the Government or its assigns in the interests of national defense.

Each applicant for extension in these classifications must prove to the satisfaction of the Patent Office prevention or substantial curtailment of the normal use, exploitation, promotion, or development of his patent within the emergency periods set forth.

The fee provisions were carefully designed to preclude any requirement for additional funds for administrative processing by the agency and full provision has been made for the protection of intervening rights.

The veteran provisions are but an extension of Public Law 598 for the purpose of covering the Korean emergency period.

The Patent Office, which under this bill has responsibility for administration, has already had successful experience in administering such extensions under Public Law 598.

No confusion need result as to the actual term of any patent granted an extension for it would be administratively simple to stamp the extension termination date on the face of the patent for public inspection.

Patent legislation has long been overdue in this country. All major countries, with

the exception of Russia, have passed and now have in force similar patent laws.

The passage of this bill will forestall the introduction of an increasing number of private bills to take care of individual cases of injury.

The need for a patent extension law of general applicability to place the burden of handling such cases where it properly belongs, in the Patent Office, instead of in the Congress, which is not equipped to handle either the technical details or the workload of these applications, has been so keenly recognized that several bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and bills by the late Senator Tobey, Senator Dirksen, Senator Beall, Senator Capehart, and Senator Dworshak were introduced in the Senate this session.

H. R. 3534 as now presented encompasses the best features of all these bills and covers all phases of the subject matter.

This bill has had the studied consideration and unanimous approval of the House Judiciary Committee, the Members of the House of Representatives, and of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Full and adequate hearings were held by the House Committee on the Judiciary and to this your committee has given careful consideration.

In behalf of my colleagues who have introduced patent extension bills and of the committee, I ask adoption by unanimous consent of H. R. 3534.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a number of Senators have spoken to me about the desirability of passing H. R. 3534, Calendar No. 2284. It is with reluctance that I interpose an objection. I hold this to be very unsound legislation. A great deal has been said regarding the hardship on veterans. However, an examination of the report will show that patents which have now expired or which may expire in the future would be extended on 2 or 3 other grounds, having no relation whatever to service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

I do not wish to discuss the bill at length today. But I raise serious objection to an extension of patent rights which have expired under law or which will expire in the future under law for reasons set forth in the bill. If the bill should be scheduled for action, I shall at that time discuss it at some length. For the time being I must, with regret, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

GUBBINS & CO., OF LIMA, PERU

The bill (S. 2564) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear the claims of Gubbins & Co., of Lima, Peru, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am the one who asked that the bill go to the foot of the calendar. I wish, now, to make a very brief statement with reference to the bill.

It is a bill which was reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee, and in its report the committee recommended that the claim of Gubbins & Co., go to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment thereon.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that it is true that the Department of Justice has recommended against the bill, but it recommended against it on very broad general grounds, to wit, that it feels that if it has to give consideration to the claim of this particular company, there may be other companies in a like situation which may ask for similar treatment.

My answer to that is the answer of the Judiciary Committee, which will be found on page 2 of the report:

> While it is true, as is stated in the letter from the Department of Justice dated December 9, 1953, which is set forth in full below, that there may be a great number of persons and firms who are in a similar situation, the committee was of the opinion that Reynaldo Gubbins and his firm should be entitled to a day in court, both for the purpose of clearing his name and learning whether, in fact, there was any justification for the action of the Government, which was taken almost 6 months before our entry into the war.

Mr. President, I have never been impressed by the argument that we should not do justice to one person because it might involve our having to do justice to others. If an injustice is done, I do not care how many are involved, I think our Government should be big enough to see to it that justice is done.

I wish to point out that if we give jurisdiction to the Court of Claims, if there is no merit to the case the court can throw it out on the pleadings. But I am not in position to pass upon the legal requirements and the legal technicalities. That is why we have a Court of Claims. It would seem that our own Judiciary Committee, to which we must look for guidance and advice in regard to legal matters, feels that a sufficiently good case was made—I assume, a prima facie case before the committee—to justify its recommendation. I understand this bill is one of a group of bills which the Judiciary Committee considered en bloc upon the recommendation of a subcommittee. We who are working on committees know that usually subcommittees do a much more thorough bit of analysis of bills within their jurisdiction than do full committees. But be that as it may, we have the report of the Judiciary Committee, based upon an analysis by the subcommittee, which simply says, "Let us let the Court of Claims take a look at the situation."

I do not know anything about the case other than by reading the report of the Judiciary Committee, but I am in favor of supporting the Judiciary Committee and letting the Court of Claims throw this case out if it decides it has no merit. It may throw it out at the very beginning, after it has passed on the pleadings. But if, in fact, Mr. President, this is a case which has merit, I think we are doing an injustice in not letting the Court of Claims pass upon it simply because there may be some other claim. If they are of like merit, they should be brought in.

This is a case which involves a company which operated in Peru. It has been represented to me that a considerable amount of ill feeling is being aroused over this case in Peru because of the allegation that the American Government is not doing justice in the premises.

I think we should resolve the doubt in a situation like this, Mr. President, by placing the case on the docket of the Court of Claims, which exists in order to handle the alleged injustice involved in this case, as well as others.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that the calendar committee on this side of the aisle has no objection to the consideration of the bill. We have examined it very carefully.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am much persuaded by the very fine argument of the Senator from Oregon. The reason why the bill was first objected to was that in looking at the record it was found that some time before our country got into the war, but when it appeared that war was imminent, under an act which was passed authorizing the Federal Government to proscribe certain people from doing business with the United States and to seize their assets under certain conditions a committee which had been established by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and various other departments, put this company's name on the list and said, "We believe they may be considered to be controlled by the Nazis, and for that reason we do not want to do any more business with them at this time."

I do not know whether that was right or wrong; but in 1949, the name was taken off the list. The company said, "You have improperly injured us. We actually were not controlled by the Nazis, and now we want to sue the Government of the United States for damages to our reputation and damages to us."

As the Department of Justice points out, if we authorize—and perhaps we should; I am persuaded considerably by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—if this is to be made another obviously economic measure, which was authorized by our Government in time of war, where trade was stopped between a foreign company and a company within the United States, and if we authorize that foreign company and other foreign companies to say, "We were improperly injured in time of emergency; therefore, the Government of the United States is subject to compensating us," as is pointed out in the report, there probably would be no end to these cases. We do not even compensate our own citizens when they are stopped from doing business in time of war with nationals in a foreign country. If we are to give relief to someone in a foreign country, then we shall have to give the people at home some relief.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have two very brief comments to make on the Senator's observation. First, I do not think there is a danger of opening the floodgates. Let us assume that the Court of Claims finds this case is without merit, as indicated by the Senator from Florida. That would establish a precedent, and the other cases would be out in the cold, as

we lawyers say. On the other hand, if the Court of Claims decides there is merit and holds that a wrong has been committed, then the Government rights the wrong, no matter how many other cases are involved.

Mr. SMATHERS. This is one of very few times that I have been persuaded by a speech in the Senate, but I think the Senator from Oregon's representations are good. For that reason, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. MORSE. For that compliment, let me say that it would be a delight for me to have the junior Senator from Florida as my guest at lunch.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "losses," to insert "allegedly," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of (1) Gubbins & Co., of Lima, Peru, and (2) Reynaldo Gubbins, of Lima, Peru, against the United States for losses allegedly incurred by them as a result of action taken by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, on July 17, 1941, and March 27, 1942, in placing the names of the said Gubbins & Co. and the said Reynaldo Gubbins on the Proclaimed List of Certain Blocked Nationals promulgated under the provisions of section 5 (b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claims may be intstituted by the claimants at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act. Proceedings for the determination of such claims and review thereof, and payment of any judgments thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the call of the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Calendar No. 2223, H. R. 7130, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first nomination.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Vogel, of North Dakota, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry L. Brooks, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the western district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

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

RESUMPTION OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2520, H. R. 2233; Calendar No. 2521, H. R. 9115; and Calendar No. 2522, S. 3840. These are bills which have been added to the calendar since the call of August 16, 1954. In other words, they are what might be termed as the "appendix" of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if and when there is another call of the calendar, Calendar No. 2408, H. R. 3756, be included therein.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California please restate his list of bills to be considered?

Mr. KNOWLAND. They are the bills which appear at the end of today's printed calendar. They are the ones which appear below the heading "Calendar Called August 16, 1954."

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. Would the Senator from California permit me to make an insertion in the RECORD as a part of the business of the calendar?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senate that House bill 951, Calendar No. 1986, was passed over a second time and placed on the foot of the calendar. It may be well to have that bill taken up first. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader if it is expected that there will be another call of the calendar?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I doubt whether there will be another call of the calendar. That will somewhat depend on how long the session runs, but I do not now contemplate another call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. COOPER. This bill is a rather complex bill. After I have discussed the bill with the calendar committee on the other side of the aisle, I wonder if it may be possible, by agreement, to have the bill called up on motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is a pretty "iffy" question. I do not know what the conditions might be or what the legislative problems might be, or whether any suggestions for amendment of the bill would make it a more controversial measure. So I can not give a blanket answer to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

If it were possible to say now whether the bill could be worked out satisfactorily, or if the Senator has any suggestion now, I should like to know about it, because I doubt very much there will be another call of the calendar.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think the bill should be worked out now. I think if I could consult with the members of the minority calendar committee, it might be possible to do so. I do not want to prevent the passage of the bill, but I should like to see if the bill could not be taken up.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator feels that he is not prepared to permit the bill to pass now by unanimous consent, I shall be glad to discuss the question with him, with the minority leader, with the minority calendar committee, and others, to ascertain, depending upon the legislative schedule, if the bill can be taken up. But I hope the Senator will proceed with expedition to have his consultations, because "time's a-passin'."

ALLEN POPE, HIS HEIRS, OR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that before proceeding to the consideration of the last three bills on the calendar, Calendar No. 2408, H. R. 3756, be considered. The bill had been temporarily laid aside.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3756) for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs, or personal representatives.

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

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised, and the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will call the first of the last three bills on the calendar.

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR THE OAHE DAM, S. DAK.

The bill (H. R. 2233) to provide for the acquisition of land for the Oahe Dam, S. Dak., was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. May I ask some member of the committee if I am correct in my understanding that this is simply a typical bill for the purchase by the Federal Government of necessary land to proceed with the construction of a dam?

Mr. CASE. The Senator is not a member of the committee, but I should like to say that this bill is in pursuance of a previous act of Congress whereby directions were given to carry out such a directive. The bill has been passed by the House and should be approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, there is a typographical error in the bill; there should be a correction in the total figure on page 13 to conform with the figures shown in the report on page 2. The report on page 2 gives a correction of the figures. The correct figure is $10,644,014. I shall offer the amendment at the proper time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to confirm what the Senator has said about the bill and about the correction. The bill had the unanimous support of the subcommittee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. The bill was not reported by the subcommittee to the full committee. Does the Senator feel that the first section, which allows $5 million, is justified in view of the Army's report?

Mr. CASE. The Army's report was made some years ago. I should again like to point out that the Army has made similar reports on tracts of land owned by whites. Litigation concerning such land has been going on in the United States district courts, with increases in the allowances made by the courts of from 20 to 80 percent. We have provided about a 40 percent increase, plus relocation costs. I personally own a small tract of land located on the same river, about 100 miles farther upstream. It is identical so far as bottom land and grade above the river are concerned. I would not dispose of that land for the figure allowed by the Army.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the Senator from South Dakota explain the last part of the bill? I am not fully sympathetic with this approach toward rehabilitation. The Senator from Arizona and I asked for rehabilitation for the Navahos and Hopis. If the amount merely represented damage to a tribe of Indians, I might think it would be excessive, but of the $6 million, $5 million is for rehabilitation. That amount might have been carried in a separate rehabilitation bill had it not been put into this bill.

Mr. CASE. It could have been put in a separate rehabilitation bill, but action was forced on us because of the dislocation of about 200 families. We have to face the fact that not only have we taken land away from them, but they are faced with a readjustment problem. When they are moved is the time to act, instead of waiting until they are scattered all over the country.

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

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. With respect to the appraised value of the land being taken for this project, I am advised the Army engineers' report did not take into consideration any severance damage. There is a case for severance damages in the project. One of the main portions of the claim is based on ownership of land on river bottom which is good for agriculture. It can be irrigated in time. It contains much timber. In addition, the Indians owned lands at a higher elevation. That land would not be worth nearly as much if there were taken away from them the bottom land where their livestock could be wintered. So there should be taken into consideration the severance damage.

I have had some experience in condemnation suits and right-of-way suits over the years, where lands had been used together as are these two types of lands used by the Indians. In such case severance damage is involved. That severance damage had not been taken into consideration. The Army engineers gave the lowest appraisal. The Missouri River Investigation Board had the next highest, and the Indians gave the highest figures on the direct benefits. In addition, the Indians claimed $6 million in indirect benefits. I felt that constituted a duplication in large measure of the values that had been given by the Army engineers. For that reason I was not willing to vote for a bill which recognized those indirect benefits. However, severance damages should be included with direct costs and damages. I included that in the tribal claim for the loss of fruits, timber, and so forth, in the lower lands. Therefore, I felt the amount allowed for damage could be justified. The amount allowed for rehabilitation is largely based on a per capita amount, the same as was given to the Navahos and Hopis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not like to interrupt the Senator, but the time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to speak on my own time. I merely wish to point out that the allowance for rehabilitation, in my judgment, could be justified even if the Indians were not being moved, but by reason of the fact that they were required to give up their homes and move elsewhere, I think we would be justified in granting that amount for rehabilitation.

Personally, I do not like this method of determining damages, but the officials came to an impasse, the project must go on, the Indians were driven out of their homes, and we had to do something about it. That is one reason why I am willing to recommend the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I merely point out that, like the Senator from Utah, I do not like this method of computing damages. I did want to put into the RECORD firmly the fact that part of the money allowed was for rehabilitation, which could have been carried in a separate bill, and probably would have been if it had been done earlier. It was not done in that manner. Since $5 million is for rehabilitation, which would normally be carried in another bill, and has been combined with the other amount, I do not intend to object.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2233) to provide for the acquisition of land for the Oahe Dam, S. Dak., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 16, after "Section II.", to strike out: "The United States agrees to pay for all said tribal, allotted, assigned, and inherited lands or interest in land, together with all improvements thereon (except the Agency Hospital); and for the stumpage value of standing timber and for severance damages to individual owners within the taking area; and for the bed of the Missouri River so far as it is the eastern boundary of said Cheyenne River Reservation, the sum of $2,614,778.95. And the United States further agrees to pay for overall tribal severance damages outside the taking area for Oahe Reservoir and for the loss of the annual supply of timber and for the loss of wild life and wild fruits, the sum of $3,973,076, in all, $6,587,854.95," and in lieu thereof to insert "The United States agrees to pay, out of funds appropriated for construction of the Oahe project, as just compensation for all lands and improvements and interests therein (except the agency hospital) conveyed pursuant to section I of this act; and for the bed of the Missouri River so far as it is the eastern boundary of said Cheyenne River Reservation, the sum of $5,384,014;"; on page 3, line 16, after the word "Council", to strike out "shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior for his approval a copy of the schedules on which the sum $2,614,778.95 is based, as itemized in this section, and when such schedule is approved by the Secretary of the Interior it shall be the final schedule on which the said sum shall be distributed to or credited to the owners of said lands" and insert "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior shall distribute the sum of $2,250,000 in accordance with the revised appraisal of the Missouri River Basin investigation staff of the Department of the Interior."; on page 4, line 8, after the word "this" to strike out "agreement" and insert "Act"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "upon the request of the Tribal Council of said Indian Tribe with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior for the following purposes:"; at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "Relocation" and insert "For the relocation"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "all"; in the same line, after the word "hospitals", to strike out "all"; in line 24, after the word

"quarters", to strike out "all"; in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "all"; in line 25, after the word "therewith", to strike out the comma and "at points to be determined by the Tribal Council of said Tribe with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That all the said reconstruction shall provide all said facilities of whatsoever nature in quantity and quality of not less than those now existing on said Cheyenne River Reservation. The relocation of the agency, schools, hospitals, and the replacement and construction of roads and facilities shall be the duty and the obligation of the United States at its own expense, to best serve the Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation and the requests of said Tribal Council in respect to all matters set out in this section shall be complied with except when compliance is impossible."; on page 5, line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "$6,044,500" and insert "$5,160,000"; on page 6, line 8, after the word "section" to insert a colon and "*Provided further,* That the authorization contained in section XVI hereof shall remain available for a period not to exceed 10 years from the effective date of this Act"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "$6,587,854.95" and insert "$5,384,014", and on page 13, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,732,354.95" and insert "$10,544,014."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, referring to my previous statement as to there being a typographical error in the bill, I move to strike out the figure "$10,544,014" and insert "$10,644,014" in the committee amendment on page 13, line 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INVESTMENT IN GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS

The bill (H. R. 9115) to provide that contributions received for construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KLYCE MOTORS, INC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3840) for the relief of Klyce Motors, Inc., which was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $54,996.41 to Klyce Motors, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained under the War Assets Administration sales document No. 262845 in connection with the purchase of 109 trucks, dated May 25, 1946: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks data on legislative activity from the start of the session through July 31, and comparisons between the 83d Congress, 1st and 2d sessions, the 82d Congress, the 81st Congress, and the 80th Congress.

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

Data on legislative activity from start of session through July 31—Senate

	83d Cong., 2d sess.	83d Cong., 1st sess.	82d Cong.,[1] 2d sess.	82d Cong., 1st sess.	81st Cong., 2d sess.	81st Cong., 1st sess.	80th Cong.,[2] 2d sess.	80th Cong.,[3] 1st sess.
Date session began	Jan. 6, 1954	Jan. 3, 1953	Jan. 8, 1952	Jan. 3, 1951	Jan. 3, 1950	Jan. 3, 1949	Jan. 6, 1948	Jan. 3, 1947
Days in session	139	123	115	119	142	129	102	127
Time in session:								
Hours	921	743	651	640	857	766	591	744
Minutes	02	03	24	23	36	48	30	40
Congressional Record:								
Pages of proceedings	7,373	6,479	5,558	5,295	6,853	6,077	4,743	5,641
Appendix								
Public bills enacted into law	84	72	112	33	79	82	189	116
Private bills enacted into law	167	48	251	53	139	54	110	37
Bills in conference	3							
Bills through conference	11	7						
Measures passed, total	1,031	708	1,093	577	935	659	1,048	819
Senate bills	440	304	364	215	346	251	358	276
House bills	409	234	565	211	451	259	531	365
Senate joint resolutions	20	21	10	11	16	18	27	44
House joint resolutions	19	16	27	15	15	26	27	30
Senate concurrent resolutions	27	22	21	16	16	26	16	12
House concurrent resolutions	24	11	15	10	14	11	27	16
Simple resolutions	92	100	91	99	77	68	62	76
Measures reported, total	1,294	942	1,172	649	1,082	900	1,096	922
Senate bills	570	404	414	261	420	374	407	346
House bills	518	322	573	231	513	359	522	378
Senate joint resolutions	20	29	24	14	15	25	33	50
House joint resolutions	19	17	28	15	18	28	27	31
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	22	22	18	18	30	16	16
House concurrent resolutions	17	13	15	10	14	12	27	17
Simple resolutions	127	135	96	100	84	72	64	84
Special reports	13	20	28	24	26	17	20	16
Conference reports								
Reported measures not acted on	288	173	79	53	191	214	76	67
Measures introduced, total	1,480	2,858	1,366	2,243	1,446	2,678	1,144	2,108
Bills	1,226	2,545	1,147	1,932	1,227	2,352	973	1,756
Joint resolutions	68	108	58	87	58	122	65	156
Concurrent resolutions	49	49	37	40	31	57	22	34
Simple resolutions	137	156	124	184	130	141	84	162
Quorum calls	196	186	121	191	298	277	223	310
Yea-and-nay votes	125	89	129	115	159	142	102	130
Bills vetoed	4	1	6	1				
Vetoes overridden								

[1] Session ended July 7, 1952.
[2] Session ended June 19, 1948.
[3] Session ended July 27, 1947.

LOSS OF NATIONALITY OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (H. R. 7130) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7130), to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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 (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the bill under consideration was suggested by the President of the United States. It will be recalled that in his address delivered before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives relative to the state of the Union on January 7, 1954, President Eisenhower stated:

> The subversive character of the Communist Party in the United States has been clearly demonstrated in many ways, including court proceedings. We should recognize by law a fact that is plain to all thoughtful citizens—that we are dealing here with actions akin to treason—that when a citizen knowingly participates in the Communist conspiracy he no longer holds allegiance to the United States.
>
> I recommend that Congress enact legislation to provide that a citizen of the United States who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship.

The President's recommendation evoked a spontaneous burst of applause from the assembled Senators and Representatives. The bill now before the Senate is in implementation of this recommendation.

As you know, the doctrine of expatriation is not a new one. In 1868 the Congress of the United States recognized the inherent right of expatriation in the act entitled "An act concerning the rights of American citizens in foreign states" (15 Stat. 223). The initial clause of that enactment reads:

> Whereas the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensible to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

In the same enactment we find "That any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officers of this Government which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this Government."

The first general expatriation statute was enacted in 1907 (34 Stat. 1228). That act imposed expatriation as a consequence of naturalization in a foreign country, taking an oath of allegiance to a foreign state, or marriage by a female citizen to a foreign national.

Since 1907 the United States has not been without a general expatriation statute. Currently, section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163, 267 and 268) sets forth 10 types of activities a consequence of which is loss of nationality by both native-born and naturalized citizens. Some of the acts enumerated are carryovers from the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (8 U. S. C., 1946 ed., 801).

Section 349 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act now provides for expatriation of a national of the United States for "committing any act of treason against, or attempting by force to overthrow, or bearing arms against, the United States, if and when he is convicted thereof by a court-martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction."

The measure now before the Senate would amend section 349 (a) (9) to provide for the loss of nationality by any citizen convicted of violating, or of conspiring to violate, section 2383, part of section 2384, or section 2385 of title 18, United States Code. Section 2383 makes criminal inciting, setting on foot, assisting, or engaging in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States or the laws thereof, or the giving of aid or comfort thereto. The portion of section 2384 under which conviction would result in loss of nationality provides that criminal penalties shall be imposed upon persons who in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States "conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them." Section 2385, the Smith Act, makes it a felony to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying the Government of the United States or of any State, Territory, District, possession, or political subdivision therein, by force or violence. The section also makes felonious certain other action directed to the same purposes.

In its report to the Senate on this legislation, which report I had the privilege of submitting, the Committee on the Judiciary stated its position in these words:

> The manifestation by a national of the United States of the outright severance of his allegiance to the United States by the commission of any of the acts defined in sections 2383, 2384, and 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code should be regarded as an overt act of expatriation. The committee also believes that the advocating of the overthrow, or the joining in a conspiracy to overthrow, the Government of the United States through the activities of the Communist Party and its membership is tantamount to the transfer of allegiance to the foreign power which directs such activities of the Communist Party.

Personally, I feel strongly that individuals convicted, either by a court-martial or by a civil court of competent jurisdiction, of any of the offenses which this legislation would make expatriating, should lose the rights and privileges incident to United States citizenship. Such a potential loss may be expected to deter some persons from committing the acts covered even if the criminal penalties provided for in title 18 of the United States Code did not.

We know that many of the consequences of becoming an alien depend upon State laws, while others depend upon Federal law. It appears to me that the possibilities of deportation, the difficulties which may be anticipated with respect to the obtaining of United States passports for foreign travel, the impact of State laws pertaining to the rights of aliens to inherit or otherwise acquire real property, the restrictions in some States limiting the practice of professions and the following of certain trades to citizens, the limitation of public employment on the Federal, State, and local levels to United States citizens, voting limitations, and other potential consequences of loss of citizenship could well serve as deterrents to the commission of the offenses to which the legislation is directed. If they did not serve as such deterrents, they would at least serve as worthy concomitants of convictions for such offenses.

Accordingly, I urge the Senate to act favorably on this legislation.

This amendment in effect extends expatriation to all those who are convicted of offenses under the Smith Act.

Mr. President, I think this act is worthy of adoption by the Congress. It has already passed the House, and the Senate has not at this stage made any amendments thereto.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted an amendment to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Although it will not be possible for the bill to pass in this session, I wish to bring this matter to the attention of the CAB and other interested branches of our Government, looking to action early next year.

My proposal would have the effect of requiring our airlines to carry personal baggage, not exceeding 150 pounds, at the same rate which would be paid if this baggage were sent airfreight between the same two points.

This additional amount of personal baggage would be in addition to the regular allowance for personal baggage for which there is no charge. It would also be required that this additional 150 pounds of personal baggage be carried on the same aircraft as that used by the passenger unless the number of other passengers and the mail requirements of the particular aircraft precluded it.

In the event that the additional personal baggage could not be carried on

the same aircraft as the passenger, my amendment would require that it be sent on the next regular flight of the air carrier where similar circumstances would not prevent it.

Mr. President, this matter was brought to my personal attention some time ago, and it represents only one of the several instances in which rates of our airlines are maneuvered by the air carriers to their own benefit.

As an illustration of the diversity in rates for similar goods, I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a brief table showing the rates for excess baggage, air express, and air freight on 12 different voyages, two of them on international routes. This table was prepared for me by our excellent Legislative Reference Service.

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

Excess baggage and air freight (personal baggage) comparison of airline charges

	Excess baggage (per 100 pounds)			Air express	Air freight (per 100 pounds) personal baggage
	Rate [1]	3-percent tax	Total	Total [2]	Total [3]
New York to Miami	$38	$1.14	$39.14	$36.87	$12.88
New York to New Orleans	39	1.17	40.17	40.17	13.91
New York to Los Angeles	79	2.37	81.37	79.72	29.75
New York to Chicago	23	.69	23.69	23.69	9.52
New York to St. Louis	28	.84	28.84	30.28	11.25
Chicago to Houston	34	1.02	35.02	30.28	13.60
Seattle to Los Angeles	57	1.71	58.71	30.28	12.38
Atlanta to Los Angeles	63	1.89	64.89	66.54	23.25
Boston to Chicago	27	.81	27.81	30.28	10.66
Philadelphia to San Francisco	77	2.31	79.31	79.72	30.34
New York to London	182	None	182.00	(2)	83.00
New Orleans to Mexico City [4]	32	None	32.00	29.87	16.00

[1] Quoted on a per-pound basis.
[2] No express service.
[3] Includes 3-percent tax.
[4] Via Houston.

Source: Airlines serving the above points.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it will be seen from this table that the charge for additional personal baggage at the excess baggage rate is in most instances more than three times the rate charged for airfreight. The air express rate, however, which the air carrier apparently can have excellent control of, is more nearly in line with the excess baggage charges.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, there is this gross discrimination. One hundred pounds of personal baggage carried as airfreight costs one-third of the price if carried as excess baggage with the passenger. If my amendment is adopted the passenger will be benefited, not only by the saving in rates but also because he will be able to take with him additional things for his personal convenience.

We all know that passengers traveling by bus or rail are permitted far greater free baggage allowances than one gets in air travel. My amendment does not propose that the airlines be required to carry personal baggage free to the same extent as rail and bus lines carry it. However, it would require that this sharp discrimination be eliminated and that the regular air carriers be willing to give priority to airfreight which is accompanying or immediately following a passenger.

Mr. President, airlines incur additional expenses in the handling of airfreight which they do not incur for excess personal baggage. There is little documentation necessary, and I should certainly hope that my proposal would not lead to additional redtape. Handling difficulties are also at a minimum where the passenger delivers the excess baggage to the designated place at the airfield and picks it up from a designated place at his destination.

Mr. President, for many years the airlines were operated at a loss. It was necessary for the Government to subsidize them heavily in order to get them out of the red and into the black. Any additional income from freight or baggage tended to reduce the necessary amount of Government subsidy.

Today that situation does not exist insofar as the larger airlines are concerned. For the most part they are operating on a so-called nonsubsidized rate for mail service. Any reduction in the cost of excess baggage to the public today would not require an increase in Government subsidy as far as the large airlines are concerned. It would be a net savings to the traveling public.

When the airlines decided to bid for the privilege of carrying first-class mail in competition with the Flying Tiger Lines some time ago, they bid 23 cents per ton-mile and they urged strongly that there was no need for additional air freight service beyond that offered by the scheduled passenger carriers. It was their contention that they had excessive freight capacity far beyond their requirements. Assuming that the airlines correctly represented their position, this bill should cause them no inconvenience.

Some time ago I attempted to see how readily available the airfreight service is for a passenger with excess baggage. In placing my family aboard an airplane I inquired whether it would be possible to send the excess baggage as air freight. The reply was that this could be done but that it would be necessary to carry the excess baggage down to a remote hangar and locate an employee there who in turn would see if it was possible to place the bag upon one of the planes leaving immediately.

I suppose that this type of procedure is customary for the purpose of discouraging passengers from taking advantage of the large saving that can be achieved by sending excess baggage as air freight.

This is a matter which the CAB could handle on behalf of the public. I regret to say that I have seen very little indication that the majority of the members of the CAB are fully aware of their responsibility to the public. All too often I gain the impression that some of the members of that Board seem to view their responsibility more in the light of an arbiter between the contending giants of air commerce rather than a guardian of the interests of the traveling public.

Inasmuch as there will not be sufficient time for the Congress to act on this proposal before the end of this session, I expect to introduce this bill again early next year and to press it most vigorously.

LIMITATIONS ON MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House on the bill (S. 3706) to outlaw the Communist Party, to prohibit members of Communist organizations from serving in certain representative capacities, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. KILGORE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM AND ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives relating to Senate bill 3628.

The effect of the bill is to amend Public Law 815, title III, relating to federally impacted areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3628) to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to extend for 3 additional years the program and assistance for school construction under title III

of that act, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the last sentence of section 301 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for the 3 succeeding fiscal years, such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary for such purpose."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 303 of such act is amended by striking out "1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "1956."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 304 of such act is amended by striking out "regular school year 1953–1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "regular school year 1955–1956."

SEC. 4. Section 305 of such act is amended (1) by striking out "regular school year 1953–1954" wherever appearing in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "regular school year 1955–1956"; and (2) by striking out "regular school year 1951–1952" wherever appearing in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "regular school year 1953–1954."

SEC. 5. Section 305 (d) of such act is amended by striking out "school years 1951–1952 and 1953–1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "school years 1953–1954 and 1955–1956."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 310 of such act is amended by striking out "1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "1956."

SEC. 7. Section 209 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by this act shall not apply with respect to any application filed, r any funds appropriated, before the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, in order to extend for two additional years the program of assistance for school construction under title III of that act."

Mr. COOPER. I now move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

LOSS OF NATIONALITY OF PERSONS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7130) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the loss of nationality of persons convicted of certain crimes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the subject matter of this bill is substantiallly covered in the existing law. I believe it is covered there about as fully as it can be, within the limits of constitutionality. I will agree there is a certain doubtful area within which the bill might have some effect, while staying within the bounds of constitutionality. But I do not favor legislating in such doubtful areas, if it can be avoided.

There appears to be little doubt that it is constitutional for the Congress to enact a reasonable statute providing that the voluntary performance of a certain act shall be deemed an act of expatriation. On the other hand, it is extremely doubtful if the Congress can provide that the mere maintenance of a status shall be deemed the basis for expatriation. Also, there is serious doubt about the constitutional right of the Congress to deprive a man of his citizenship as a criminal penalty. Depriving a felon of his civil rights is, of course, an accepted thing; but depriving a felon of his citizenship, which means his basic nationality, is an entirely different matter.

I think it would be a grave mistake to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in such a way as to render it subject to a court decision declaring a portion of the act unconstitutional; and I think there is no such urgency about the bill H. R. 7130 as to justify the risk in this case.

This bill would make it a basis for expatriation to be convicted of a violation of section 2385 of title 18, United States Code. Under this section, it is a crime to be a member of an organization advocating the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of any State, Territory, or possession thereof or any political subdivision thereunder. In the case of violations of this provision, any expatriation which might result under this bill would be clearly an additional penalty upon conviction of a crime, since there would be no affirmative or willful act which could be deemed to be an act of expatriation. The crime here is the mere maintenance of a status. I do not wish to argue here and now the question of whether the mere maintenance of a status can itself be made a crime. That statute is on the books, and is for the courts to interpret. What I am saying is that there is grave doubt, at least, whether the Congress can impose expatriation as the penalty for a crime which consists entirely of the mere maintenance of a status.

Because I do not believe it is fighting communism effectively to pass legislation which is clearly unconstitutional or which is a mere invitation to litigation, I do not believe the bill H. R. 7130 should be enacted in the form in which it has been reported from committee.

I send to the desk an amendment which would cure the deficiency in this bill which worries me, by limiting the effect of the bill, with respect to expatriation, to those violations of section 2385 involving the performance of a willful act. I ask that this amendment be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "of section" and insert in lieu thereof the words "of title 18, United States Code, or willfully performing any act in violation of section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is sought to be amended by the pending bill, contains a separability clause. If any part of the act is determined to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the act is not affected.

However, in view of the lateness of the session, and in order to get this measure on the books, because it will cover most of the violations under the Smith Act, I do not oppose the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TERMINATION OF SUPERVISION OVER CERTAIN INDIANS IN THE STATE OF UTAH—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2670) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2670) to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of certain tribes, bands, and colonies of Indians in the State of Utah and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the bill as it was passed by the Senate sought to free 359 Indians of miscellaneous tribes in southwestern Utah and give them the right to take full charge of their property and to become independent and free citizens of the United States. Subsequent to the passage of the bill in the Senate, two Indian bands in west-central Utah asked to be removed from the provisions of the bill. There are about 144 Indians in those 2 bands. The House adopted an amendment removing the two bands which had objected.

I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF DETENTION BENEFITS TO EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS WITH THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 541) to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "War Claims Act Amendments of 1954."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2004), is hereby amended by striking out "(A) a person within the purview of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the act entitled 'An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes.' approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended; or (D)."

(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of such section is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: The last sentence of section 101 (a), section 101 (b), section 101 (d), section 104, and section 105."

(c) Such subsection (f) is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(10) No benefits provided by this subsection for injury, disability, or death shall accrue to any person who, without regard to this subsection, is entitled to or has received benefits for the same injury, disability, or death under such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

"(11) No benefits provided by this subsection shall accrue to any person to whom benefits have been paid, or are payable, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, or any extension thereof, by reason of disability or death of an employee of the United States suffered after capture, detention, or other restraint by an enemy of the United States, when such disability or death is deemed, in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to have resulted from injury occurring while in the performance of duty, under subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended,' approved July 28, 1945, as amended."

(d) The second proviso of subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' as amended," approved July 28, 1945, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "gratuity from the United States" the following: "(other than detention benefits under section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948."

(e) (1) Individuals entitled to benefits under subsections (b), (c), or (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, solely by reason of the amendments made by this act, must file claim therefor within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

(2) The time limitations applicable to the filing of claims for benefits extended and made applicable to any individual by subsection (f) of such section 5 shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this act with respect to any individual who is entitled to such benefits solely by reason of the amendments made by this act. This paragraph shall not be construed to affect the right of any individual to receive such benefits with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 102. (a) (1) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; subsection (c) of section 6 of such act; and paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of such section 6, are each hereby amended by striking out "dependent" each time it occurs.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2), striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof; "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(4) Parents (in equal shares) if there is no husband, or child."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to benefits paid prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Individuals entitled to benefits solely by reason of the amendments made by this section must file claim therefor within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 103. The War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 15. (a) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim for compensation filed by or on behalf of any individual who, being then an American citizen, served in the military or naval forces of any government allied with the United States during World War II who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which such allied government has been at war subsequent to such date. Compensation shall be payable under this section in accordance with the standards established by, and at the rates prescribed in, subsection (b) of section 6 of this act, and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (d) of such section 6.

"(b) The amount payable under this section shall be reduced by such sum as the individual entitled to compensation under this section has received or is entitled to receive from any government by reason of the same detention.

"(c) In the event of death of the individual entitled to compensation under this section, payment may be made to the persons specified in paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 6 of this act.

"(d) Claims for benefits under this section must be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

"SEC. 16. (a) As used in this section, the term 'merchant seaman' means any individual who was employed as a seaman or crew member on any vessel registered under the laws of the United States, or under the laws of any government friendly to the United States during World War II, and who was a citizen of the United States on and after December 7, 1941, to the date of his death or the date of filing claim under this section; except any such individual who is entitled to, or who has received, benefits under section 5 of this act as a 'civilian American citizen'.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive and determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim for detention benefits filed by or on behalf of any merchant seaman who, being then a merchant seaman, was captured or interned or held by the Government of Germany or the Imperial Japanese Government, its agents or instrumentalities in World War II for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, during which he was held by either such government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity. Detention benefits shall be paid under this section at the rates prescribed and in the manner provided in subsections (c) and (d) of section 5 of this act.

"(c) Payment of any claim filed under this section shall not be made to any merchant seaman, or to any survivor or survivors thereof, who, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any government hostile to the United States during World War II.

"(d) Claims for benefits under this section must be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of this act.

"SEC. 17. (a) (1) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by—

"(A) any individual who—

"(i) on or after December 7, 1941, was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States;

"(ii) is the survivor of any deceased individual described in subparagraph (i);

"(iii) was a national of the United States on December 7, 1941, and is a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this section; or

"(iv) is the survivor of any deceased individual who was a national of the United States on December 7, 1941, and would be a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this section if living; or

"(B) any partnership, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, in which more than 50 percent of the ownership was vested, directly or indirectly, both on December 7, 1941, and on the date of enactment of this section, in individuals referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph;

for losses arising as a result of the sequestration of accounts, deposits, or other credits of such individual or legal entity in the Philippines by the Imperial Japanese Government.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any bank or other financial institution doing business in the Philippines which reestablished sequestered accounts, deposits, or other credits of—

"(A) any individual referred to in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

"(B) any partnership, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, in which more than 50 percent of the ownership was vested, directly or indirectly, both on December 7, 1941, and on the date of reestablishment of such sequestered credits, in individuals referred to in such subparagraph (A);

for reimbursement of the amounts of such sequestered credits paid by such bank or financial institution.

"(b) Claims must be filed under this section within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(c) Where any individual entitled to payment under this section is under any legal disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5 of this act. In the case of the death of any individual entitled to payment of any claim under this section, payment of such claim shall be made to the individuals specified, and in the order provided, in subsection (d) of section 6 of this act; except that no payment shall be made under this section to any individual who voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any government hostile to the United States during World War II.

"(d) Each claim allowed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the war claims fund established under section 13 of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay such claims as follows:

"(1) In the case of each claim allowed in an amount equal to or less than $500, such claim shall be paid in full; and

"(2) In the case of each claim allowed in an amount greater than $500, such claim shall be paid in two installments. The first installment shall be paid in an amount equal to $500 plus 66⅔ percent of the amount of such claim allowed in excess of $500. The last installment shall be computed as of September 1, 1956, under the next sentence of this paragraph, and, as so computed, shall be paid from the sums remaining in the war claims fund on that date. If the sums remaining in the war claims fund on September 1, 1956, are sufficient to satisfy all claims allowed under this section and not paid in full, the unpaid portion of each such claim shall be paid in full; if the sums remaining in the war claims fund on September 1, 1956, are not sufficient to satisfy all claims allowed under this section and not paid in full, the last installment payable on each such claim shall be reduced ratably, and, as so reduced, shall be paid from the war claims fund."

SEC. 104. (a) Section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2012), is hereby amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) thereof, and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) thereof the following:

"(b) Before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate and report to the President the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable by reason of section 5 (f) of this act. If the President approves the amount so estimated as reasonably accurate, the total amount so estimated and approved shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury; if the President does not so approve he shall determine such amount, and the amount so determined shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such certification shall be made on or before September 1, 1956. The Secretary of the Treasury shall then transfer from the war claims fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount certified to him under this subsection.

"(c) Before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate and report to the President the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this act. If the President approves the amount so estimated as reasonably accurate, the total amount so estimated and approved shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury; if the President does not so approve, he shall determine such amount, and the amount so determined shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such certification shall be made on or before September 1, 1956. The Secretary of the Treasury shall then transfer from the war claims fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount certified to him under this subsection."

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 13 is hereby amended by striking out "The Secretary of State" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On or before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of State."

SEC. 105. Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States shall wind up its affairs in connection with the settlement of all claims for benefits authorized by the amendments made by this act.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. As used in this title—

(a) The term "prisoner of war" has the meaning assigned to it by section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; and

(b) The term "civilian American citizen" has the meaning assigned to it by subsection (a) of section 5 of such act.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with, and with the assistance of, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct a study of—

(1) the mortality rates among prisoners of war and civilian American citizens, with a view to determining whether their abnormally high mortality rate is directly attributable to the malnutrition and other hardships suffered by them while held as prisoners of war, hostages, internees, or in any other capacity;

(2) the mental and physical consequences of the malnutrition and other hardships suffered by prisoners of war and civilian American citizens while so held; and

(3) the procedures and standards which should be applied in the diagnosis of the mental and physical condition of prisoners of war and civilian American citizens.

SEC. 203. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report the results of such study to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to certain classes of persons, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the House amendments to S. 541. If my colleagues will bear with me, I shall explain briefly why I take this position.

The purpose of S. 541, which I introduced and which passed the Senate on July 18, 1953, was to correct an inequity which exists under the present provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948. The bill authorizes detention benefits to be granted to certain employees of American war contractors who were engaged in the construction of airfields, fortifications, and ship facilities in the Pacific islands prior to World War II and who were interned by the Japanese in prisoner of war camps. Their present exclusion from the benefits of the War Claims Act is manifestly unjust.

The amendments to S. 541, proposed by the House committee, and which the House adopted, would correct certain other equally glaring injustices under the present coverage of the War Claims Act.

Detention benefits would be granted to a few other small groups of prisoners of war and civilian internees who are as deserving as the groups already covered by the act. Also American nationals, including survivors of Bataan and Corregidor, whose bank accounts and other credits were confiscated by the Japanese and whose claims against Japan were waived in the Japanese Peace Treaty would be compensated. This amendment accomplishes exactly the same purpose as the bill S. 3305, which I also introduced, and which was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee on July 19, 1954.

The enactment of S. 541, with the amendments proposed by the House, will substantially wind up the war claims program instituted through the War Claims Act of 1948.

The question has been asked whether there is enough money in the War Claims Fund to take care of the provisions of this bill. The answer to that question is that after the payment of all claims presently authorized by the War Claims Act, including the revised awards in favor of religious organizations, the Budget Bureau has stated that at least $13 million will remain in the War Claims Fund. This amount should cover all or nearly all of the claims authorized by S. 541, and the House amendments thereto.

Let me recapitulate, Mr. President, basically, the House version of this bill consists of two bills both of which have been reported favorably to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary, and one of which has passed the Senate. These are, first, the original S. 541, which has already passed the Senate, and which would grant detention benefits under the War Claims Act to employees of American war contractors who were captured and interned by the Japanese in prisoner of war camps; and second, the bill S. 3305, reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee on July 19, which would compensate American nationals, including survivors of Bataan and Corregidor, whose bank accounts and other deposits in the Philippines were confiscated by the Japanese. The claims of these people against the Japanese Government were waived by Secretary Dulles in the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The House amendments correct certain other injustices under the present War Claims Act by extending the detention benefits provided by the act to a few small groups presently excluded, such as about 1,250 Federal employees in the same situation as the war contractors employees, and approximately 250 merchant seamen. The House amendments also provide that a study should be made of the effects of malnutrition and other hardships suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees.

With respect to the major provision of the House amendment, compensating American nationals whose bank accounts and other deposits in the Philippines were confiscated by the Japanese, the equity of this bill for compensation is clearly seen when it is realized that in the Japanese peace treaty the United States took from these citizens the right to claim compensation from the Japanese for the property that had been taken from them. This legislation as it comes from the House—and in that respect, the effect is the same as in the bill S. 3305 reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee and now on the

Senate Calendar—would merely carry out the legal obligation of the United States to compensate its own nationals for the rights thus taken away from them by treaty.

Mr. President, I have indicated that this bill as it comes from the House is in line with the recommendations of the President. I cannot say it "follows" the recommendations of the President, because in fact the bill was introduced more than a year before the President made his recommendations. But the bill is in line with recommendations made by the President; and in order to establish that fact, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the report transmitted with the letter of June 28, 1954, from the office of the President of the United States to the President of the Senate. This report concerns and recommends provisions which are contained in the bill S. 541, as it passed the House. I note that the letter to which I refer, from the Budget Bureau, was printed in the RECORD a few days ago.

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

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The bill herein proposed would further amend the War Claims Act of 1948. It would extend to certain United States nationals who, during World War II, were interned by the enemy or were captured while serving either in allied military forces or as merchant seamen aboard United States vessels, or vessels of friendly governments, benefits comparable to those authorized under similar circumstances by the War Claims Act of 1948 as presently amended. In addition, the bill would provide for restoration in part of funds that were on deposit with Philippine financial institutions to the credit of American nationals, which were sequestered by the Japanese Government.

This bill, which technically drafted to amend the existing claims act referred to above, assumes that if Reorganization Plan No. 1 now before the Congress becomes effective such additional claims as may be authorized from those recommended herein will be assigned to the new Foreign Claims Settlement Commission proposed by that plan. The assignment of such additional claims programs to the new Commission would assure that payments thereunder would occur at the earliest possible date.

It is proposed to reconstitute the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, into titles I and II. The present act would become title I and the bill would amend the title by adding sections 15, 16, and 17.

CLAIMS RECOMMENDED

Briefly, section 15 would extend the prisoner-of-war benefit provisions of the present act to American citizens who served with allied military forces and were detained as prisoners of war during World War II. Section 16 would extend the civilian detention benefits of the act to members of the merchant marine who were captured and detained during World War II. Section 17 provides funds for the payment of these claims.

Section 3 of the bill (proposed title II) would compensate American nationals and others whose bank accounts in the Philippines were sequestered by the Imperial Japanese Government during World War II.

More specifically, new section 15 would extend the present coverage of the War Claims Act to American citizens who were members of the armed forces of a government allied with the United States during World War II and who during that period were captured and detained as prisoners of war. It will be recalled that prior to the official entry of the United States into World War II, many American youths joined the military forces of countries which subsequently became allies of the United States. The records disclose that some of these youths were detained by enemy governments as prisoners of war. The present proposal would compensate these citizens at the same rates as members of United States Armed Forces detained as prisoners of war who were previously compensated under the present provisions of section 6 of the act. The payments proposed are for food deprivation and inhumane treatment. However, if these citizens were afforded similar compensation by the allied governments they served, such persons would be compensated under this proposal only to the extent necessary to equalize their compensation in terms of the American standard.

It is estimated that only 100 claims amounting to $100,000, would be received as a result of this proposed amendment.

New section 16 provides for detention benefits for civilian American citizens who were merchant seamen, and as such, were captured and interned or held by the governments of Germany and Japan during World War II. During the administration of section 5 (a) through (e) of the act, it became evident that many of these merchant seamen were captured by Japanese forces elsewhere than the specified areas set out in section 5 of the act. In most instances they were brought to and detained in camps at which other civilian American citizens were interned who have been compensated for the period of their detention. Almost without exception, the vessels on which these seamen served were under the direction of the United States Government, which at the time controlled the movement of American sea commerce. They were, therefore, promoting the national interest of the United States. In a number of instances the ships on which they served were sunk and the survivors were picked up by German submarines in waters far removed from the limited areas specified in section 5 of the act, namely, Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or any Territory or possession of the United States attacked or invaded by Japan. Some of them were subsequently turned over to the Japanese forces for internment.

It is estimated that approximately 150 American merchant seamen captured in the Pacific theater would be eligible for these benefits, and it is further estimated that these benefits would approximate $375,000. Moreover, it is estimated that between 50 and 100 such seamen were captured and detained in other than the Pacific theater by the armed forces of Germany and that benefits for this latter group would approximate $125,000.

That portion of the bill which would add title II to the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, provides for compensating American nationals, and American controlled companies, who suffered loss of bank deposits and other credits in the Philippines during World War II by virtue of orders of the Imperial Japanese Government sequestering such funds.

Sequestration of the bank accounts of United States military personnel, American civilian citizens, and American-owned companies resulted in losses estimated at $1,750,000, of which American military personnel losses alone are estimated at $200,000. Other credits lost by American nationals are estimated at $750,000. In addition, voluntary payments or reinstatements before the Haw Pia and subsequent decisions by the Philippine Supreme Court approximate $5 million. In the aggregate, these claims may total about $7,500,000. It is estimated that actual payments under this title will not exceed $5 million since payment of claims in full will only be allowed up to $500 with the excess over $500 being paid at 52.5 percent of the allowed claim. This payment scale was established in settling claims under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, and is suggested as a precedent to be followed here.

It is to be noted that under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, the loss of accounts, money, and intangibles, was not subject to compensation. In the debate on the Japaneese treaty the attention of the Congress was drawn to this problem and the unchallenged view expressed at the hearings was that the American nationals who lost property through this sequestration were entitled to compensation.

In addition, this section further provides compensation at the $500 plus 52.5 percent standard for those banks or other financial institutions doing business in the Philippines which reestablished or reimbursed American nationals for their losses through sequestration.

It is believed those who paid the Americans have a just claim for compensation. Had they not paid the American citizens and American business institutions, and they were, in fact, under no obligation to pay the Americans after having transferred the sums to the Bank of Taiwan, the Americans would have had valid war claims for the amount they were reimbursed by their debtors.

FUNDING OF THESE CLAIMS

The War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, together with section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (especially section 39), as amended, authorized the creation of a "War claims fund" and the use of sums deposited in it, not to exceed $225 million, "as may be necessary to satisfy unpaid awards heretofore or hereafter made under the War Claims Act of 1948." The purpose for which the war claims fund was created was to compensate American nationals for injuries or property losses sustained during World War II. The amount in the fund was derived from assets of Germany and Japan blocked or seized during that war.

It is estimated that war claims currently being settled by the War Claims Commission and the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, will require approximately $212 million of the $225 million described above, leaving a balance of about $13 million. The war claims herein recommended, which correct inadvertencies and inequities of the present War Claims Act, are estimated to require, if authorized, about $6 million of this balance. The proposed bill therefore provides for use of such funds from this source as may be necessary, not to exceed the $225 million currently authorized, for these claims.

There are several bills recently introduced into the Congress, e. g., S. 3423 and H. R. 9076, which propose to return to former German and Japanese private property owners vested property seized during World War II. The executive branch has been asked for its position in this regard and expects to submit its reply as soon as possible. The action recommended on the funding of proposed claims categories does not prejudge the executive branch position on these bills, since the fund authorization here requested is within the level contemplated by the Congress under existing claims laws and does not involve assets which may be available for disposition above that amount.

ADDITIONAL "WAR CLAIMS" CONSIDERED

It seems most apt at this point to state that extensive consideration during the preparation of this bill was given to the proposal to make provision for death and disability compensation for civilian American citizens who sustained injury as a direct result of hostilities during World War II, over and beyond those persons who have previously

been compensated by the United States or any other nation. This uncompensated category of citizens and nationals who were either disabled or died as a direct result of hostilities is estimated at 1,000 and if compensation were to be provided about $7,500,000 would be required. This category of claims has merit. However, despite their appeal, they are not included in the executive branch draft bill. Among other reasons for omitting them is the fact that these individuals were warned by the State Department of the impending danger and asked to leave. We are concerned about setting the precedent of payments for death or disability under these circumstances, but suggest that the Congress will also wish to explore carefully this claims category.

The executive branch agencies primarily concerned carefully reviewed each of the recommendations contained in the "Supplementary Report of the War Claims Commission with respect to war claims arising out of World War II (January 9, 1953)." Despite the fact that these agencies were impressed with the harsh treatment accorded Americans, from both human rights and property interest standpoints, no categories of claims other than those recommended above were believed to be of a type which should be compensated for by the Federal Government. Representatives of the executive branch are, of course, available to discuss the types of considerations upon which these decisions were based.

The largest of the claims categories for which no relief is now recommended are the property claims. Many deserving nationals of the United States sustained great losses as a result of destruction or damage to their property from which, in many instances, they derived their livelihood. In individual cases, there is no doubt that the hardship suffered was very great. The executive branch, however, does not recommend payment of these claims from appropriated funds. It is suggested that any detailed consideration of them should await decision of the return of German and Japanese assets question discussed under "funding" above.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it will be noted that in his letter to the Vice President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget said:

Because of hardships suffered by many United States nationals as the result of actions of certain foreign governments for which this bill would afford some relief, I would strongly urge that this proposed legislation be acted upon, to the extent proposed, before the close of the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

INADEQUACY OF DROUGHT RELIEF PROGRAMS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed by the inadequacy of the present drought relief programs being conducted by the Department of Agriculture, by its apparent efforts to economize at the expense of disaster victims, and by the situation we are leaving as the Congress adjourns.

I am especially disturbed, of course, about the situation in my own State, but I am advised that the drought situation today is far more widespread and severe than it was in the days preceding the disastrous droughts of the thirties.

I have a report that rainfall since January 1 has been less than normal in 21 of the 25 States in the Plains, Southwest, Corn Belt and the South. And this follows a year when rain was less than 90 percent of normal in 13 of these States. Rainfall has been under 90 percent of normal in two States—Texas and New Mexico—for 4½ years, and in Arkansas, Kansas, Colorado, and Wyoming for 2½ years.

The Washington Farmletter of July 31 reports, and I quote:

This is one of the most extensive droughts of record—either in the making or near the breaking. Most extensive previous droughts for the area from the Rockies to the Atlantic as a whole were in 1894, 1910, and 1952.

Drought now covers virtually all of 30 States—more than half of 35 States. The entire area from the Rockies to the Atlantic is droughty except most of Maine and parts of Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and the Dakotas.

In its summary this publication points out that the great drought of 1934 was preceded by subnormal rainfall in the disaster areas in 1930, 1931, and 1933—but not to the extent nor over so wide an area as now.

There have been recent scattered rains in some of the droughty area. Further rains might break the disaster. No one can predict either that the drought disaster will deepen, or that it will be broken.

The situation that concerns and alarms me is that existing drought disaster areas are not being adequately aided, and that we are about to adjourn the Congress in the face of a potential national drought disaster without mandating the administration to deal with it adequately and seeing that they have adequate funds and authorities.

I have a letter from a respected Arkansas citizen who describes the present "alleged drought relief program" of the Department of Agriculture as a "cruel hoax."

These are strong words, but in my opinion they are fully justified.

The situation in Arkansas is already desperate. Disaster is already upon us, and I am not in the habit of using such words as "desperate" and "disaster" lightly. But the situation is really desperate, and the farmers truly face disaster.

We have suffered grave losses to all our earlier feed crops. There is a tremendous feed shortage. For a time farmers have looked ahead in the hope of a fair corn crop or a cotton crop that would provide money for feed and necessities.

But now we have passed the period when rain might save those crops. The corn crop is now already seriously damaged and may be a failure. Much is being cut now for such feed as can be salvaged. Our cotton crop is drying out. Immature bolls are already opening and the prospect of a fair income from that commodity is melting in the scorching sun.

This is the third straight year of drought in Arkansas.

I have the July water resources report of the United States Geological Survey. It shows that streamflows throughout the State are 16 percent under any previously recorded July flows in history. Ground water—water in wells—is the lowest ever recorded. We are literally dry as a bone as a result of a 3-year drying-out process.

Deficit of rainfall since January 1950—over 2½ years—varies from 11 percent to 23 percent in the State.

Simultaneously with this lack of rainfall has been record-breaking heat. The Weather Bureau advises me that temperatures at Little Rock have been 6° above normal, on the average, throughout the whole month of July. They have run far above average in most of the State. It has been the hottest July in Weather Bureau records, reaching 107° at Little Rock and 111° at Fort Smith.

In only 38 of the last 75 years has the temperature at Little Rock reached 100 degrees. But this year, the temperature has been 100 or higher on 33 days, up to August 15.

Any light rains which may fall are evaporated in a matter of hours. Only repeated heavy rains and cool weather will restore our ground moisture—and it would now be too late to save most of the crops. In Arkansas the disaster is already a reality.

I have just been reading the latest weekly crop report of the Weather Bureau for my State and it reports unseasonably high temperatures, no rain of any significance, many forest fires, heavy marketing of cattle, little or no pasture, increasingly worse feed situation, serious damage to corn, cotton, and vegetable crops, including strawberry plantings. The only crop that is coming through is rice, which is irrigated, and there has been some abandonment of this crop.

I saw a picture on the front page of the Arkansas Gazette with reference to the forest-fire situation. Dozens of acres are burning, without any possible control under such dry conditions.

In the face of this desperate situation, the Department of Agriculture has in effect in Arkansas a feed program under which an allowance of 60 cents per hundredweight is given those who qualify to buy grain. Correspondents tell me that the 60 cents will not, in numerous areas, pay the inflation in the cost of grains resulting from the feed shortage.

In other words, even with the 60-cent allowance, it will still cost as much as, or more than, it did prior to the drought.

There are no protein feeds being made available.

There is no hay program. In years past the Department of Agriculture has used its nationwide facilities to locate available supplies of hay and get it routed into feed deficit areas. The initiation of a hay program is now left up to the States. The Department of Agriculture agrees only to certify applicants who meet its requirements, and to pay the State half of freight charges, up to $10 per ton, on emergency hay—if the State or regular feed dealers can locate any hay to bring into the State. These people have neither the experience, the facilities, nor the broad knowledge of sources, which the Department of Agriculture has been able to apply to the administration of emergency hay programs in the past. At best, they can

only stumble along without adequate national connections to speedily locate supplies and get them to the emergency areas.

As we all know, the committee never assumed the programs would be conducted on a permanent basis. No organization has been established in any of the States I know of, certainly not in my State, which has all the resources necessary to cope with the problem. While I agree that the States should play an important part in the program at the present, at least, there is no machinery in existence which can cope with a crisis of this magnitude.

I am advised that the Department has only $15 million available nationally to pay its share of hay program costs, but that in the face of the widespread drought situation, the Department regards this as sufficient.

In a letter dated July 20, 1954, Mr. K. L. Scott, Director of Agriculture Credit Service, Department of Agriculture, has written:

> The Department is not requesting additional funds or authority, since we feel the present laws and authorizations are adequate to meet immediate and foreseeable conditions.

The Department's preoccupation with economy in the face of disaster, the cruel inadequacy of their programs, alarms me both in regard to what is happening to my people in Arkansas, and what may happen in the Nation after we have left Washington.

Only 28 of the 75 Arkansas counties have even been certified as disaster areas although there are farmers all over the State in the most desperate circumstances. Even in the 28 disaster counties, we have only a 60-cent program.

I have as much interest in Government economy as anyone, but this is no time to be pinching pennies in this field. This is the time for an all-out effort to save the farmers and the people of Arkansas and similar areas from a major disaster, a disaster which has arisen from causes far beyond their own control. It is time for a program that will prevent liquidation of livestock herds, and liquidation of farm families themselves.

I have only a general knowledge of the extent of present disaster conditions in States other than my own.

However, I have heard from many of my colleagues that conditions are very serious in their States.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The situation in Alabama is desperate, just as is the situation which the Senator is describing in the State of Arkansas. The normal annual rainfall in Alabama is 51.37 inches. So far this year there has been rainfall of only 13.22 inches. That gives some idea of how parched and dry and burned up the fields and pastures and crops are in Alabama. The Birmingham News stated on July 30, as follows:

> Alabama's parched croplands continue to suffer severely. The State is now rounding out its seventh month of insufficient rainfall. And what are normally the driest months of the year lie ahead. The year may bring the worst drought damage on record in the State. Already the loss to the State's farmers is set at $100 million.

I wish to emphasize that one reason given by the administration for denying drought relief to our Alabama farmers was that the administration believed we might have rain in the future. But, as the Senator well knows, corn which is burned up, feed grain which is already destroyed by drought, cotton which is dried up and its bolls prematurely opened cannot be restored or brought back to life, even if there should be heavy rain. The fact is that we are now facing the normally dry season of the year. I am certain that that is true in the State of Arkansas; is it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite right. Not only is it dry, but it is hot. The combination of extremely high temperatures and a lack of rainfall has burned crops and vegetation in the entire area.

Mr. HILL. In the State of Alabama, this is the fourth year in succession in which we have had prolonged drought; so the situation in Alabama today is desperate. I cannot understand why the administration has chosen to ignore the facts. Gov. Gordon Persons, of Alabama, has presented the facts to the President and to the Secretary of Agriculture. They have been properly and adequately presented. They are irrefutable. It is incredible that Alabama has been denied drought relief. I deeply resent the administration's mistreatment of our Alabama farmers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot understand it, considering the surpluses of wheat and corn which are on hand. It would seem to me that the administration should welcome an opportunity to make good use of the surpluses by acting in this critical situation. I cannot understand why that has not been done. It seems unthinkable that the administration would not take action.

The Governor of Arkansas has, as has the Governor of Alabama, been making appeals to the Department of Agriculture for designation of these areas of Arkansas as drought or disaster areas, but the Department has been extremely slow in moving. I have backed up every such appeal as vigorously as I know how by direct appeals to the administration, but the administration has moved into only a few counties, much less than half of the total number in Arkansas which are affected. In my opinion, too, the county method of designation is ridiculous, because drought does not pay any attention to county lines.

Mr. HILL. Drought knows nothing about county lines.

I suppose that in Arkansas farmers may have been eligible for emergency short-term loans under the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. HILL. But those are only short-term loans. They certainly are not loans that will meet the existing distressing situations of our farmers. On the contrary, the farmers of Alabama have been denied the benefits of the Government's low-cost hay and surplus feed grains program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The State of Arkansas does not have machinery adequate to deal with the surpluses which may be made available. We have no department of agriculture in Arkansas which is accustomed to importing hay from the West. My State, and I am sure many other States, do not have an agency which is in any sense comparable to the Federal Department of Agriculture. The program worked before, when the Federal Government was administering it, because with an organization they could ascertain where the feed was, buy it, and ship it to the area needing it. It is not likely to be effective now, I am told.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that he is more fortunate than we are in Alabama, because our Alabama farmers have been denied any eligibility or any benefits under the low-cost hay and surplus feed program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps Alabama has not been designated as a disaster area.

Mr. HILL. That is just the point I am emphasizing. Not only has Alabama not been designated as a disaster area, but on the other hand, the plea and the application of the Governor of Alabama has been denied, so that the farmers of Alabama have been denied benefits under the low-cost hay and surplus feed program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am amazed at that.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas has advised me that he is amazed. It is amazing and shocking when the terrible situation in Alabama is so well known. A county by county survey had been made in Alabama, and the survey revealed that over one-half of the corn crop is burned up and gone.

The pastures are almost completely gone. Practically no hay has been gathered. Most of the supply of feed that has been stored has now been exhausted. Cattlemen, dairymen, truck farmers and cotton farmers are in great distress. Our farmers are being forced to sell their cattle for any price they can get, because they have no feed or hay with which to feed the cattle. It is a question of throwing the cattle on the market and getting whatever one can or permitting one's cattle to starve to death.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I recently spoke to a person who lives in the mountains in my State and has a spring on his property. He said a neighbor of his came in and offered to give him four milk cows and asked him to accept them because he had no more feed or water, and stated that at least the cows could be given water. This person said he took them and stated that if the cattle could be kept alive, he would give them back to him. The person who originally owned the cattle said there was no use trying to sell them, because not enough could be obtained to warrant taking them to market.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that that is not an unusual case. In Alabama the situation is the same.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I might call to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas the fact that we have a Secretary of Agriculture whose name is Benson, and he makes the rules and regulations and the administrative policies we have to go by. Has the Senator from Arkansas learned what has to be done in order to get aid?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have in my hand a pamphlet, a committee print, which gives a description of the drought program, which was issued by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and I have been reading it. I believe I described the 60 cents program before the Senator came in. The 60 cents program is no program at all. It provides only a 60-cent allowance for a hundred pounds of feed, and the eligible farmer is finding that this is often absorbed by an inflated feed price. The feed is in the hands of dealers; it is not in the hands of the Government. There is nothing to prevent the dealers from asking any price they desire. The hay program is not moving.

With regard to the question of declaring a certain area a disaster area, I believe 28 counties in Arkansas have been designated as eligible for disaster aid. The Department is still far behind in accepting the recommendations of the committee in the State. In those areas there is no program in effect, and, of course, that is perfectly ridiculous, because a drought does not occur in accordance with county lines. I am now getting letters from cotton growers in the southwest part of the State. The first crops to be destroyed are small grains. Cotton stands drought better than other crops, but even cotton is being seriously affected now.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that people in the drought areas will leave those areas before the Government can get any aid to them?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are having to leave. I have in my hand a letter from a person in north Arkansas, enclosing announcements of sales by people who are losing their farms and offering to sell household equipment, cattle, what is left of their feed, a few bales of straw, and so forth. They are selling out. The letter had enclosed with it several announcements of sales. The writer of the letter described what was going on that week in her community. Farmers are having to go out of business and leave the section.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am glad the Senator said what he did about cotton. We think of and speak of cotton as a dry weather crop.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is.

Mr. HILL. There is no plant which can stand the lack of water or stand heat better than cotton, but the drought today is so exceptionally severe that serious troubles and losses are being experienced even by our cotton farmers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is so bad in one of the counties in Arkansas which is a big cotton producing county that the cotton is drying up.

Mr. HILL. I have a telegram signed by W. A. Hales and J. F. McGee, Jr., president and secretary, respectively, of the County Farm Bureau of Greene County, Ala. The telegram was dated July 16. That means the telegram was sent a month ago. Just think what the situation was a month ago and today. We all know that conditions have gotten worse day by day and every hour of the day. The telegram reads as follows:

"Corn, complete loss. Cotton, at least 50 percent off. Hay, 80 to 90 percent off. Pastures burned up. We need feed immediately."

We have petitioned and applied for and urged and pleaded with the administration for relief, but up to this good day, other than the short term emergency loans which do not even begin to meet the disaster in Alabama today, we have been denied any relief or benefit for our farmers, who are in a desperate situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am amazed that Alabama as a State has not been permitted to share in the program at all, because it certainly ought to.

Mr. HILL. I do not know that I should use the term "washed out" when I speak of the drought situation, but unless relief does come, and unless it comes immediately, it will mean that many, many Alabama farmers are going to be completely "washed out." Many will be forced to leave their land and their homes. They will have to crowd somewhere into a city and hope to get a job, despite the unemployment that exists in so many places today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, that may well happen under the ineffectual drought relief program of this administration. But we certainly should do everything possible to minimize that movement because it would result in increasing the problems which already exist in the cities, where the problems already are serious. More importantly, it would protect the equity of men in their land.

I do know that, unless there are early abundant rains in a vast part of the Nation, we are set for a tremendous drought disaster, with only penny-ante relief programs which will prove wholly inadequate to save tens of thousands of farmers from ruin.

I regret that I am one of the agricultural minority in this Congress. I did not vote for the bill that is so widely hailed as an administration victory over the farmers. If I were one of the majority, I would certainly oppose the adjournment of this Congress until it is made absolutely certain that abundant stand-by authority and funds are available to meet a major drought disaster, and that the aid given would not be too little and too late, as it has been up to this moment in my State of Arkansas.

Mr. President, at this time let me read excerpts from a few of the many communications on this subject which I have received in the last few weeks:

The alleged drought relief program announced by the DA is a farce, a cruel hoax. It will not save one herd in this country.

The cattle we raise in this country are worth from 20 percent to 40 percent of their market value 30 months ago. Many cattle producers have been holding on in the hope that things would take a turn for the better but the turn has been the other way.

Unless the Government gives some substantial relief there will be no cattle left in northwest Arkansas next spring.

When its own citizens are going broke through no fault of their own the Government with enough feed on hand to save the day comes up with an asinine program that is cruel because it promises relief but actually gives none.

I read now from another letter:

You know that I do not subscribe to the theory that the Government should set up aid for any segment of our population unless they are confronted with a major disaster.

The small farmers are in worse condition in this area than they have been in many years. It is imperative that they have help if they are to survive and be in position to even start a crop next year.

I read now from a third letter:

I know that you hear lots of distressing stories in Washington. But the one I wish to relate is really distressing. The farmers have had their third dry year and third crop failure in most places in the State. This year is the worst in this area yet, and at this date there is no sign of rain. Hay is gone, dairymen are feeding hay already, hulls going up, no corn, and I have never seen farmers in such a predicament as they are at this time. Even the cotton farmer is having his troubles, where he had no water to use for irrigation. If he had water then he is better off.

I read now from a fourth letter:

DEAR SIR: Wish it was possible for me to come up and talk the drought situation over with you personally but since that is impossible, I am taking this opportunity of coming to you with our problems.

I am going to admit to you that I don't know just what the solution to this problem is going to be, but I do know that if something is not worked out different than what they now have, that a lot of our people are going to be forced to abandon their homes and seek a livelihood elsewhere.

Several herds in the county have already been liquidated and last week all the local livestock auction companies in this territory have been begging the people not to bring their stock in as their facilities were being overrun, and the only reason a lot more has not been moving is only because there isn't enough transportation available. I was talking to several truckers yesterday and they all told me that they had turned down 8 or 10 loads of cattle for today.

I really can't tell you just how bad the situation is down here in our county, you would have to see the pastures and fields in person, and talk to some of the people to even begin to get a true picture of the disastrous situation that we are really facing.

I read now from a fifth letter:

I am enclosing handbills for four separate farm sales, to show what is taking place right here in northwest Arkansas, since milk prices have been lowered to where people can't go on, and are being forced to leave their farm homes to seek jobs in town and elsewhere. These sales have been going on for some time now, and if it keeps up, milk will be out of the reach of poor families, or none for anyone in a short time.

If people choose to live in the country, they should be left there. The only time in history that farmers have been able to

build decent homes with baths, (that farmers need as no one else needs) has been in the last 5 to 8 or 10 years.

I read now from a sixth letter:

This being the third year we have had a drought I am asking for your help to the farmers. I am in a position to know that many need help desperately.

Most of the farmers that I have talked with do not want a gift, just an opportunity to meet their obligations. I know of many good farmers, honest, hard working men, that will lose everything that they possess unless aid is offered them. Some will be able to hold on to what they have but will not be able to farm next year. A very few will be able to meet their obligations and be in a position to farm in 1955. Many of the first two classes are ready to quit farming and leave the State to seek employment of some other description. Some few have already done this very thing.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a series of telegrams which describe the same situation.

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

Situation in this area very serious. Continue urging approval of our county for drought relief program.

Drought conditions prevail throughout Pike County. This drought is more severe than either the 1952 or 1953 drought. Feed crops are about 30 percent of normal. Feed is needed now as 20 percent of beef growers are feeding now and 80 percent would be if they had feed. Pastures have produced 50 percent of our feed needs since July 1. Our greatest need is protein concentrate.

The situation here is desperate and far worse than prior years because of a continuous 3-year drought. Our farmers have no pasture, many are out of water, none of them have enough feed for fall and winter.

This section is experiencing its worst drought and long-continued heat wave in all the 20-odd years that I have lived in Howard County. Pastures parched, truck and fruit crops yields far under normal and row crops badly damaged by heat and drought. But little rain has fallen here since in May and a heat wave of 60 days' duration.

COPY OF TELEGRAM TO SECRETARY BENSON

The drought is having a devastating effect on Arkansas farmers. In many instances their crops are burned beyond recovery. Losses on poultry and livestock are running into millions. Immediate steps must be taken to save our farmers from bankruptcy. Other droughts in recent years coupled with the shrinking margin between selling prices and production costs have depleted the reserves which some of our farmers had accumulated. Others have been operating on credit.

No doubt you already know that we are in an awful drought here in this part of the country after last year. People are almost giving their stock away. Practically no market. If there ever was a time that people—I mean the stockman—needed help with cheap feed and low interest on loans it is now. If something is not done soon there will only be a few stockmen left in this part of the country so I am asking you to do what you can to see that this kind of a program can be put into effect soon.

The continued problem of extreme hot and dry weather has completely ruined both the pastures and crops. Then with prices of farm commodities what they are we feel that the farmers are in need of assistance again now.

The corn that tassled out in July, the hottest month on record for this period, was burned to such an extent that there was not proper pollenization and as a result, little or no corn matured on the ears. The condition of the dairy farmers in the Midsouth area is critical, and drought relief is necessary if many of the producers are to stay in the dairy business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the suggestion in the last letter I read—namely, that many persons are ready to quit farming and leave the State, to seek employment of some other kind. Although that is one way to solve the surplus of agricultural commodities which has plagued the country, I submit that it is not only a cruel and inhuman way, but that the problems it would create, as a result of the movement of those people into urban areas, would be far more serious to our society than the cost of an adequate aid program for these people. They wish to remain on the farms, and in the past they have contributed much to the economy of the Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The truth is that to grant the relief that is so desperately needed today, and for which there is such great compulsion, would cost practically nothing; the cost would be virtually nothing, in comparison with the overall expenditures of the Government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true; the cost would be scarcely anything, because I daresay more wheat and corn will spoil in Government storage than the amount of wheat and corn which would be required for the relief program. All we need is a little imagination and a little energy on the part of responsible authorities, in order to move the machinery which already is in existence, and in order to move to the needy farms the commodities which also are already in existence. I do not think the amount of money involved would be significant, compared to the benefits which will accrue.

Mr. HILL. In other words, all we need to do is to make use of what we already have.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. All we need is someone in the Department of Agriculture who is really interested in doing something for these small farmers. That is all we need, because the authority and the appropriated funds for this program already exist. In the past, emergency programs have worked well. Certainly the proposed feed program, especially when using the surplus feeds which are in storage, could be effective in moving the necessary animal food into this area; and the cost would be practically nothing, insofar as new appropriations are concerned.

Of course, the program would use the commodities now in storage and owned by the Government. Under those circumstances, the cost of the program would be only an academic question, or a bookkeeping question, because in the final analysis, something must be done with the stored commodities before they spoil.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that in my judgment this Congress ought to take a hand, this week, to put an end to 60-cent economy at the expense of drought victims. If necessary, we ought to remain here for whatever time it takes to mandate the Department of Agriculture to deal adequately with the drought crisis, giving the Department whatever authority and funds might prove to be necessary if this major disaster continues, worsens, and spreads.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter I addressed to the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, on August 17, 1954.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 17, 1954.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very deeply concerned about the inadequacy of our drought relief program to handle the sort of major disaster which is occurring in Arkansas.

There has been a deficiency of rainfall in Arkansas for 3 years. The feed situation is desperate. Continued drought has exhausted the resources of thousands of farmers.

The current drought relief program may be useful to areas in a short drought. But it is wholly inadequate in the areas where farmers have been victims of drought now for 2, 3, and even more years. Declining farm income and inadequate credit facilities aggravate this situation. The practice of designating drought relief areas by counties is completely unrealistic. Heat and drought do not confine themselves to county boundary lines.

Additionally, I am receiving many complaints that the costs of feeds have gone up so that the 60 cents per hundredweight allowance for Commodity Credit Corporation supplies does not offset advances in feed prices. In my opinion it is inadequate anyhow.

Hay is desperately needed in Arkansas, but is not being made available under the program to pay half of freight, up to $10 per ton. The responsibility for running such a program has been shifted by you to the States. Location of surplus hay is left largely to private dealers. I am advised that even without the program, the dealers are unable to get adequate quantities through normal trade channels. Local dealers cannot economically scour the country for available hay. There is obviously needed the assistance of the Federal farm agencies—as in the past years—to locate and arrange for deliveries of hay.

I am advised that you have only $15 million for the feed program. With drought conditions in all or parts of 30 States, it is inconceivable to me that such funds are adequate to meet the needs which will come with the sort of major disaster which confronts us.

I am aware of the fact that your Department has previously advised that no additional funds or authority are needed. However, if, upon reconsideration, you find additional funds and authority are needed to meet a major drought disaster, I am sure Congress would remain in session to meet

any contingency which might develop, if requested by you or the President.

I urge you, as strongly as I can, immediately to reconsider and revise your programs in the light of the situation which now exists.

Sincerely,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. BUTLER obtained the floor.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 83D CONGRESS, AND PENDING MATTERS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish at this time to present for the record a brief summary of the activities of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the second session of the 83d Congress.

Your committee had referred to it for consideration a total of 101 pieces of legislation, including 70 Senate bills and 19 House bills, exclusive of some 40 amendments thereto; 3 Senate joint resolutions, and 9 simple Senate resolutions.

A total of 41 bills and joint resolutions and 5 simple resolutions were reported favorably.

Forty-five measures passed the Senate and 28 passed the House. To date, 23 measures have been signed into law by the President and several others are awaiting his signature.

The committee this year held 95 sessions of public hearings on legislation, 20 sessions of public hearings on nominations, and 4 sessions of public hearings on miscellaneous matters other than legislation and nominations. In all, your committee and its subcommittees conducted 119 sessions of hearings covering more than 500 hours.

There were referred to the committee during the second session, 649 so-called routine nominations in the Coast Guard and 300 routine nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey. In addition, the committee disposed of 23 major nominations. The nomination of G. Joseph Minetti to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board is pending before the committee.

There were 93 official papers referred to committee.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a listing of the hearings held by the committee and its subcommittees and the legislation heretofore referred to, covering the activities of the committee this session.

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

Following is a list of the number of hearing sessions by each subcommittee and the full committee: Surface transportation, 4 sessions of open hearings; communications, 11 sessions of open hearings; aviation, 1 session of open hearings (20 sessions of hearings were held by full committee); water transportation, 25 sessions of open hearings; fisheries and wildlife, 3 sessions of open hearings; business and consumer interests, 22 sessions of open hearings; full committee, 53 sessions of open hearings.

A list of the bills reported to the Senate during the second session and report numbers are as follows:

S. 602, to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules for the loading, stowage, and securing of grain and other similar bulk cargoes (S. Rept. No. 1324).

S. 904, to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees (S. Rept. No. 1803).

S. 906, amending the Interstate Commerce Act to establish finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers (S. Rept. No. 1655).

S. 1763, life preservers for river steamers (S. Rept. No. 1646).

S. 1878, to amend the Merchant Marine Act (war-risk insurance) (S. Rept. No. 1212).

S. 2370, to authorize the sale of certain vessels to Brazil for use in the coastwise trade of Brazil (S. Rept. No. 1276).

S. 2371, extension of emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority (S. Rept. No. 1087).

S. 2389, granting commissioned officers of Coast and Geodetic Survey certain military benefits and rights during time of war (S. Rept. No. 1752).

S. 2407, to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (S. Rept. No. 1213).

S. 2453, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to implementing the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship (S. Rept. No. 1583).

S. 2713, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property to the city of Boulder, Colo. (S. Rept. No. 1088).

S. 2777, to provide transportation on Canadian vessels (S. Rept. No. 1089).

S. 2802, to further encourage the distribution of fishery products (S. Rept. No. 1210).

S. 2814, to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes (S. Rept. No. 1214).

S. 2818, biennial inspection of hulls and boilers of cargo vessels (S. Rept. No. 1272).

S. 3185, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to instruments evidencing the mortgage, lease, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers (S. Rept. No. 1461).

S. 3190, strengthening of act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce (S. Rept. No. 1651).

S. 3219, to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction (S. Rept. No. 1804).

S. 3233, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide permanent legislation for the transportation of a substantial portion of waterborne cargoes in United States-flag vessels (S. Rept. No. 1584).

S. 3379, exemption of certain fabrics and wearing apparel from application to Flammable Fabrics Act (S. Rept. No. 1323).

S. 3435, creation of Washington National Airport Corporation (S. Rept. No. 1653).

S. 3464, to provide for the carrying out of the agreement for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio (S. Rept. No. 1747).

S. 3542, prohibition of transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities (S. Rept. No. 1652).

S. 3546, Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954 (S. Rept. No. 1647).

S. 3630, to permit the city of Philadelphia to further develop the Hog Island tract as an air, rail, and marine terminal (S. Rept. No. 1805).

S. 3713, to give effect to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952 (S. Rept. No. 1806).

Senate Resolution 173, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce (no written report).

Senate Resolution 272, to commend States having legislation to prevent discarded refrigerating units from becoming a menace to children and to urge consideration of similar legislation by other States (no written report).

Senate Resolution 276, providing additional funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (no written report).

Senate Joint Resolution 67, to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels (S. Rept. No. 1649).

Senate Joint Resolution 161, authorization for sale of passenger-cargo vessels (S. Rept. No. 1645).

H. R. 6436, amending the Communications Act of 1934 (S. Rept. No. 1090).

H. R. 6870, to approve existing railway installations and authorize further installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La. (S. Rept. No. 1275).

H. R. 7395, to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act (S. Rept. No. 1751).

H. R. 7468, amending certain provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the regulation for purposes of safety and protection of the public, of certain foreign motor carriers operating in the United States (S. Rept. No. 1650).

H. R. 8357, to amend the Standard Container Act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 685; 15 U. S. C. 257–257i), to provide for a ⅜-bushel basket for fruits and vegetables (S. Rept. No. 1585).

H. R. 8538, revocation or denial of merchant marine documents to persons involved in certain narcotics violations (S. Rept. No. 1648).

H. R. 8647, regarding provisions to register or license a vessel of the United States (S. Rept. No. 1748).

H. R. 1843, to increase the retired pensions of members of former lighthouse service (S. Rept. No. 2215).

H. R. 9868, to amend the Ship Mortgage Act to provide for the charter of a passenger vessel to the Hawaiian Steamship Co. (S. Rept. No. 2213).

H. R. 9584, to provide for the protection of fishermen in territorial waters (S. Rept. No. 2214).

H. R. 8898, to amend section 401 (e) (2) of Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended (permanent certificates for local service air carriers) (S. Rept. No. 2267).

Senate Resolution 292, expressing the sense of the Senate for the development of private aviation.

Senate Resolution 310, authorizing the investigation of marketing of new cars by the Business and Consumer Interests Subcommittee (S. Rept. No. 2316).

H. R. 9115, to provide that contributions received under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction (S. Rept. No. 2490).

H. R. 9434, to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

A list of the bills which passed the Senate is as follows:

S. 602, to provide for greater safety of life and property at sea.

S. 906, amending the Interstate Commerce Act to establish finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers.

S. 978, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under sec. 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

S. 1763, life preservers for river steamers.

S. 1878, to amend the Merchant Marine Act (war-risk insurance).

S. 1918, to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946.

S. 2370, to authorize the sale of certain vessels to Brazil for use in the coastwise trade of Brazil.

S. 2371, extension of emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority.

S. 2389, granting commissioned officers of Coast and Geodetic Survey certain military benefits and rights during time of war.

S. 2407, to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920.

S. 2453, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship.

S. 2777, to provide transportation on Canadian vessels.

S. 2802, to further encourage the distribution of fishery products.

S. 2814, to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes.

S. 2818, biennial inspection of hulls and boilers of cargo vessels.

S. 3185, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to instruments evidencing the mortgage, lease, conditional sale, or bailment of motor vehicles sold to or owned by certain carriers.

S. 3233, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide permanent legislation for the transportation of a substantial portion of waterborne cargoes in United States-flag vessels.

S. 3379, exemption of certain fabrics and wearing apparel from application to Flammable Fabrics Act.

S. 3464, to provide for the carrying out of the agreement for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.

S. 3546, Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954.

S. 3630, to permit the city of Philadelphia to further develop the Hog Island tract as an air, rail, and marine terminal.

S. 3713, to give effect to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952.

Senate Resolution 173, to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce.

Senate Resolution 272, to commend States having legislation to prevent discarded refrigerating units from becoming a menace to children and to urge consideration of similar legislation by other States.

Senate Joint Resolution 67, to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels.

Senate Joint Resolution 72, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

Senate Joint Resolution 161 (H. J. Res. 534), to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built passenger-cargo vessels, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1026, providing medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service.

H. R. 4557, to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations.

H. R. 4558, to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder.

H. R. 4559, to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

H. R. 6436, amending the Communications Act of 1934.

H. R. 5976, to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act.

H. R. 6870, to approve existing railway installations and authorize further installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service Hospital property in New Orleans, La.

H. R. 7380, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property to the city of Boulder, Colo.

H. R. 7468, amending certain provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the regulation for purposes of safety and protection of the public, of certain foreign motor carriers operating in the United States.

H. R. 8357, to amend the Standard Container Act of May 21, 1928, to provide for a ⅜-bushel basket for fruits and vegetables.

H. R. 8538, revocation or denial of merchant marine documents to persons involved in certain narcotics violations.

H. R. 1843, to increase retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service.

H. R. 9584, to protect rights of vessels of United States on the high seas and in territorial waters of foreign countries.

H. R. 8647, to amend Revised Statutes 4426 (exemption of certain small vessels from vessel inspection laws).

Senate Resolution 292, to express the sense of the Senate for development of private aviation.

H. R. 9868, to amend the Ship Mortgage Act to provide for the charter of a passenger vessel to the Hawaiian Steamship Co.

H. R. 9115, to provide that contributions received under Public Law 485, 80th Congress, for the construction of a merchant marine chapel shall be invested in Government obligations pending their use for such construction.

H. R. 9987 (S. 3219), to amend certain provisions of title XI of Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new ship construction, and for other purposes.

A list of the bills and resolutions which were signed by the President and became public laws are as follows:

S. 2370, to authorize the sale of certain vessels to Brazil for use in the coastwise trade of Brazil (Public Law 496).

S. 2777, to provide transportation on Canadian vessels (Public Law 441).

S. 2802, to further encourage the distribution of fishery products (Public Law 466).

Senate Joint Resolution 72, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes (Public Law 469).

H. R. 4557, to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations (Public Law 321).

H. R. 4558, to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder (Public Law 320).

H. R. 4559, to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony (Public Law 314).

H. R. 5976, to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (Public Law 323).

H. R. 6276, to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (Public Law 447).

H. R. 6436, amending the Communications Act of 1934 (Public Law 345).

H. R. 6870, to approve existing railway installations and authorize further installations on the batture in front of the Public Health Service hospital property in New Orleans, La. (Public Law 376).

H. R. 7380, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to reconvey certain property to the city of Boulder, Colo. (Public Law 341).

H. R. 8357, to amend the Standard Container Act of May 21, 1928, to provide for a three-eighths-bushel basket for fruits and vegetables (Public Law 434).

H. R. 8538, revocation or denial of merchant marine documents to persons involved in certain narcotics violations (Public Law 500).

H. R. 7468, to amend section 203 (a) of Interstate Commerce Act authorizing regulation of motor-carrier transportation in certain instances (Public Law 522).

S. 2371, to extend emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority of Public Law 101 of 77th Congress (Public Law 569).

Senate Joint Resolution 161 (H. J. Res. 534), to authorize Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built passenger cargo vessels (Public Law 553).

S. 2389, granting commissioned officers of Coast and Geodetic Survey certain military benefits and rights during time of war (Public Law 593).

S. 2408, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes (Public Law 574).

S. 3713, to give effect to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952 (Public Law 579).

Senate Joint Resolution 67, to repeal certain World War II laws relating to return of fishing vessels, and for other purposes (Public Law 580).

S. 2453, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to implementing the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea relating to radio equipment and radio operators on board ship (Public Law 584).

S. 3464, to amend Communications Act of 1934 in order to make certain provision for the carrying out of the Agreement for the Promotion of Safety on the Great Lakes by Means of Radio (Public Law 590).

H. R. 1026, providing medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service, was vetoed by the President (H. Doc. No. 429).

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF WATER TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I have received from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Transportation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], a letter detailing the work of his subcommittee.

I wish to express my very deep appreciation for the Senator's work. I know I express the appreciation of all members of the committee for the diligent work the subcommittee has conducted throughout the year, and the accomplishments of the subcommittee.

The Senator from Maryland is about to present a very important bill, which was reported by his subcommittee, and was approved unanimously by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This letter from the Senator from Maryland details the work of that subcommittee, which is one of the very important subcommittees of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I wish to commend the Senator particu-

larly on the bill he is about to present to the Senate today. I think it will make effective the program attempted 2 years ago in our committee. I think it will bring into the shipbuilding industry much private money, without the expenditure of Government and taxpayers' money, and will help to fill a great need in building up our shipping industry.

I ask unanimous consent that I may place in the RECORD at this time the letter from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Transportation, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
August 5, 1954.

Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER,
Chairman, Committee on
Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRICKER: During the present session of the 83d Congress it was my privilege to be designated by you as head of the Water Transportation Subcommittee, handling legislation pertaining mainly to the American merchant marine. I think it only proper, as the Congress comes to a close, that I summarize for you what our subcommittee has done and what we hope to do in the near future.

Let me stress at the outset our good fortune in serving under you as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Without your continuing support and wise counsel our subcommittee efforts could not possibly have been so fruitful. Likewise I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation and admiration for the industry and ability of each of my subcommittee colleagues—Senators POTTER and PAYNE on the majority side, and Senators MAGNUSON and SMATHERS on the other. Leaders in the shipping and shipbuilding industries and in the interested Government agencies, as well as officials of maritime labor have generously asserted that our subcommittee has accomplished much of value during this session. If that is so, and I believe it is, it was made possible only by the unfailing assistance and cooperation of all concerned.

And here I pause to observe that any statement of our progress would be incomplete if it failed to emphasize that the maritime industry has had no better support from any Member of the Senate than it has had from the distinguished majority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, and from the very able chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator BRIDGES. Senator KNOWLAND almost uniformly has given right of way to our bills, more than two-thirds of which were approved within 10 days of their inclusion in the calendar. Senator BRIDGES was most considerate of our representations as to Government's obligations to American shipping—and receptive to our pleas for funds to discharge those obligations. His willingness to accept the $18 million amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill for the emergency ship-repair program was but the latest instance of his courtesy and support in this respect.

At the conclusion of this letter I will append a list of the maritime bills which have been approved by the Water Transportation Subcommittee and acted upon favorably by the Senate. Any account of legislation for the maritime industry must necessarily include, however, not only a recital of what has been achieved, but, perhaps even more important, what remains to be done. Despite the definite gains made in the struggle to keep the American merchant marine alive and adequate to the requirements of peace or war, urgent needs remain to be filled. And the preparatory work to remedy these needs, or much of them, can and should be done in the months that will intervene before Congress again convenes in January next.

Much has been said, necessarily, during this session about the depressed conditions in the shipbuilding and ship repair industry, and the lack of available cargoes which caused the lay-up of many American ships, especially in the tramp trade. However, the matters coming before the subcommittee did not deal solely with these matters.

One of the primary concerns of the subcommittee has been the advancement of safety of life and property at sea. In this field there were five bills considered and passed, all of which will result, without question, in greater safety for both lives and property. One of the most persistent causes of catastrophies on the high seas has been the improper loading of certain types of cargoes, such as bulk grain, wheat, and the like, which have a tendency to shift unless properly contained in their allotted spaces. One of the bills passed, S. 602, is addressed to the prevention of future troubles of this nature.

Improved design of vessels has been another necessary consideration and our bill, S. 2814, as passed, would help matters greatly in this respect. Requirement of approved life preservers on river steamers to replace the unsatisfactory life rafts now in use, as provided in S. 1763, is of great importance. Likewise, provisions to authorize denial or revocation of seamen's licenses to narcotic users or addicts is another long needed step in the right direction.

Under the heading of national and public interest an impressive number of bills were reported and passed. One of them, S. 2408, made provision for adding needed strength to the strategic reserve tanker fleet. Another, initiated entirely by our subcommittee, and cosponsored by many able Senators from both sides of the aisle, provides for an emergency ship repair program, to keep strategic yards in operation, as well as to put selected vessels in the reserve fleet in ready condition, for immediate use in the event of an emergency. Other bills under this heading would strengthen diplomatic and trade relations with several foreign nations by permitting sale or charter to them of ships badly needed in their domestic trades. And on the Pacific, there was made possible the sale and charter of additional passenger vessels which will greatly advance the public convenience in those areas, while adding vastly to the defense potential in available troop transports.

For the benefit of the shipping industry itself, which has been so hard hit by low-cost, foreign competition, measures of utmost importance have been passed and to a large point developed by our subcommittee. Two especially stand out in this regard—one, the cargo preference, or 50–50 bill, to assure to the United States flag vessels, on a permanent basis, the transportation of at least 50 percent of all cargoes for the account of or financed by this Government. The other, S. 3219, to provide for private financing of ship construction.

Our subcommittee's hearings on the Commerce Department's very splendid Maritime Subsidy Policy Report focused the spotlight on a number of pressing problems which will have to be met within the immediate future.

Of pressing importance to maritime labor, as well as to a large segment of American shipping engaged in the tramp trades, was the inquiry conducted by our subcommittee into the administration of the law dealing with the transfer of United States-flag vessels to foreign registry. The Maritime Administrator came before the subcommittee at an open hearing, and outlined in detail the policies governing such transfers, following which those who opposed or questioned the transfer policy were heard at length. The subcommittee's conclusion was that the law was not being improperly administered, but we urged the Maritime Administrator to exercise caution in acting on the many pending requests for foreign transfer.

It seems especially appropriate to mention the successful efforts made by our subcommittee to have this Government meet its obligations to the shipping lines with regard to payment of operating differential subsidies, some of which had been overdue for years.

The fourth and final phase of the subcommittee's activities was centered upon the shipyards of our country and here, I am sure, we have made a substantial contribution to the future security of the Nation.

Besides initiating the ship repair program which, as passed and sent to the President, will undoubtedly prevent the closing of many vital yards and the loss of thousands of skilled shipworkers, our subcommittee has been most active, and successful, in its attempts to impress upon Congress and the administration the urgency of approving plans for new passenger vessels and tankers and for various other forms of new ship construction. These programs are of the utmost importance to the Nation, and of immediate urgency to the shipyards, nearly all of which are facing imminent closing.

Convinced that depressed conditions in American shipyards merited for them preferential consideration over foreign shipyards for which contracts had been allotted under the Navy's offshore ship procurement program, I felt it incumbent upon me as chairman to urge that these contracts be placed in this country. As a result I was advised by Admiral Leggett, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, for whom I have the highest regard, that contracts totaling $27,500,000 for minesweepers for the North Atlantic Treaty countries would be diverted back from European shipyards to yards in this country.

During this session, likewise, in connection with our efforts on behalf of shipping and shipbuilding, we have developed a close working partnership with the responsible Government agencies. That relationship has been most effective in promoting the legislative and allied efforts deemed essential for the preservation and strengthening of these important segments of our peacetime and wartime economy.

Most of the legislation immediately affecting the shipping and shipbuilding industies acted upon during the session was of the emergency type. Ships were being laid up, shipyards were closing or facing such action. Action had to be of such a nature as to afford prompt but, I fear, in some instances, piecemeal help, to keep these important facilities alive until more permanent measures could be devised and enacted.

The more important problems to be faced on a long-range basis are interrelated, necessarily.

First, the private shipyards upon which the Department of Defense is placing heavy reliance must not be allowed to shut down or deteriorate to a standby status. This would be a catastrophe. If it is allowed to happen, a sudden emergency would find the Nation unable to meet the vast demands for new shipping that the defense authorities assert will be required. An atom war will not permit months or even years to organize our shipyards, as was the case in World Wars I and II.

Second, the American merchant fleet is aging rapidly. Almost all of it was built during the war years. Before 10 years have passed this vast fleet will have passed its useful lifetime. Replacement of all these

vessels when that happens, within a 2- or 3-year period, will be absolutely impossible. Our shipyards couldn't begin to handle that many contracts—even if the necessary funds were available, a truly fantastic supposition.

The sensible approach to such replacement, recommended in the Maritime Subsidy Policy Report of the Department of Commerce, is an annual construction program of 60 ocean-going ships a year. This is estimated to cost at least $400 million annually.

Where the money to finance this program would come from is, at this moment, a grave question.

Under title V of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Government is authorized to finance, and in some instances has financed, 75 percent of the owner's cost of construction, on a 20-year basis, with interest on the unpaid balance at the rate of 3½ percent per annum. There have been no losses to the Government under this program. But to obtain title V funds, appropriations must be sought. Accordingly, because of this budgetary obstacle, and in an attempt to encourage private financing of merchant vessel construction, the subcommittee worked with representatives of the shipping industry, the lending institutions, and the Government agencies concerned to develop a private financing bill, S. 3219. Admittedly, encouragement of private financing of vessel construction is nothing new, witness Public Law 288, passed at the last session for the same purpose, but which apparently has not done the job. Indeed, title XI of the Merchant Marine Act is designed to encourage private financing and has been on the books since 1938. But we believe S. 3219, if enacted, will do the private financing job in large part.

The 1936 act, likewise, under section 206, authorized the establishment of a revolving fund for the financing of vessels to replace obsolete units. In recent years operation of this fund has been discontinued under provisos of the Commerce appropriation bills. However, one of the recommendations advanced in the recently published Maritime Subsidy Policy Report of the Department of Commerce is that this revolving fund be reactivated and made available for use in connection with ship construction. The report suggested that there be authorized for deposit in this fund appropriations for ship construction, receipts from sale of ship mortgages, interest and principal payments of ship mortgages, and charter receipts.

The report goes on to suggest that consideration be given to limiting the use of such funds for the purpose of paying the Government's share of ship construction. So great will be the need during the next 10 years for funds to finance replacement of the aging merchant fleet that it will require extensive participation from both Government and private sources.

Our subcommittee proposes to go thoroughly into this matter over the coming months with the responsible Government departments to the end that legislation which will reactivate the revolving fund may be developed for presentation to the Congress early in the next session. If the Nation is to have a privately owned merchant marine beyond the next 10 years, a merchant marine of modern design, adequate in size to meet the needs of our economy during peacetime, let alone to serve as the fourth arm of defense in war or emergency, we must do everything possible now to assure that the necessary funds will be available. And, in our judgment, such a revolving fund is absolutely essential if this problem of replacing our fleet, rapidly becoming obsolescent, is to be met on anything like an adequate basis.

Closely related with this No. 1 problem of merchant-vessel replacement is the basic American shipping policy question of subsidies, or Government participation, as provided under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Are its provisions for such Government aid as basically sound as they were in 1936, when the act was passed?

So important is it that conflicting views on this matter be resolved, that I intend to present a resolution early in the new Congress which would authorize the setting up of a joint commission, made up of Members of both Houses of the Congress, as well as experts from budget, the General Accounting Office, Commerce, and Treasury, plus representatives from the shipping industry and maritime labor. The objective of this joint commission will be to perform promptly a thorough review of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and to bring it into line with the needs not only of the present day but of this critical 10-year period ahead.

The results of such a study as I shall propose could help materially to clear the atmosphere with respect to the congressional as well as the public attitude toward the merchant marine. The accomplishments, and the problems, of the merchant marine have never been adequately presented to the Congress or to the public. I believe the findings and recommendations of such a Commission as I have in mind, would be very helpful in dispelling some current misconceptions as to the proper place of the merchant marine in the national economic and security picture. Likewise, I have no doubt that such a study will enable us to spend the taxpayers' merchant marine dollars more wisely than we are able to do today.

A further aspect of the maritime situation that deserves the attention of the Congress, and particularly of our subcommittee, is the question of modernizing cargo handling, to cut costs, and thus to place American shipping in a better competitive position in the world market. It must be admitted that ship design and shore cargo-handling facilities have undergone little change in many years. Now, in recent years, new ship design and new mechanical facilities are being developed. They may point the way to a radical advancement. If so, American shipping may be able to improve its competitive position—and to reduce its need for operating subsidies.

America has become the leading world power because of its technical ingenuity. Applied to shipping problems I feel confident this ingenuity can do much to overcome the low-pay advantages of foreign shipping, to a point where American shipping can stand more and more on its own feet, and be less and less dependent upon Government aid to make up the difference between ship construction and operation here and abroad.

Following World War II, the President's Advisory Committee on Shipping found that "ocean shipping has lagged in the application of new techniques and methods of handling materials developed during the last 10 or 15 years. The great percentage of dry cargo is still handled in and out of holds of vessels with cargo booms and winches, in a method which has experienced little improvement, except in the winches themselves, in the last 100 years." A study in this field by the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University found that cargo-handling costs in domestic shipping in prewar years averaged 41 percent of the cost of transporting cargo by water. More recent estimates place the "turn around" costs as high as 65 percent. Here certainly should be an opportunity for our shipping to lessen the cost differential now existing as regards foreign shipping.

Likewise, as shown so clearly when the great port of Baltimore was called upon recently to handle a huge volume of traffic diverted from other ports because of a dock strike, shoreside facilities for the speedy handling of ocean freight are as archaic as the loading facilities of the ships themselves.

Here is a problem, the challenge of which must be met, and met on a basis where all phases of the operation will be called upon to participate in the extensive modernization operations that undoubtedly will be required.

We can lift the American shipping industry from the doldrums into which it has fallen, if we can alert all hands to the opportunities for betterment that abound. Here is a field where the Federal Government can and should take the lead. Our subcommittee proposes to set the ball a-rolling, through hearings in which all interested parties will be invited and urged to participate freely.

In closing let me say that one truly gratifying aspect of the session's activities was the bipartisan spirit in which the subcommittee functioned. In no single instance was there evidenced any desire on either side to pursue other than what seemed to be the wise and helpful course. No chairman could have had more complete support from the minority. Senator MAGNUSON's broad experience in the maritime field, and his zeal for the betterment of that industry, were of outstanding value to our program.

Now to complete the record, I submit for your consideration the session record of bills and resolutions handled by the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee.

Public hearings held on all bills—Session record on bills and resolutions handled by Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee

	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate
S. J. Res. 67. Repeal World War II laws	June 28, 1954	July 6, 1954
S. 602. Bulk grain storage, etc	May 12, 1954	May 17, 1954
S. 1763. Life preservers for river steamers	June 28, 1954	July 6, 1954
S. 1878. War-risk insurance	Apr. 15, 1954	Apr. 19, 1954
S. 2370. Sale ships to Brazil	May 3, 1954	May 11, 1954
S. 2371. Extends emergency foreign merchant-vessel acquisition authority	Mar. 24, 1954	May 4, 1954
S. 2389. Coast and Geodetic officers, etc	July 7, 1954	July 10, 1954
S. 2407. Ship mortgages	Apr. 15, 1954	Apr. 19, 1954
S. 2777. Alaskan Steamship Service	Mar. 24, 1954	Apr. 5, 1954
S. 2814. Admeasurement of vessels	Apr. 15, 1954	Apr. 19, 1954
S. 2818. Biennial inspection hulls, etc	Apr. 29, 1954	May 4, 1954
S. 3219. Private ship financing	July 14, 1954	
S. 3233. Cargo preference (50-50)	June 11, 1954	June 15, 1954
S. 3546. Emergency ship repairs	June 28, 1954	July 8, 1954
S. 3732. To authorize charter passenger vessels for domestic trade	Aug. 4, 1954	
H. R. 8538. Denial or revocation of seamen's license for narcotic violations	June 28, 1954	July 6, 1954
H. R. 8647. Small vessel inspections	July 7, 1954	
H. J. Res. 534. Sale vessels to American President Lines, Ltd	July 6, 1954	July 8, 1954

HEARINGS HELD, NO REPORT ISSUED

S. 3610, to establish Merchant Marine Academy (approval withheld at request of Secretary of Commerce, pending Department's study of Academy's operations). See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 23, 1954, page 11576.

S. 3620, transfer of certain Coast Guard property.

OTHER HEARINGS CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 173, 83D CONGRESS

Inquiry into administration by Maritime Administrator of the law dealing with transfers of United States-flag vessels to foreign registry.

Public presentation, by Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Robert B. Murray, Jr., of the report of the Department's study on maritime subsidy policy.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his very generous remarks. I have never enjoyed anything so much as I have enjoyed acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Transportation under the distinguished Senator from Ohio, as chairman of the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is most gracious. He has done an excellent job which more than justifies all the comments I have made.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is very kind.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, since the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] became chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, he has directed the professional staff of the committee to prepare a summary of the activities of the committee during each session of the Congress.

This summary is in the nature of a report to the Congress and to the people of the legislative activities of the committee.

For the first session of the 83d Congress, the document ran about 50 pages.

The report for the second session is now in preparation. It will be comprehensive, covering all activities since the beginning of the second session of the 83d Congress. It will run possibly 80 pages.

Inasmuch as it is not feasible to file the report prior to the adjournment of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent for and on behalf of the chairman of the committee, who is absent from the Senate on official business, to file such report, entitled "Summary of Activities of Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 83d Congress, Second Session," after the adjournment of the Congress, and to have it printed as a Senate document.

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

SOME IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF THE TAX REVISION BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Congress recently passed and the President has signed into law one of the most important pieces of legislation in the history of this Nation. I refer, of course, to the general tax revision bill, the first undertaking of its kind in three-quarters of a century.

I was privileged to be a member of the Senate Finance Committee which, under the able chairmanship of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], spent more than 10 weeks studying this bill. Its effects upon the general economy and welfare have been noted many times and by many highly placed persons. Any bill, Mr. President, which can save American taxpayers $1.4 billion, of which $827 million will directly benefit individuals, is worthy of notice.

Every citizen will benefit directly or indirectly from this revision bill, which has produced tax savings that surpass any previous total in the history of Congress. There are those, of course, who for partisan and personal reasons carp at isolated parts of the bill, but I am proud and happy that this administration has thus helped fulfill its campaign pledge to "reduce Government spending and thereby permit lower taxation."

Here are just a few figures that should interest the American people. These are some of the benefits of this legislation: 8.5 million people will benefit from medical deductions; 7 million will be taxed less on dividends; 2.1 million people will get relief from "working mother" provisions of the bill; from tax cuts in retirement, 1.8 million; 1.6 million citizens will gain from changes on installments; from the new dependent rule, 1.3 million; from the soil conservation rule, 500,000 people; from easier depreciation, 9.6 million plus 600,000 corporations.

We must not forget, either, Mr. President, that it was the cuts we have made in Government spending—particularly the $12 billion trimmed from the Truman budget for fiscal 1954—which made a 10 percent income tax cut practicable. This will save the American public $3 billion—and a lot of short tempers.

In April of this year, Congress also voted a billion-dollar excise tax reduction which took a lot of necessities off the so-called luxury lists. In my own State of Utah the fact that the admission tax to rodeos and historical pageants was eliminated means the difference between profit and loss to many cities and towns where such entertainment is an important part of our life.

It has been estimated that these excise tax cuts alone will save about $20 per household and that all the tax cuts made by the Eisenhower administration—in just 2 short years—will put an additional $100 in the pocket of the average taxpayer.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have a digest of the tax revision bill, H. R. 8300, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the digest was ordered printed as follows:

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members of a family can be claimed as deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependence deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental illness.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: a family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 will be able to deduct $60. The same family can deduct nothing today.

Third. The bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter will be entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

First. All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, will in effect be exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This will mean a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Second. Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 today pays about $300 in income tax.

Under the bill, his tax is reduced to $60, a saving of $240.

Third. The same exemption will extend to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The bill allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, $10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The bill increases from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million.

AID TO FARMERS

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Second. The bill permits more rapid write-off of the expense of farm machinery, equipment and construction.

Third. Removes tax on the proceeds of the sale of cattle when the sale is necessitated by disease.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans will not be taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The bill exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the bill also provides a simpler method for taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

First. Excludes first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Second. Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings will be entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Third. Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings will exclude the first $50 entirely, and then reduce his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The bill will permit the more liberal write-off of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers will be relieved of the present requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns will be due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The bill grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

No revenue estimate possible. The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The bill brings tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two sets of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

Savings to taxpayers, $47 million.

DEPLETION

The bill increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

PARTNERSHIPS

First. The bill adopts comprehensive provisions concerning the tax treatment of partners and partnerships in order to remove confusion of existing law. Principal objectives are simplicity, flexibility, and equity between partners.

Second. Certain proprietorships and partnerships are given the option to be taxed as corporations.

Savings to taxpayers, $20 million.

INVENTIONS

The bill extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

No revenue estimate possible. The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The bill extends the net operating loss carryback to 2 years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The bill lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The bill removes the 2 percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The bill eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

CORPORATION INCOME TAX

The bill extends for 1 year the present 52 percent corporation income tax.

Total increase in revenue, $1.2 billion.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2054, House bill 9987, to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new-ship construction, and for other purposes.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9987) to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of new-ship construction, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BUTLER. I am happy to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Maryland would agree to yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor, and with the further understanding that we shall attempt to rescind the order for the quorum call.

Mr. BUTLER. I am happy to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am about to make some brief remarks in connection with the bill, H. R. 9987, providing for private financing of merchant ships.

Before doing so, however, I wish to say to the Senate that my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who was the cosponsor of the Senate bill, S. 3219, the companion bill to the House bill, is very much interested in this legislation, but he is now in a meeting of the policy committee and is unable to be present. He asked me to make this brief statement evidencing his interest in the bill.

Also, Mr. President, I note the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is not present. I wish to state for the purposes of the RECORD that during the consideration of this bill in the hearings, the Senator from Washington objected to the bill, and when we reported it, I think he voted against it. He did so not because he was not in favor of the bill or the objectives of the bill, but because he believed that the Government should make all ship-construction funds available as heretofore under title V of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The committee, with the exception of the Senator from Washington, felt that the financing of ship construction was a job which should be undertaken by private enterprise. We felt that, unless the job was undertaken by private enterprise, we would be continually, as we have been in the past, encountering difficulty in obtaining appropriations sufficient to keep our merchant fleet from deteriorating and becoming obsolescent.

With that brief statement, Mr. President, I shall proceed to discuss the bill.

Mr. President, the bill, H. R. 9987, would further amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to facilitate private financing of new ship construction and for other purposes. As Senators probably know, there presently are 2 statutory means by which owners of American-flag vessels may finance 75 percent of the owner's cost of construction in American yards. Title V of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provides for such financing by way of direct Government loans at 3½ percent interest, to be paid back by the ship owner over the

life of the vessel. This method calls for appropriations; and due to budgetary practices these loans, which in the past have proven to be sound investments, are considered as expenditures.

Since 1938 the Merchant Marine Act has provided, through title XI, for Government insurance of loans made by private lending institutions to those who desire to build American-flag ships in American yards. There has been very little private financing of new ship construction under title XI of the 1936 act, as amended. The reason that private lending institutions are unwilling to lend money for such a purpose is that, until last year, there were defects in title XI which could cause the lending institutions trouble in the event of default by the borrower.

First, difficult, tedious, expensive, and long-drawn-out foreclosure proceedings. Second, the necessity for the lending institution to become actively engaged in the shipping business in the event of default by the borrower.

Last year in an attempt to make title XI workable as an effective alternative to title V, Congress passed Public Law 288. Because of what appears to be an unworkable interest-rate provision which we wrote into that law, and because of the requirement that in the event of default by the borrower the lending institutions surrender all collateral obtained from the borrower, even though a maximum of 90 percent insurance of the loan was permitted, that law has not brought forth any private financing of new ship construction.

Therefore, early this session S. 3219 and its House companion bill, H. R. 9987 were introduced. As our report on S. 3219 makes clear, these bills, as introduced, contained certain objectionable features. Every one of those objectionable features has been removed. The bill is now unanimously approved by all segments of the shipping and shipbuilding industries and maritime labor. Indeed, every Government agency concerned has carefully examined it and urges its enactment. The letters of the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget appear in our committee report. As you will note, they recommend enactment of this bill. The technical amendments which they have proposed are now embodied in H. R. 9987 which we here have under consideration.

There are only two things in this bill which should be stressed. First, the bill will not permit any windfall profits such as we have all been concerned with of late by reason of certain FHA appraisal abuses. In a great majority of cases, the Secretary of Commerce is expressly forbidden to pay as insurance any amount in excess of 90 percent of 75 percent of the amount of money actually paid by the mortgagor or borrower for the construction, reconstruction or reconditioning of the vessel in question.

In certain instances, for special-purpose vessels which the Secretary of Defense has certified are essential to the national defense, the Secretary of Commerce may pay as insurance up to but not exceed 87½ percent of the amount paid by or for the account of the mortgagor or borrower. Therefore, in all circumstances, the borrower out of his own capital must have invested at least 12½ percent of his actual cost of construction; and, in most instances, at least 25 percent of such costs. Accordingly, I state without equivocation that having incorporated into this bill the safeguards recommended by the General Accounting Office and the Treasury Department, there can be no windfalls.

Second, I wish to stress, as does our report on S. 3219, that in urging enactment of this bill we are merely trying to make workable for the first time the private financing provisions of the Merchant Marine Act. We tried last year. We failed. This bill should do the job. But, and this I emphasize, in urging enactment of this bill, we are not suggesting that private financing should become a substitute for public financing under title V. Title XI has never been more than an alternative for title V financing, and it is not our intention to alter that situation in any way by this bill. In appropriate cases it is hoped and expected that the Administration will employ title V for the worthy purposes for which it was originally enacted.

In closing, let me state that I am convinced that this bill, the enactment of which has been unanimously urged by Government agencies, shipping and shipbuilding industries and maritime labor, will bring forth a substantial amount of private financing of ship construction. In my opinion, it is essential that it do so because various other important maritime bills which we have passed this year might well be made relatively ineffective if this bill is not passed. I have reference in particular to the tanker long-term charter bill, the trade-in-and-build tanker program and the construction of the four large passenger vessels by Grace and Mormack.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I congratulate the Senator on the very fine work which he has done in connection with this piece of proposed legislation. I think he developed well before the full committee that under existing law, even though it appeared to be very generous insofar as the shipbuilders are concerned, and even though one could properly believe they would be encouraged to build new ships, nonetheless, no ships were being built.

Mr. BUTLER. There has not been a single application under Public Law 288.

Mr. SMATHERS. It was made clear that if we were ever to get any ship construction under way, it would require legislation of this nature. So, Mr. President, I wish personally to subscribe to what the Senator from Maryland has said, and to associate myself with him in his statement. I think the passage of the bill will result in an improved shipbuilding industry in the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my dear friend from Florida, who is always very constructive in his thought and in his actions as a member of the committee, that I hope we can now under this bill build a strong and virile American merchant marine.

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

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I should like to join with my distinguished colleague from Florida in his expression of appreciation of the work of the Senator from Maryland, because my interest and attention have been enlisted in merchant marine activities. From the short time I have had an opportunity to serve on the committee, it is my belief that, under the very capable and able leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and because of the great interest and concern he and all the members of the committee have shown in the subject, we have made a very real contribution to the future of the merchant marine. I know the work is appreciated by everyone concerned with that activity.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank my colleague from Maine. He has been most cooperative and has really done more work on this bill than has any other one member of the subcommittee. I held some hearings on the question, but the Senator from Maine began in the early stages and did a great deal of work on the bill. The people of the country should give him well-deserved credit. I believe the bill will go a long way toward assuring a strong and virile merchant marine, which we so badly need.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, but I feel that the distinguished Senator is entirely too charitable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9987) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the companion bill Senate bill 3219 is indefinitely postponed.

THE DROUGHT-RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very few brief observations concerning the functioning or the lack of functioning of the drought-relief program which is supposed to be in effect in this Nation today.

In my State, as in other agricultural areas of the Nation, there have been some very severe conditions due to prolonged drought and the terrific heat which has all but destroyed this year's crops, particularly the hay crops and the feed and grain crops. There are counties in my State in which farmers who own a few head of cattle have been compelled to place them on the market because they were unable to feed them. They have watched them lose 75 to 100 pounds of beef to the acre.

The Department of Agriculture, after being importuned by the Governor of the State of Georgia and Members of

the congressional delegation, did request that a survey be conducted within the State of Georgia to determine as to whether any of the aid available under existing law might be extended to the farmers of that State.

The survey was conducted by Mr. R. L. Vansant, State director of the Farmers Home Administration activities in my State, a committee consisting of the head of the Extension Service, the Associate Director of the Extension Service, the chairman of the State agricultural stabilization committee, who, incidentally, received his appointment in this administration, and by the agricultural statistician in charge of the agricultural marketing service, and by representatives of various State departments.

Mr. President, the recommendations which grew out of the survey indicated that 108 counties in my State where farming is carried on extensively should be included in any drought disaster relief program.

The survey also indicated that there were 32 agricultural counties of my State which did not have sufficient hay to last for 30 days. Out of the entire State, with 159 counties, only 14 counties were indicated as having hay for sale.

Mr. President, this report is dated August 7. It so happens that I have known Mr. Vansant for more than 40 years. We graduated in the class of 1914 as classmates at the Seventh District Agricultural and Mechanical School at Powder Springs, Ga. We were classmates at the University of Georgia. There is no more careful or painstaking public servant in the employ of the United States Government than is R. L. Vansant. The members of the committee are men of good character and thoroughly familiar with the agricultural situation in Georgia. Despite the fact that the report was forwarded to Washington under date of August 7, to this date no action whatever has been taken to extend any aid whatever to the drought-stricken areas of my State.

I have always tried to avoid a partisan approach to any question, or to impute partisanship to anyone else, but I can but wonder, when I observe counties in States all over the land which are designated as drought areas, entitled to receive at least some measure of relief, why there has been such an unconscionable, unreasonable delay in dealing with the very severe situation in my own State.

At this very hour we are pushing upon those behind the Iron Curtain, in the Communist satellite states, who have suffered from flood and other disasters, all kinds of relief for the benefit of the people who have been stricken. Yet, here we have American citizens who are unable to make their voices heard in the Department of Agriculture, so as to be placed upon the list of those who are entitled to the treatment which their fellow citizens in other areas are receiving, and who have suffered no worse disaster than that which has befallen agriculture in the State of Georgia.

The distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] some weeks ago made a statement on the floor of the Senate as to the very large measure of aid which had been extended to one of the largest farms in the United States, the owners of the King Ranch in Texas. It is appalling to me that the little people of the country—and most of them are little people and small farmers—cannot make their voices heard and secure any recognition whatever even though they are in dire distress.

I realize that this late in the session it is perhaps impossible to secure any legislative drought relief. But I shall take the occasion, in the days to come, if I am spared to serve in the Senate, to express my deep resentment of the very cavalier treatment which has been given to the farmers of Georgia with respect to extending to them the same measure of relief which has been extended to farmers similarly situated in a number of other States of the Nation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am advised that the Department has only $15 million available for its share of the aid program. This strikes me as being much too small, although the Department has not asked for any money. Does the Senator from Georgia think that $15 million is an adequate amount?

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that in the hay program, the only aid which the Department extends it to pay half the cost of the freight on the hay to the drought areas. Even at that, I should think that $15 million would be far from sufficient.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think that that is adequate participation, considering the conditions as he understands them to be?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not; but the difficulty in my State is that there is no participation of any nature whatsoever. I have taken occasion to look into some legislation on the situation. Public Law 480, of the 83d Congress, title 3, extends about as sweeping a grant of power as it is possible to extend to deal with these matters. Other laws also are available, and are now being applied in other areas of the Nation. In my own State, I know of my own knowledge of farmers whose entire crops have been destroyed by the prolonged drought and the extreme heat, who have been unable to obtain any relief whatsoever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of a report and recommendations made by the committee, together with part of the attachment thereto. I did not have time to have all of the attachments typewritten for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator from Georgia think it might be possible for the administration to work out a way to make available some of the surplus grains for feed purposes on a basis which would be more helpful than the so-called 60-cent program? Let us assume that the Senator is able to have his area certified. The difficulty then is that after certification, the aid which is provided is very small in extent.

While in my State 11 counties have been certified for some time, the amount of assistance is so small and so inadequate that it is not of great benefit. Sixty cents on 100 pounds of feed, the market price of which has substantially advanced, is not a great amount of aid.

The Senator is familiar with the extent of surplus grain in storage, belonging to the Government, which, as he has said, is being offered to countries like Hungary. Is there any reason why some way could not be worked out to make the grain available to our own stricken farmers on a basis which would be really helpful?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have said that, in my opinion, there is adequate authority under the law, if there were only a will to afford relief. The Senator from Arkansas has had experience with the program, because some of the counties of his State have been able to receive aid. In my State we have had no experience whatsoever with it, and that is the chief basis of my complaint. The benefits of the aid program have not been applied in Georgia.

I did not give the figures a few moments ago, but I have before me the RECORD containing the statement of the senior Senator from Delaware, in which he stated that the King Ranch has received relief in the amount of $32,585. That is one farmer, one ranch, in the State of Texas. We have been unable to have even one county in Georgia included in the program. I am only asking that the impoverished and drought-stricken farmers of Georgia receive the same treatment as the millionaire ranch owners of Texas who received relief amounting to $32,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps the relief afforded the King Ranch is adequate, but every letter I have received indicates that the relief is not adequate for a farmer who has lost all his feed and hay, to afford him the privilege of going to a dealer and being allowed a 60-cent certificate on a bag of feed which cost $3.50. That is very slight assistance to the farmers in northwest Arkansas, who are trying to keep their dairy herds together. So even if farmers in the Senator's State of Georgia are able to get their counties certified, I will guarantee that that will not be of much help.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am asking only the same measure of relief under the program as others who are in distress. I do not say I would be satisfied with that relief, but certainly I would be satisfied with no less than the treatment accorded other agricultural counties of the Nation.

EXHIBIT A

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DESIGNATION OF DROUGHT AREA EMERGENCY FEED PROGRAM

Pursuant to your directions to me by telephone on July 28, a survey of the drought conditions in Georgia has been completed and the recommendations of the temporary State USDA drought committee and supporting data are transmitted herewith.

The day following your request, I met with the dean of the College of Agriculture and director, extension service, Dr. C. C. Murray, Mr. W. A. Sutton, associate director of

extension service; Mr. John F. Bradley, chairman, State agricultural stabilization committee; Mr. D. L. Floyd, agricultural statistician in charge, Agricultural Marketing Service; Mr. J. C. Holton, representing the Governor of Georgia and the Georgia commissioner of agriculture. Also present were members of the staffs of each official present. This group considered the request for a survey and decided upon the exact information to obtain and the means of doing so.

A directive, along with the questionnaire, was mailed immediately to all county Farmers Home Administration offices in the State, with the request that the reports be mailed to me not later than August 4. In most locations this gave only 3 days in which to complete the survey and prepare the report. All reports were received by August 6. On the afternoon of August 6 the temporary State USDA drought committee met and considered individually the conditions in each county in the State, using the information obtained by the survey, information made available by the USDA Agricultural Marketing Service, personal observations of those present who, as a group, have seen conditions in every section of the State during the past few weeks. Present at this meeting were Mr. Bradley, Mr. Floyd, Mr. Holton, Mr. L. I. Skinner, Assistant Director of Extension Service, Mr. Charles O'Kelley, Economist, Extension Service, Mr. Fleming of the State ASC office, Mr. Slappey of this office and me. At this meeting Mr. Holton represented both the Governor's office and the commissioner of agriculture.

Attached is a list of the counties which the committee recommends for inclusion in the drought disaster area. We are also enclosing the following additional information:

1. A copy of a completed questionnaire prepared in each county recommended for designation. Also enclosed is copy of the bulletin directing the survey.
2. Map showing in red the counties recommended for designation.
3. Pasture conditions as of August 1 for 1952, 1953, and 1954 by crop reporting districts.
4. Corn conditions as of August 1, 1952, 1953, and 1954, by crop reporting districts.
5. Totals of hay and grain on hand and hay and grain needed.
6. List of counties with hay for sale.
7. List of counties without sufficient hay for 30 days.

It has been extremely dry with rainfall substantially below normal during a considerable portion of this entire growing season. Temperatures have also been higher than usual during much of that time. These statements are general, as the situation is somewhat spotted throughout the State. The enclosed map indicates those areas of the State which have not suffered drought or in which the drought has been mild. An area in northwest Georgia, a smaller area in northwest Georgia, an area in west Georgia, and the counties fringing the Florida line and the coast generally have had better moisture conditions. There are a few other isolated spots in which the drought has not been as severe. The worst conditions in general prevail in that part of the State beginning roughly along the northern part of Fulton County and as far south as the lower part of Tift County and reaching from the South Carolina line on the east to the Alabama line on the west, with the exception of the southwest part. In other words, the whole central area of the State has been rather severely affected. There have been many scattered rains which have helped to a limited extent. To the extent that this lack of general rains prevails, the condition in Georgia may worsen rapidly. It should be borne in mind that, while we are not recommending designation of about one-third of the State, there are individual farmers scattered throughout many of these counties who have suffered from the drought. In trying to evaluate the reports and other information available so as to decide whether such conditions actually amount to distressed conditions, the committee took the view that yields and crop and pasture conditions of 75 percent of normal or better could not be considered as disastrous. The committee also gave due consideration to the extent to which livestock farming and dairying is carried on in each county. We also considered in each instance the normal importation of feedstuffs, such as occurs in the counties bordering metropolitan centers.

You will observe that the committee obtained information on the more important cash crops and obtained figures on the amount of corn needed. It should be borne in mind that the reported need for corn is based heavily on the need for hog feed. The committee understands of course that feed for hogs is not included in the emergency feed program, but the entire crop condition situation was obtained in order that the committee could consider the relationships that exist. For example, poor cash crops affect the farmers' ability to purchase feeds. Also, in considering the comparative pasture conditions for the 3 years shown, it must be kept in mind that 1952 was a severe drought year in Georgia and that the entire State was designated under Public Law 875 and Public Law 38.

Georgia has not been an important livestock-producing State but a few years, and the livestock industry is still growing in the State. As a result, we have not yet developed our feed programs to the point that the State can withstand severe drought conditions without involving the importation of feedstuffs. All agencies are working toward feed programs that provide us with more reserve and more ability to withstand adverse conditions in the future.

If the drought is broken soon by general rains, or to the extent that good rains are received locally, the condition reflected here may be alleviated somewhat, particularly with respect to pastures. If we receive rains it is not expected that the need for assistance under this program will reach real large proportions. In any event, however, it appears to the committee that there now exists a need for aid in widely varying degrees in all of the counties recommended. You will appreciate the fact that the committee was forced to exclude from the recommendations some counties which the information indicated had not reached the critical stage. It may be that additional appeals will be received from some of these counties not included in the recommendation. It is believed likely that there will be appeals for loan assistance at a later date. It would be much easier to make a reliable survey with respect to loan needs at a much later date, after these crops have been harvested.

The committee realizes that the information upon which these recommendations are based was obtained very hurriedly in the individual counties, and the consideration of that information by the committee of necessity had to be done hurriedly. Therefore, if there is further information you would like in support of these recommendations or concerning the conditions here, please let us know.

Copies of this report are being furnished to the Governor; Mr. R. B. McLeaish, Administrator, Farmers' Home Administration; and to the heads of agencies represented on the committee.

R. L. VANSANT.

Counties recommended for inclusion in the drought disaster area (108): Cobb, Clayton, Fulton, Franklin, Stephens, Polk, Haralson, Paulding, Madison, Banks, Gwinnett, Forsyth, DeKalb, Oglethorpe, Barrow, Wilkes, Elbert, Lincoln, Dawson, Cherokee, Pickens, Jackson, Walker, Dade, Chattooga, Floyd, Upson, Monroe, Lamar, Carroll, Bleckley, Pulaski, Newton, Rockdale, Taliaferro, Greene, Hancock, Jefferson, Bibb, Crawford, Jones, Putnam, Morgan, Jasper, Spalding, Pike, Henry, Butts, Fayette, Talbot, Taylor, Heard, Troop, Coweta, Peach, Houston, Baldwin, Washington, Warren, Columbia, Glascock, McDuffie, Richmond, Twiggs, Bacon, Appling, Jeff Davis, Laurens, Wilkinson, Dodge, Toombs, Wheeler, Telfair, Jenkins, Montgomery, Treutlen, Bulloch, Bryan, Candler, Chatham, Evans, Emanuel, Screven, Effingham, Johnson, Wayne, Coffee, Atkinson, Tattnall, Burke, Dougherty, Baker, Calhoun, Lee, Irwin, Brooks, Wilcox, Ben Hill, Turner, Worth, Dooly, Crisp, Sumter, Mitchell, Clay, Randolph, Tift, Webster.

Counties without sufficient hay for 30 days (32): Clayton, Cobb, Cherokee, Jackson, Oglethorpe, Upson, Newton, Bibb, Crawford, Morgan, Jasper, Putnam, Houston, Peach, Washington, Baldwin, Appling, Coffee, Laurens, Wilkinson, Toombs, Jenkins, Treutlen, Bulloch, Candler, Chatham, Evans, Wayne, Sumter, Mitchell, Irwin, Wilcox.

Counties with hay for sale (14): Clarke, Lumpkin, Rabun, White, Hart, Catoosa, Douglas, Marion, Taylor, Glascock, Tattnall, Thomas, Worth, Lanier.

SUPPLY OF HAY AND GRAIN AND AMOUNT OF HAY AND CORN NEEDED

Hay (tons), 135,860.

Grain (bushels), 7,918,720.

Hay needed (tons), 30 days, 17,760; 60 days, 32,150; 90 days, 69,095.

Corn needed (bushels), 7,857,500 (includes needs for hogs).

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I concur in the statement made by my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia. I especially commend the character of the man who made the survey at the request or direction of the Department of Agriculture. Among those who were brought into the work of making the survey was the chairman of the State agricultural stabilization committee, who was appointed by this administration. He was selected by the commissioner of agriculture, or at least he must have had the approval of the commissioner of agriculture. He joined in the recommendations which were made; and, as has been pointed out, 108 counties of the 159 in the State were recommended to be included in the drought disaster area. Thirty-two counties were found by the same committee to be without sufficient aid for 30 days. A very few counties in the State have some surplus hay, and some hay might be made available to the counties in this area.

But the information has come to us that the Department of Agriculture was disposed to make no recommendation for the declaration of any drought area in the State. To my personal knowledge, the drought condition in Georgia has been most serious in 1954. It has not been universally so in all parts of the State, but it has been serious in the greater number of agricultural counties of the State. Georgia had a severe drought in the late summer of 1952, a condition which virtually destroyed pasturage for the livestock in some areas of the State. The State, therefore, entered the year 1954 without a bountiful supply of feedstuffs.

There is no question about the actual conditions which now obtain in a large area of the State. When the information first reached me that the Secretary

of Agriculture and the administration were not willing to declare any part of the State to be within an area to which limited assistance, as has been referred to, could be extended, I did not accept it. Yet while there has been no official statement made, so far as I know, the information which comes directly from the Department of Agriculture confirms the earlier report that no part of Georgia would be included in the drought area.

I live in the southern half of the State; and it so happens that in my particular home county at least a portion of the country has had some rain during the last 30 or 40 days; but beond all doubt, two-thirds of my home county would not be able to harvest more than one-fourth of a normal feed crop, or one-third of a fair feed crop. The pasturage has suffered because of the dry weather and the intense heat which we have experienced, and which, for that matter, has been experienced in most of the country during this summer. I am at a loss to know why the Secretary of Agriculture should be unwilling to designate as disaster areas the particular counties in Georgia which are described and covered in the report of Mr. Vansant, who brought together a committee highly representative of all the agricultural interests in the State, with the State department of agriculture, the Secretary, and the Governor himself, or his representative, participating in the survey.

There can be no doubt about conditions in the State, many of which are within my personal knowledge. As early as the early part of May conditions were developing which would, beyond all doubt, justify and demand that high ranking Federal officials in the administration designate the area pointed out in the survey as a disaster area because of drought conditions.

Those conditions still prevail in nearly all the counties included in the survey. Although the survey was made in early August, and was actually transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture on the 7th of August, those conditions still exist. While small areas within or around the fringes of the drought area have been relieved by restricted and local rains, the greater portion of the area remains without any assistance or recognition, and without the benefit of whatever slight assistance might be given.

That is a situation which ought not to have occurred, and the Secretary of Agriculture, even at this late hour, should recommend to the Congress the adoption of a resolution which would result in making available additional funds, if the President is now short of funds, or is operating with very limited funds, in order that some relief may be granted to the drought areas. The conditions in that area, as well as those in the Southeast, have been very serious. There is little reason for keeping a law on the books which provides for relief if the Administrator closes his eyes to facts that exist, as has been done, I regret very much to say, by the Department of Agriculture in this instance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. I point out that even since this report was submitted we have had the hottest weather in the State of Georgia in 75 years, according to the official records.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. Last night I talked with persons in my home in Georgia. I was informed that in a small area small amounts of rain have fallen within the past 30 days. I was advised that heat conditions there have been terrible. Yesterday, I was told, that the temperature reached 103 in the shade.

COPYRIGHTS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2235, House bill 6616, the copyright bill, which goes along with the convention which the Senate formally approved several weeks ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6616) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceded to consider the bill (H. R. 6616) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1953

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3329) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to correct certain inequities, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (d) of section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, approved June 20, 1953 (67 Stat. 77), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 101 of this act in the grade or rank of Chief of Police shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Chief of Police be increased by more than five longevity increases."

SEC. 2. Section 102 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 3. Subsection (d) of section 202 of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The minimum basic salaries contained in subsection (a) of section 201 of this act in the grade or rank of Fire Chief shall not be increased by more than four longevity increases, nor shall the minimum basic salaries of grades or ranks below that of Fire Chief be increased by more than five longevity increases."

SEC. 4. Section 202 of said act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(f) In initially adjusting salaries in accordance with the provisions of this section, any officer or member promoted from a lower grade to a higher grade prior to July 1, 1953, shall receive credit for such part of continuous service in both grades for longevity purposes as is necessary to establish his basic salary, including longevity pay, at least equal to the basic salary he would have received under the provisions of this section in the lower grade had such promotion not been made. Service for future longevity increases of any officer or member whose salary is adjusted under authority of this subsection shall begin as of the date such adjustment became effective."

SEC. 5. Section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 is amended by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by—

"(1) $390, while he is assigned to duty as an aide to the Fire Chief or to a Deputy or Battalion Fire Chief;

"(2) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a regular first driver-operator of a fire department hose wagon, aerial ladder truck, rescue squad, or fire department ambulance;

"(3) $390, while he is assigned to duty as a chief radio technician; and

"(4) $208, while he is assigned to duty as a chief photographer."

SEC. 6. Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 shall take effect as of July 1, 1953, and section 5 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia which begins after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this is an amendment by the House, in conformity with the recommendations of the District Commissioners, to a bill which had previously passed the Senate. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

CARL AND W. J. PIOWATY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1665) for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in this case the House refused to concur in the Senate amendments. I have checked and I find that by receding and agreeing to the House bill as originally passed we could save the Government about $1,400. I have conferred with the author of the bill, the sponsor being from my State. He is perfectly willing to follow that

course, rather than to ask for a conference at this late hour in the session.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recede from its amendments, accept the provisions of the House bill, and complete action upon the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE DROUGHT SITUATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], with respect to the drought situation which is developing so rapidly in our area. I do not think the people of Mississippi are any quicker than others to be concerned about a situation of this kind. They are not ones to come running quickly for relief at the slightest suggestion of a drought or any other calamity of that kind.

The Governor of Mississippi, who is a very experienced and very fine businessman, and has had wide experience, tells me that he has never seen the agricultural situation deteriorate as rapidly and as completely as it has in the past two weeks. In Mississippi there have been sustained temperatures, day after day and week after week, of 102, 103, 104, and 105—several degrees higher than is customary there, and with no rain. The Governor tells me the pastures are drying up, crops are wilting, and dairy herds and beef cattle are rapidly becoming dependent upon special feed, inasmuch as the pastures cannot carry the load. Although he had not filed an application in Washington and has not yet assembled all the factual material regarding the situation, yet as he studies it further, he is amazed at its extent and the rapidity of the development of the decline.

In making this plea, I am not asking for relief as the term is ordinarily understood.

Last year, Mississippi turned back approximately $24,000—almost all the money alloted to Mississippi, although our State received substantial relief in the way of feed, even though it was greatly delayed. So Mississippi is not simply trying to obtain a gift. Last year there was great delay in declaring certain counties eligible for relief although those finally approved were the same counties as originally recommended by the Governor.

Regardless of whatever program is to be carried out, I wish to urge the Department of Agriculture to be alert and to be prompt in taking proper action in this situation, for an ounce of prevention at the right place and right time can be worth so much more than a pound of cure applied later.

I am not particularly alarmed, but I am impressed with the severity and the completeness and the widespread blanket application of the situation to the entire State of Mississippi, although the northern part of the State is affected more severely than is the southern area.

So I join in urging that this subject be given prompt and adequate attention by the Department of Agriculture, and be promptly attended to, and that the Department now send its men to the stricken areas and have them obtain first-hand reports and information, and that the proper action be taken promptly. I submit that matter to the Department of Agriculture, not with a plea for relief merely as a money benefit, but in order to have this emergency met and to avoid a calamity. A positive program should be planned that will meet the realities of this distress. This should include feed and other forms of practical assistance.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr GEORGE], and the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The situation in a very large area of the country is serious; it is critical, and is daily worsening.

Mr. President, the saddest thing about the entire picture is the utter indifference with which the Department of Agriculture regards it.

I wish to say to my distinguished friends, the Senators from Georgia, that in this situation the troubles of their State would not be over, even if they could have prevailed upon the Department of Agriculture to declare their State a part of the disaster area. Some weeks ago, evidence with reference to the drought situation in Oklahoma was submitted to the Department of Agriculture. Prior to that time, portions of Texas and of Colorado and of Wyoming had been designated as disaster areas, and available for assistance under the program which the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to put into effect for such areas. Information was given to the Department of Agriculture with reference to Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture went to Missouri, personally visited a very large part of the State, and recommended assistance for 70-odd counties, which were designated as disaster areas.

I thought it was quite coincidental or quite significant that he managed to get that done in the district of Representative DEWEY SHORT, just a day or two before Representative SHORT's primary election, in which he was in a very hot contest. But regardless of how it happened, Mr. President, I thought the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture was late, not early, in getting it done.

At the same time, some 26 of Oklahoma's 77 counties were so designated—apparently on a hit-and-miss basis, either in complete ignorance of the fact or in total disregard of the fact that most of the other counties in Oklahoma were equally distressed from the standpoint of the drought and its devastation and destruction. Since that time, 11 other counties in Oklahoma have been so designated, making, as of now, a total of 37 counties in Oklahoma to be so designated.

But the farmers in those 37 counties are scarcely more distressed than the farmers in counties which are equally entitled to such a designation, although it has not been made as to them. If the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff had their heads buried in the sand, they could not be in a worse situation of complete indifference and disregard of the realities of the present situation, than their present actions indicate them to be.

Mr. President, someone should put a charge of dynamite under someone in the Department of Agriculture, in order to get the Department to visualize and realize the situation and to meet its responsibilities with reference to it. Today, literally thousands of farm families in the drought-stricken areas of the States which have been mentioned and in States adjacent thereto or nearby have been—as the result of drought and the accompanying disaster—reduced to a position where they can no longer stay on and maintain and operate their farms. Wells which have not gone dry in a quarter of a century, are going dry today. Thousands of farm ponds, which in years past have proven adequate, today are dry. Pastures are burned. Crops have been burned. Yet, Mr. President, the Secretary either refuses to designate these areas as disaster areas, or, having so designated them, refuses to do anything effective to benefit the people of those areas.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I join my senior colleague in calling the attention of the Senate to the disaster which faces our farmers and the need for urgent and speedy action in this drought disaster, particularly in counties which have already been declared to be critical disaster areas.

This is the third straight year, as the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma knows, that these same farmers, cattlemen, and people on small farms have had to suffer from unprecedented drought. This comes on the heels of two preceding droughts, with temperatures ranging from 105 to 120, which are devastating to feed crops and all forms of crop life in the counties which have already been declared to be disaster areas, as well as in neighboring counties, which have not yet been so declared.

We find it difficult to make people understand the urgency of the needs. If help is not extended quickly, we shall see liquidated the farms of the finest farm families in the State of Oklahoma—because of delay. This program must be thrown into gear fast.

It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture should turn this program over to the very best agricultural leaders in the State of Oklahoma. A piece of paper declaring an Oklahoma county a disaster area or a critical disaster area is very poor relief for the hungry livestock and for the devastation we find

on Oklahoma farms. It seems to me that we should treat this situation as we would treat a flood emergency or any other emergency. Time is of the essence in meeting the needs.

I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma. It is time for someone to get busy and coordinate and expedite this program, so that relief for our people can be forthcoming.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for those friendly remarks, which are so pointed and accurate.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does it not seem almost immoral to hear that this country is facing such a tremendous surplus, about which we have been talking—and we are struggling to find a way to do something about the surpluses which we seek to prevent in the future—and now that our warehouses are bulging with surplus grains of nearly all kinds, grains which these people need for feed, still the Department seems to be unable to find a way to make those grains available to farmers who are facing complete disaster, bankruptcy, and the loss of their farms? Surely the Department of Agriculture has enough imagination and energy to do something about this situation. I cannot understand why some plan has not been devised, or some request made for authority. If the Department has no authority, why has not a request been made of the Congress for authority? I understand the Department has the authority.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator can think of anything we can do to put dynamite under the Department and to make it move?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I would put the dynamite under the Secretary of Agriculture, and I would light the fuse, if I thought it would get him off that part of his anatomy which he is wearing out and get him out where the duty and the responsibility exist in this regard.

We cannot find 1 farmer in 500 who will admit or is capable of being convinced that he has a Secretary of Agriculture. It is a tragedy beyond description, Mr. President.

We have an abundance and a surplus of grains, and the Secretary has put a grain program into effect, whereby he directed that farmers in the disaster area be permitted to buy feed made from surplus grain at a price of 60 cents a hundred pounds under the market value. The market value of most of those grains has gone up, since the Secretary issued the order, a greater amount than 60 cents a hundred.

The Secretary has put into effect a hay program, and I wish to tell the Senate what that is. If the State makes a certain contract to supervise, participate, designate, and cooperate, the Department of Agriculture will pay half the freight on hay at a cost not to exceed $10 a ton. I ask Senators what benefit that is to a farmer who cannot pay for the hay, let alone half the freight? It is like placing a sumptuous, alluring feast in front of starving men and building a partition of bulletproof glass between them and the food, placing men with shotguns on guard to shoot them down in case they succeed in breaking through the glass. That would do them as much good as what the Secretary of Agriculture is doing under the guise of putting into effect a drought disaster relief program for certain designated counties.

The Secretary holds out the promise, but the only farmer in the country today who is more disappointed, more disillusioned, and angrier than those who are in an area which has not been designated a disaster area is the farmer who is in an area which has been so designated, and who finds that he is getting nothing by reason of such designation.

Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to make loans. But the Federal Reserve bank would loan money on less collateral and at a lower rate of interest than would the Secretary of Agriculture. He is not loaning money; he is hoarding it. Oh, he is making a record. Farm families who are entitled to relief, and who without it will become casualties, are being denied the opportunity for economic survival. We have been giving away billions of dollars. Mr. President, somehow, in some way, justice must be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. After listening to the Senator from Oklahoma, I judge that his people in Oklahoma feel toward the Secretary of Agriculture much the same as the people of Wisconsin feel toward the Secretary. The Secretary of Agriculture came up there to speak. Did the Senator read the article in the New York Times, commenting on that speech of the Secretary?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I did.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator read that a snow fence was built 25 feet out from the platform to keep the people from tearing the Secretary limb from limb? They were not satisfied with that. Did the Senator read that they built a barbed-wire entanglement a little closer, about 10 feet out, and left 15 feet between? Even with the barbed-wire entanglement that arrangement was not satisfactory. Guards were stationed between the snow fence and the barbed-wire entanglement to guard the Secretary of Agriculture. Did the Senator read that story?

Mr. KERR. I read that story, Mr. President, but I arrived at a little different interpretation of the story from that given by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

As I remember the story, the snow fence and the barbed-wire entanglements were placed in position at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that the people had threatened to tear the Secretary limb from limb?

Mr. KERR. The Secretary's conscience must have been so guilty or his realization of his inadequacy so intense that he promoted the building of that barricade to defend him. Then he asked for an escort of 12 special deputies to protect him.

The facts show that within 2 weeks of that time the farmers in that particular area held a special election and elected a Democratic Representative for the first time, as I understand, in many years. If the President ever gets around to giving the Secretary of Agriculture his just reward and just due, he will decorate him for his efficiency in getting that Democratic Representative elected.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I, too, read the article to which Senators have referred. It is amazing how many different interpretations one can get from an article. I understood that the protective devices, such as the barbed wire, were placed in position for the purpose of protecting the farmers from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. KERR. I must say that that is the most logical interpretation of the situation I have yet heard. It may be that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has put his finger on the correct analysis of the situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to make loans. He has authority to provide feed for the cattle in disaster areas, from surplus crops at any price he wishes to charge.

What he has done is to fix the price at a level which makes it certain that the farmers cannot get the feed. In the meantime, devastation, destruction, and economic bankruptcy march on, totally disregarded by the Secretary of Agriculture, when, by the exercise of the discretion and authority given him, he could alleviate the suffering and prevent much of the destruction which is taking place.

I am glad that Senators have today called upon him for action. While hope springs eternal in the human breast, I must say that if there is anything to be gained from experience and the knowledge of what he has not done, it is quite likely that the hope that he will act is not altogether justified. Nevertheless, I indulge the hope that he will act in a manner which will meet their requirements and the responsibilities of his office.

COPYRIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6616) to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is Calendar No. 2235, House bill 6616, to amend the copyright law.

The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is the question on the passage of the copyright bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I do, indeed. I sincerely regret that I must be a "pinch-hitter" tonight, but the members of the subcommittee who supported this bill are all absent.

Mr. President, on June 25 last, the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification of the Universal Copyright Convention signed at Geneva in September 1952. This chamber manifested its approval of that treaty by the overwhelming vote of 65 to 3.

In order to give effect to the provisions of the treaty, a number of minor changes are required in our domestic copyright law. The present bill, S. 2559, is the implementing legislation which will make the necessary changes.

The substance of the bill has, in fact, already received the attention of this body, because when we took up the Copyright Convention the Senate had to consider the specific changes in our law which would have to be made under the convention. All of these matters were brought to the attention of the Senate, both in the committee report, and in debate on the floor. The convention itself contains obligations which could only be performed by the United States if the changes provided for in this bill were made.

Mr. President, seldom has any legislation been introduced on the floor of Congress which has had such widespread support from so many segments of the American public as has this bill. The volume of favorable correspondence received by the committee from authors, playwrights, composers, publishing companies, library associations, Catholic, Protestants, and Christian Science publication societies, music companies, photographers associations, radio, and television organizations, and motion picture companies, was overwhelming.

That correspondence is an impressive measure of the public conviction that this legislation is necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, I should like to introduce into the record a list I have of the groups which have indicated their support for S. 2559.

I send this list to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senate is considering the House bill instead of the Senate bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am referring to the Senate bill, but I understand the House bill is the bill before the Senate.

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

GROUPS SUPPORTING THE UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION AND THE RELATED LEGISLATION

American Academy of Arts and Sciences; American Bar Association; American Book Publishers Council, Inc.; American Civil Liberties Union; American Council on Education; American Council of Learned Societies; American Library Association; American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Artists Equity Association; Association of American University Presses; Authors League of America; Book Manufacturers' Institute; Catholic Library Association; Chicago Bar Association; Chicago Patent Law Association; Christian Science Church; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Copyright Committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York; Curtis Publications; Federal Bar Association; Hearst Publications; Inter-American Bar Association; Los Angeles County Bar Association; McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; Motion Picture Association of America; Music Publishers Association; Music Publishers Protective Association; Mystery Writers Association of America; National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; National Music Council; Patent Bar Association; Photographers' Association of America; Protestant Church-Owned Publishers Association; Readers' Digest; Song Writers Protective Association.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I previously stated, I am pinchhitting. My remarks were prepared to be directed to the Senate bill, but I am aware of the fact that the House bill is pending.

The bill has the endorsement of virtually the entire organized copyright bar, including both the section of patent trade-mark and copyright law, and the section of international and comparative law of the American Bar Association. Upon joint motion of these two sections, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association on March 8, 1954, adopted a resolution endorsing the provisions of the bills before us.

These bills would make the following changes in our copyright law:

Section 1 of the bill amends section 9 of title 17 of the United States Code, by adding a new subsection (c). The subsection provides that whenever the universal copyright convention shall have come into force between the United States and a foreign state or nation, copyright protection under title 17 of the Code shall extend to the work of an author or copyright proprietor who is a citizen or subject of such foreign state or nation and to the works first published therein. A number of formal requirements are then listed from which such protected works would be exempt. The principal exemptions involved are these:

First. The elimination of the manufacturing requirements as to English language books and periodicals originating in a member state;

Second. The qualification of the right of the Register of Copyrights, seldom if ever exercised, to void copyright in a foreign work for failure to make the required deposit after demand;

Third. The statutory requirements of copyright notice are relaxed;

Fourth. The requirements for a separate proclamation under section 1 (e) is removed.

Section 2 of the bill modifies section 16 of title 17 of the United States Code so as to permit an American author who first publishes a book abroad in the English language to import 1,500 copies of the book. This privilege, which is already enjoyed by foreign writers, has not until now been available to American authors. The bill would remove this discrimination so as to permit Americans, as well as foreigners, to test the market to determine the desirability of printing a run in the United States.

Section 3 of the bill modifies the provisions with respect to the notice required by section 19 of title 17 of the Code, so that an American author or publisher may utilize the symbol C in a circle © as an alternative statutory copyright notice in a book. This change is desirable to permit a single, simple notice to be used by domestic publishers for all books marketed, whether here or abroad.

The changes under sections 2 and 3 of the bill, while not required to implement the convention, are regarded as meritorious by the copyright profession. There has been no objection to them from any source.

It remains to be mentioned that the House of Representatives, on August 3 last, by a more than two-thirds approval, passed the companion bill, H. R. 6616, which is identical with S. 2559.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the proposed legislation is sound as a matter of copyright law and earnestly desired by the professional groups in the United States which are most directly affected. It is, moreover, a measure which is indispensable if we are to give effect to the convention which the Senate has already overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in further explanation of the copyright bill.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON S. 2559

The pending bill, as has been observed previously, would effect a slight change in what we call the manufacturing clause. I think it should be pointed out that this clause does not prohibit imports of books. What it does is to deny the precious right of copyright protection to a foreign author writing in English, unless he also manufactures, prints, and binds his book here.

This may come as a surprise to some of us, but we in the United States who are

accustomed to viewing ourselves as righteous in so many things, have never been solicitous about protecting the rights of foreign authors. In fact, for the greater portion of our history, from 1790 to 1891, it wasn't even possible for foreign writers to secure copyright here. This period was our age of literary piracy. There was nothing in our law to prevent thievery of the great works of that time. Dickens, Thackery, Stevenson, and others were freely pirated, until public opinion demanded the end of this national sin.

At long last, in 1891, a revision of the Copyright Act extended protection to foreign writers on condition that they comply with all our formalities—including the requirement that their works be manufactured in the United States. The manufacturing clause extended to all foreign writers, no matter what the language of their works. Finally this requirement was removed with respect to foreigners abroad writing in a language other than English. Such is its present form.

There may have been a selfish reason early in our history to adopt such an attitude. We were a young Nation, an importing Nation, without an established printing industry. It might have made some sense to say "We will not grant copyright to foreign authors unless they manufacture here." And so we were free to pirate such works, which we did. Dickens and the others saw their works sold without a dime in revenue coming back to them.

But today, the situation is completely different. We are no longer an importing country in the literary and artistic field. We are an exporting country. And it's no small business. Book exports alone account for almost $25 million annually. Receipts from foreign showings of motion pictures account for another $175 million. It is now American authors, American music, American motion pictures, which are desired overseas. It is now we who need protection against piracy and uncompensated use.

But we cannot get the magnificent kind of protection provided for under the Copyright Convention which the Senate approved last June, unless we make some concessions. And virtually all that is asked of us of any significance is the slight modification of that clause on our statutes which requires a foreign subject, residing abroad, who writes in the English language, to have his book printed here in order to get copyright protection. Everyone else who writes in English must manufacture here—including Americans and resident aliens.

The pending bill is so reasonable, so eminently fair, that it is a small price indeed to pay for the benefits which our people will enjoy from a convention which, for the first time, assures them of adequate and sound protection throughout the entire world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 6616 having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2559 is indefinitely postponed.

COMPACT FOR ALLOCATION OF WATERS OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2352, Senate bill 2821, the interstate compact for allocation of waters of the Missouri River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2821) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, to enter into a compact for the allocation of waters of the Missouri River.

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, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for a basinwide, comprehensive program of unified planning for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources projects of the Missouri Basin, and for the coordination of the water resources development of the agencies of the States in cooperation with the agencies of the United States: *Provided*, That existing compacts between the States and decrees of the United States Supreme Court relating to any of the waters of the Missouri River or its tributaries shall be fully recognized: *Provided further*, That any compact negotiated pursuant to this act shall recognize the provisions of existing law that the use for navigation of waters arising in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian, shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial use of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall apply to any area of the National Park System established as of the date of this act or any future areas added by acts of Congress.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner to represent the United States to participate in such negotiations, and who shall make report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and any compact entered into.

SEC. 3. Any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to permit the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa and Minnesota to enter into a compact to establish a basin-wide unified plan for the development of the Missouri River.

The bill provides that there shall be no conflict with or modification whatsoever of the compacts presently existing in the basin among the States, or any part of them; and it further provides that the agencies of the States and of the Federal Government shall cooperate and work together for the orderly development of the water resources of the basin. The sole purpose of the bill is to authorize the States to arrive at an agreement to achieve that objective.

A representative of the United States Government will sit in the proceedings. After the States have agreed, and the compact has been approved by the legislatures of the various States, the subject will then be returned to Congress, and it will be for Congress to determine whether the agreement which has been proposed and entered into by the various States shall be approved by Congress and become the law of the river.

Compacts of this nature have been entered into many times. All precautions have been taken to insure that none of the rights of the several States will be violated.

The governors of all 10 States of the basin have appoved the bill. The committee considered the bill, which was first approved by the Secretary of the Interior and then by the Bureau of the Budget, and reported it unanimously. I know of no reason why the bill should not be passed, because I have heard no objection to it whatsoever.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I ask to have read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 2, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert after the word "law", a comma and the word "and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the amendment to the committee amendment is to correct what I think must have been an error in copying, because the comma and the word "and" appear in the proviso as the bill is printed in the report. The purpose of my amendment is to make the text of the committee amendment as printed in the bill conform with the amendment as set forth in the report on the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct, and the committee accepts the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I merely desire to repeat what I said during the time when the bill was under discussion on the call of the calendar. The bill represents the wishes of the governors of the several States, as set forth in various resolutions which have been adopted from time to time, particularly in their recent meeting at Yellowstone Park.

The Governor of South Dakota, Hon. Sigurd Anderson, has been chairman of the committee of governors during the past year, and in several ways and on various occasions he has expressed to me his deep personal conviction that the States of the Missouri River Basin should have the opportunity to negotiate a compact through their representatives, with a representative of the Federal Government being present, and then to submit the compact to Congress for ratification. That is precisely what the bill proposes to do.

As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has so correctly stated, the bill conforms with the custom and practice of the States in that area and with the proviso contained in the Flood Control

Act of 1944, with respect to the beneficial consumptive use of waters which lie wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian.

In all respects the bill recognizes the desires and aims of the people concerned, and recognizes the authority of Congress over subjects relating to interstate commerce, in that the proposed compact will be submitted to Congress for ratification.

I, therefore, join with the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators in urging the enactment of the bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I join with my colleague in support of the bill. I read into the RECORD during the call of the calendar this afternoon a letter from the Governor of Minnesota. I know that for several years there has been a great deal of interest in the bill in Minnesota, Minnesota is joining with the other States and their administrators in the study of the compact. Therefore, I urge that favorable consideration be given to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from South Dakota, and the Senator from Minnesota in giving my enthusiastic support to the bill. It seems to me what we need to keep in mind is that the bill fits in with the spirit and intent of the compact section of the Constitution of the United States. When the Constitution was adopted it was intended that in matters of interest to groups of States they should be authorized to enter into compacts that involved a consideration of common problems. That is what the bill seeks to effectuate.

Furthermore, I think the Senator from Wyoming went to the very heart of the question when he pointed out that all Congress would be doing when it passed the bill, if it should be passed—and I hope it will be—would be to authorize the respective States to negotiate a compact. The passage of the bill would not result in the adoption of a compact which the States have negotiated. In a sense, it is an authorization bill. It would really authorize the States, under the compact section of the Constitution, to proceed to negotiate a compact.

Surely, no Senator would wish to deny that under the compact section of the Constitution of the United States the subject matter of compacts is one which does not fall, without action by Congress, within the purview and the jurisdiction of the States. All the checks the constitutional fathers intended will be available to us after the passage of the bill, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from South Dakota. The compact will then come back to the Congress of the United States for ratification.

I cannot imagine any sound basis for an objection to the bill from the standpoint of what I consider to be procedural rights of the States. We are dealing with pretty precious rights of the States. We are dealing with a recognition on the part of the Congress of the United States of what ought to be considered the right of States to negotiate compacts within the subject matter and the spirit and intention of the compact section of the Constitution. I think there is such an intention. I think we can take judicial notice of it. In my judgment, no one can doubt it.

My last argument is, and I made it earlier this afternoon when the bill was before the Senate on a call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, that this is the kind of Federal Government-State government cooperation we ought to be encouraging. This is carrying out the kind of Federal-State relationship which results in a true partnership between the States and the Federal Government. I think States should be encouraged to negotiate compacts within the subject matter of the bill, because it is a subject which has been the source of a great deal of discussion in the States for a long time in the past. I think Senators will agree that it has been the subject of considerable disagreement from time to time in the States. There have been divisions of opinion, but at long last——

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say it has been the subject of very bitter disagreement.

Mr. MORSE. Very heated as well as bitter disagreement, but, at long last, on the anvil of compromise, there has been a hammering out of what looks like an equitable and fair solution of this long-standing disagreement.

I think we would be performing a disservice if, as a Congress, we stood in the way of enabling these States to reduce agreements to a compact and then to submit the compact to the Congress and ask for its approval.

I think at this point in my remarks there ought to appear in the RECORD the section of the Constitution to which I have referred, which is to be found in section 10, clause 3, of article I of the Constitution, and reads as follows:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

The authorization to enter into compacts was definitely specified in the Constitution, and I respectfully submit that the proposed compact is in keeping with that section of the Constitution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was surprised when the bill was reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, because under the La Follette-Monroney Act, it was specifically specified that compacts generally should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. This matter deals with navigation, if one reads the bill carefully. After the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I joined in a bill, in which the Senator from Kansas also joined, we were surprised to learn that the late Senator Butler, of Nebraska, introduced a bill authorizing an interstate compact, which he apparently thought related to the apportionment of waters for irrigation and reclamation purposes, including easements of public lands for irrigation purposes.

I am not going to object to the bill, and I did not object when the late Senator Butler came to me and said they had had a hearing on the subject matter and they had agreed to it. After the Governor of my State had also agreed to it, I did not raise any objection.

However, I wish to make it plain that as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary I shall object in the future when a compact comes before the Senate unless it is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is the committee which, under the La Follette-Monroney Act, has jurisdiction of compacts generally. However, in view of the fact that the Governor of my State and the governors of the other States favor it, I shall not object.

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

If there is no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

WHAT KIND OF RELIEF IS THIS?—NEWS ARTICLE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Fallon Standard, of Fallon, Nev., in its issue of August 11, 1954, carries a striking and cogent editorial entitled "What Kind of Relief Is This?" The editorial concerns the failure of certain structures constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Truckee-Carson irrigation district. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WHAT KIND OF RELIEF IS THIS?

It causes one to wonder what kind of disaster relief has been given the Truckee-Carson irrigation district when quake-damaged structures cannot be replaced of materials as good as they were before.

For instance, the concrete Coleman Dam cannot be rebuilt with concrete because Federal regulations say that concrete is permanent material.

It is ironic that if a structure was originally designed and built by the Federal Government that would not stand up under an earth tremor, it must be replaced with wood, brush, and dirt, or flimsy material to merit aid under the disaster area relief program.

Cost of this first reclamation project to be brought into being by the Federal Government has been charged up to the settlers. Soon the bill will be paid in full.

Since it was built 50 years ago, numerous instances of erroneous estimating, of faulty design and poor construction have shown up. Those early engineers hired by Uncle Sam are responsible for that—not the farmers.

It would seem only just that these irrigation works should be rebuilt to perform as was originally intended, and that without the need for seeking relief from disaster funds.

All the benefit they can get from disaster relief funds is to use them for fragile dams, flumes, and takeouts, and then arrange for a bond issue to do the job right, as it should have been done by the Bureau of Reclamation in the first place.

The water users here eventually will be confronted with the excessive burden of

building structures better than they were at the outset.

Either that, or we might join Great Britain, France or some other country getting billions in relief with no questions asked and with no intention whatever of paying anything back—not even a promise of playing ball in this international game of preventing war.

Somewhat the same situation is seen in the Small Business Administration program of aiding owners of buildings that have been shattered by earthquakes.

In order to get loans at almost the same interest rates that are charged by regular loaning agencies, the building owner must be in such financial straits that the bank wouldn't advance the cash. Then the borrower must be listed as a good risk before the SBA will take a chance.

After being disqualified for one type of loan, then qualified as a questionable risk for a Government loan, the building owner is up against another proposition.

His structure that didn't stand the July tremors here cannot be rebuilt with anything better to survive another quake if it should occur.

It would be the same rotten brick, the same foundations without reenforcement, the same flimsy building as before.

The only relief evident in this Federal SBA loan is a slightly lower interest rate and a longer period for repayment.

Were the owner allowed to rebuild more substantially than before, even to enlarge if desirable, the Government would have a sounder loan.

But sound business policies are not characteristic of the Federal Government.

It is either an all-out giveaway, or doling out money on loans of questionable security.

LOCAL SERVICE AIRLINE BILL

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the August 13 issue of American Aviation Daily contains a short article entitled "Local Service Bill Suffers Setback; Chances Slim." The article then goes on to say that the bill, H. R. 8898, now pending on the Senate Calendar after being reported favorably, with amendments, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is going to die on the calendar because it is opposed by officials of the Commerce Department. This article says that these Commerce Department officials "have stepped up their campaign to kill the bill" and implies that they have enough influence with the majority policy committee to prevent the bill from coming to the floor for a vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LOCAL SERVICE BILL SUFFERS SETBACK; CHANCES SLIM

The local service airline bill, H. R. 8898, which was passed in the House and amended in the Senate committee to include the all-cargo air carriers, suffered a major setback in the Senate when objected to on a call of the calendar.

The outlook for eventual and favorable reconsideration of the measure, whether with or without the all-cargo amendment, is considerably dimmed despite the fact it was put at the top of the list for the next call of the calendar. Senate sources are uncertain that there will be another calendar call in the rush for a quick adjournment early in the week.

The only alternative facing the proponents of local service legislation for permanent certification is the difficult task of receiving a favorable ruling from the Senate Republican policy committee to bring up H. R. 8898 for immediate floor action.

Opposition to the pending legislation in any form has openly come from the administration and has been led by Commerce Department officials. Although overridden by committe action in reporting the legislation, the opposition forces have stepped up their campaign to kill the bill.

The all-out effort to defeat the local service bill in the Senate, rather than letting it go through and then having it vetoed at the White House, was launched because it was not believed that President Eisenhower would exercise his veto. A signing of the legislation into law would nullify, possibly destroy a major portion of the Murray-ACC civil air policy report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in my opinion this bill, H. R. 8898, will be passed by an overwhelming majority if it is permitted to be brought to a vote in the Senate. I want to ask the able majority leader whether it is true that the opposition of Commerce Department officials is going to be permitted to prevent this bill from coming to a vote in the Senate, or whether he will now give us assurance that he will permit the bill to come up on motion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to which bill is the Senator from Nevada referring?

Mr. McCARRAN. House bill 8898.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, all I can say is that the bill is one of a great many bills which are under consideration by the policy committee; and its consideration will depend upon the progress we are able to make. Let me say, in my capacity as an individual Senator, that, I happen to be favorably inclined toward that bill. However, it has not been definitely scheduled for consideration.

LABELING OF FOREIGN-PRODUCED TROUT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I call up my motion for reconsideration of the vote by which the Senate concurred in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 2033.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is that the trout bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have sent for the Senator from Idaho, who is not in the Chamber at the moment.

If the Senator from Nevada does not mind waiting, I should like to point out that we are about to dispose of the bill relating to the interstate compact relating to allocation of the waters of the Missouri River.

COMPACT FOR ALLOCATION OF WATERS OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2821) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, to enter into a compact for the allocation of waters of the Missouri River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2821) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the attainment of the conservation and development of the water resources of the Missouri Basin, and for other purposes."

ACCUSATION OF FAVORITISM AGAINST THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on August 16, last, a spokesman for the Democratic Party in a public address attempted to impugn the motives and actions of the President of the United States, by inferring some sinister action in connection with a contract noted in the legislation affecting the purchase and distribution of electric power.

I shall not indulge in any discussion of the merits of that legislation, but shall confine my remarks to one thesis: namely, the Presidency of the United States of America.

The President of the United States is the leader of the free world. His office exemplifies all that free men yearn for—free government and honest government. The man who holds that office, be he a Republican or a Democrat, is looked upon by free men the world over as the man to lead a darkened and disheartened world to light and freedom. To destroy the integrity of that high office is to destroy the only possible leadership for free men in the world today. To create the impression that the Chief Executive of this Nation would stoop to sharp practices is to present a sorry picture of the American political system at work.

We in America are born to the idea that it is our inalienable right to criticize our President. Other peoples throughout the world have been taught for centuries that the head of State can do no wrong, that criticism of the sovereign is unthinkable. They find it hard enough to understand our customary and every-day criticism of our President's acts and pronouncements; but when that criticism challenges the integrity of our President, it becomes totally nonunderstandable, and the United States, its institutions and our boasted free Government lose caste in the eyes of the world.

This Nation lost caste enough when—for shame—we demonstrated to the world that manhood under our system could breed traitors the likes of Alger Hiss, et al.

In these serious days of unrest and indecision on the part of millions of people around the world, there can be no justi-

fication for a purely political attack upon the integrity of the President of the United States.

At a time when the slightest deviation from correct American thinking could bring a terrible holocaust in this troubled world, it little befits any American or any American organization to degrade in the slightest degree the office of the leader of the Free World, the President of the United States.

The personal integrity of the present occupant of the White House needs no defense from me or from anyone else. The integrity of the office of the President of the United States, however, is a precious asset of all free people, and should be jealously guarded at all times, more especially in these times, by all Americans, of whatever political faith.

So, Mr. President, I, for one, condemn this attack on President Eisenhower. While the attack in question was obviously intended to be a brilliant political move for American consumption, in reality it is a thoughtless and un-American blow against the leader of the Free World and all that the Free World stands for—honest free government.

SANTA MARIA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1801, House bill 2235.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.

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 (H. R. 2235) which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am happy to rise to speak briefly in support of the pending measure.

House bill 2235 originated in the House of Representatives, and authorizes a project which is referred to by the Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, as "Santa Maria project, South Pacific Basin."

The Santa Maria Valley is located in the northern part of Santa Barbara County, Calif. The area affected by the project consists of approximately 40,000 acres of land under irrigation or capable of being placed under irrigation. I understand that, on the average, three crops are grown every 2 years.

The people in the area have handled their land in such a way that the fertility of the soil has not been depleted. Farming in the area has conformed to good conservation practices.

The project report was submitted by letter of transmittal, signed by Secretary McKay, dated July 20, 1953, and was contained as a preface to the report which is referred to as House Document 217, 83d Congress, 1st session. In transmitting the report, Secretary McKay said, in part:

> The report and copies of all the comments were transmitted to the President, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submittal of the report to Congress. A copy of Assistant Budget Director Rowland Hughes' letter of July 9, 1953 is enclosed.
>
> I recommend that the project be authorized.

Very complete hearings were held on the project by the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and both the House subcommittee and the House Interior Committee recommended the project. The bill was then passed by the House and was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill was recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, on July 9, with very minor amendments, and was recommended by the full committee on July 8, 1954.

The principal physical features of the project are as follows:

The project is designed to furnish a supplemental water supply for the irrigated lands of the Santa Maria Valley, to which I have referred. The project plan provides for the multiple-purpose Vaquero Dam which will be an earthfill dam providing a reservoir having a capacity of 214,000 acre-feet.

The project is unique, in that no surface water will be furnished to the irrigated land. Mr. President, I wish to repeat that the project is unique in that no surface water will be furnished to the irrigated land. The conservation capacity of the reservoir would be released, after the winter storms are over, into the stream bed of the Santa Maria River, where the water would percolate underground and would recharge the underground water sands and gravels; and the water would then be pumped from this source for irrigation. In other words, Mr. President, the individual pumps owned by those who are tilling the soil in that area would continue to be used as they are used today.

As is usual in flood-control projects, all flood-control water would be released to the ocean as soon as the stream bed could carry such water to the ocean in safety.

The project would furnish an average of 18,500 acre-feet of additional water for irrigation. It is anticipated that this additional supplemental water would take care of the needs of this area for many years to come.

The costs of the project have been estimated as of October 1952 prices. The total estimated cost is $16,982,000, of which $3,031,000 is assigned to flood control and will be nonreimbursable, and $13,969,000 is assigned to water conservation and would be repaid by the local interests. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that the annual costs of maintenance and operation would amount to $41,600.

As I have pointed out, the project was found to be feasible, and was approved by the former Secretary of the Interior under the prior administration, and the present Secretary of the Interior under the present administration. The project report has also been approved by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the United States Department of Agriculture, the State of California, and other interested agencies.

The annual equivalent direct benefits of the project as a whole are estimated to be $1,911,000, of which $600,000 is considered to result from flood control and $1,311,000 from conservation benefits.

I repeat, Mr. President, that $600,000 is estimated by the agencies involved to be the annual equivalent of benefits based on flood control, and $1,311,000 is the estimate of benefits from conservation. This results in a very high benefit cost ratio of 1.87 to 1. The intangible indirect benefits are estimated to equal an additional $1 million, resulting in a total overall benefit cost ratio of 3 to 1.

Based upon the estimates as of October, 1952, the local interests would be obligated to pay to the Government $350,000 per year over a 40-year period.

The Santa Maria Valley Water Conservation District was organized under the laws of the State of California in 1936 and has the legal authority to contract to pay back to the Government these capital costs. Santa Barbara County has also been farsighted in preparing to take care of its water problems, and the county itself organized the Santa Barbara County Water Agency under State law, and this agency will also participate in the repayment contract.

The United States Government will be thoroughly protected in recouping the construction costs allocated to reclamation. The estimates of the Bureau of Reclamation show that the repayment capacity per acre of land in the Santa Maria Valley is $105 per acre. Class 1 lands have a repayment ability of $42 to $163 per acre, with a weighted average of $115 per acre, and class 2 lands vary from $42 to $105 per acre, with a weighted average of $65 per acre. This results in an overall weighted average ability to pay of $105 per acre.

I wish to reiterate the fact that all agencies involved have approved this compact; the Members of the House of Representatives from California on both sides of the aisle have approved it; and the local people involved, representing all walks of life, have approved it.

Mr. President, I come from a State which is essentially a semiarid State. I come from a State which is increasing in population at the rate of 1,000 a day. I come from a State which needs to conserve and put to beneficial use all the water it can, up and down the 1,100 mile coastline of the State.

We have here an instance in which two rivers come together in Santa Barbara County, which I may describe for Members of the Senate as being about midway between Los Angeles County and San Francisco County, and where annually there are flood damages and water is completely wasted. So the Government, through its agencies, determined that the way to cope with the problem, the way to prevent flash floods, and the way to impound the waters which otherwise would waste into the sea and put them to beneficial use was to build an earth reservoir; not providing

for surface distribution of the water, but rather allowing the water in the dry periods during the year to go out from the reservoir and percolate down through one of the two river beds. To that extent the water would replenish the underground water supply which, over the years, has decreased.

Since I am talking about an area which is adjacent to the Pacific Ocean, obviously such a location would increase the possibility of salt-water intrusion.

When the bill was brought up on the calendar call some time ago, my friend, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] raised a question. I should like tonight to anticipate the Senator's question and endeavor to clear up the doubt he has had in his mind, while at the same time explaining to Members of the Senate what is involved.

When the bill came to the floor of the House of Representatives, one of the Members of the House from California was most zealous in his desire to have the acreage limitation provisions continued in the reclamation laws of America. So he went into the subject carefully, as did the members of the committee and the Bureau of Reclamation. It was decided unanimously that when water percolates into the ground from the alluvial soil of a riverbank which is dry many months in the year, we have a situation in which the underground water table is raised, but it is impossible physically and legally to determine and apply any acreage limitation. Therefore, an amendment was written into the bill very specifically. Because the bill is very short, Mr. President, I wish to read it at this time:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct the project for irrigation and the conservation of water, flood control, and for other purposes, on Santa Maria River, Calif., pursuant to the laws of California, and, otherwise substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior dated January 16, 1953, entitled "Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.," in relation to the Vaquero Dam and Reservoir and any other conservation feature of the project: *Provided*, That in view of the special circumstances of the Santa Maria project, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat, 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable thereto—

And underline this language, Mr. President—

so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir: *Provided further*, That a repayment contract not exceeding a period of 50 years be executed prior to commencement of construction of the works herein authorized.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for the purposes of this Act not to exceed $16,982,000.

I believe I have presented a thumbnail sketch of a unique situation, which has resulted in the unanimous approval by the agencies involved of the bill before us; and I very much hope that my brethren in the Senate will see fit to pass the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk. I am not asking for its consideration at this time. First I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold offering his amendment until the committee amendments have been disposed of?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Do we have an understanding that the adoption of the committee amendments will have the effect of leaving the bill as a so-called clean bill, and that further amendments may be offered to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know of such an agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I am asking whether we may have such an agreement. I am asking that the committee amendments may be agreed to en bloc with the understanding that agreeing to them will not subsequently prevent the offering of amendments to the bill, even though the language of such an amendment may involve language in a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. I ask such unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the committee amendments are adopted, will it be in order for the Senator from South Carolina to offer his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is out of order at this time. It will not be in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended, be considered as the original text for purpose of further amendment. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are, on page 1, line 6, after the name "California", to insert "pursuant to the laws of California, and, otherwise"; and on page 2, line 7, after the word "reservoir", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That a repayment contract not exceeding a period of 50 years be executed prior to commencement of construction of the works herein authorized."

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe my amendment is at the desk. I make the point of no quorum at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum.

LABELING OF FOREIGN-PRODUCED TROUT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum? The Senator from Nevada has a matter he wishes to bring up at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I withhold it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of my motion heretofore entered, to reconsider the action of the Senate in concurring in the House amendments to S. 2033, providing for the labeling of foreign-produced trout.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as acting majority leader, I consent to that course being followed, because I believe the question should be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I call up my motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed, with amendments, to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill S. 2033, relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout.

I have in mind several amendments which I want the Senate to consider; but I want to point out that whether or not my amendments are considered or adopted, it is necessary that this bill be called back, because of an unfortunate parliamentary situation resulting from the action of the Senate on Thursday.

The Senate attempted, on Thursday, to amend one of the House amendments to this bill, and also to amend certain language in the Senate text, which had not been amended by the House.

Of course, the Senate had a perfect right to amend the House amendment; but the Senate could not by motion amend the language of the bill as it had previously passed the Senate and as it had been accepted by the House of Representatives.

The amendments which the Senate sought to make were entirely technical, involving only the change of a section number in order to recognize a recently enacted law and avoid having two sections in the code numbered the same. But even though this is only a purely technical amendment, it must be accomplished in a proper parliamentary manner.

The net effect of what the Senate did on Thursday, therefore, was to amend

the language of the House amendment, but not to make a similar amendment in the Senate language. Since the language in the two places in the bill interacts, the result is confusion.

It is necessary to reconsider the action the Senate attempted to take, and the action the Senate did take, on Thursday, because such action, being only partly effective, is worse than no action at all. What the Senate sought to do, on Thursday, can be accomplished by concurrent resolution; and I have prepared such a concurrent resolution, and will offer it as soon as the Senate has reconsidered its action of Thursday, which can be done by agreeing to my motion to reconsider. Then, after this technical correction has been taken care of, the bill will still remain open to amendments to the House amendments, and I shall then offer the amendments which I have in mind.

I now submit the concurrent resolution, which is designed——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his submission of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to reconsider the Senate action in concurring in the House amendments to Senate bill 2033.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, the Senator from Nevada entered notice that at a later date he would move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate concurred in the House amendments to S. 2033. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is about to make his motion to reconsider the action of the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The motion to reconsider would be subject to a motion to lay on the table, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If a motion to lay on the table is made, it will cut off debate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am merely making the inquiry. The majority leader is not contemplating making such a motion. As I said to the Senator from Nevada earlier today, there is a possibility that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may desire to move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. As a matter of courtesy, the Senator from Idaho did not wish to make that motion without giving the Senator from Nevada an opportunity to present his case, so to speak, in explanation of his point of view as to the necessity of an amendment. I wish to be certain that the Senator from Idaho, if he desires to make such a motion, will not be foreclosed from making it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nevada to proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider the Senate action in concurring to the House amendments to S. 2033.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That motion will be subject to debate until the time a motion is made to lay it on the table. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent request to proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to reconsider the action of the Senate in concurring in the House amendments to S. 2033. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the motion.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I now submit a concurrent resolution which is designed to make the necessary change which the Senate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold submitting the concurrent resolution? The question now is on the motion to reconsider the Senate action in concurring in the House amendments to S. 2033.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I intend to make a motion to lay that motion on the table. I have withheld it merely to extend to the Senator from Nevada the courtesy of an opportunity to make his statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator wishes to have an imperfect bill go out of the Senate again, he may make his motion, and the bill will go out again in that fashion. I have been trying to correct a mistake that has been made on the Senate floor. However, if the Senator wishes to make a motion to table my motion, he will have to take his chances.

Mr. DWORSHAK. On Friday evening, when the Senator from Nevada asked unanimous consent to have the papers returned from the House, so that he could move to reconsider the vote, the Senator from Idaho, without having had any advance notice of the proposed action, extended a courtesy to the Senator from Nevada by not objecting, so that it might be possible for the Senator from Nevada to discuss the question.

However, the Senator from Nevada is an astute parliamentarian, and I am sure he knows, in view of the fact that the House has spent parts of 2 days in debating the bill, that all that is necessary is for the Senate to take this action again by concurring in the House amendments and returning the bill to the House in order to make a typographical correction, and that is the only procedure which confronts us, other than perhaps action on the concurrent resolution to which the Senator has referred. That, of course, would block action, because the House has served notice that it will not take any action on it.

I have assurances from the Senator from Nevada that, realizing the importance of the bill which passed the Senate 14 months ago, he has no desire whatever to kill the measure, which has the overwhelming support of various organizations throughout the country, such as the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sports Fishing Institute, Field and Stream magazine, and various fish and game organizations in 38 States.

I point out to the Senator that he is in reality jeopardizing the status of this bill, and I am sure he does not have that in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Idaho is about to make a motion to lay my motion on the table. Therefore I ask that the concurrent resolution which I intended to submit be inserted in the RECORD at this point, so that those who run may read and see whether I am trying to impair the bill. I am trying to improve the bill so that it may be legislatively worthy of passage. But if the Senator wants to make his motion, that is his right.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's friendly spirit, and I am sure he wishes to cooperate; but, in view of the fact that all the interested organizations and the fish-hatchery industry of this country favored the enactment of the bill which passed the Senate 14 months ago, it would be unwise to initiate any parliamentary action which would probably foreclose final action on the bill during the remaining days of this session. I am sure the Senator is cooperative. I have no desire to prevent the Senator from Nevada from presenting his views. He has done so, I am sure. If he desires to continue, I shall be glad to have him do so. If he wishes to submit any other proposals, such as a concurrent resolution, he has the right to do so. But, under the circumstances, in view of the overwhelming support of the various organizations and of the industry directly concerned with this legislation, the Senator from Idaho, as the author of the bill, has no other alternative than to move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, has the Senator made his motion? If he has, I am cut off.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have been withholding it in order to permit the Senator from Nevada to make any statement he desires to make.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed concurrent resolution be now inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2033) relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear in public eating places serving such trout, the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to make the following corrections in the engrossed bill:

On the first page, line 8, strike out "408" and insert in lieu thereof "409."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "408" and insert in lieu thereof "409."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Idaho made his motion to lay on the table?

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the Senator from Nevada has completed his statement, I so move.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Idaho moves to lay on the table my motion to reconsider, I shall go no further. He can make his motion if he so desires, but he is finishing the bill if he makes his motion. That will be the end of it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Nevada to reconsider the action of the Senate in concurring in the House amendments to Senate bill 2033 be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	McCarran
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bowring	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Reynolds
Cooper	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kennedy	Russell
Crippa	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smathers
Ellender	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Lehman	Stennis
Frear	Lennon	Symington
Fulbright	Long	Thye
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Goldwater	Malone	Williams
Gore	Mansfield	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that the vote by which the Senate concurred in the House amendments to Senate bill 2033 be reconsidered.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SANTA MARIA PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2235) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Santa Maria project, Southern Pacific Basin, Calif.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment was, on page 1, between lines 2 and 3, to insert the following: "Part I"; on page 2, after line 14, to insert the following:

PART II

TITLE I—EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

SEC. 101. (a) Section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
1	$2,670	$2,750	$2,830	$2,910	$2,990	$3,070	$3,150
2	2,920	3,000	3,080	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400
3	3,120	3,200	3,280	3,360	3,440	3,520	3,600
4	3,345	3,425	3,505	3,585	3,665	3,745	3,825
5	3,580	3,705	3,830	3,955	4,080	4,205	4,330
6	3,985	4,110	4,235	4,360	4,485	4,610	4,735
7	4,415	4,540	4,665	4,790	4,915	5,040	5,165
8	4,850	4,975	5,100	5,225	5,350	5,475	5,600
9	5,315	5,440	5,565	5,690	5,815	5,940	6,065
10	5,775	5,900	6,025	6,150	6,275	6,400	6,525
11	6,235	6,435	6,635	6,835	7,035	7,235	
12	7,390	7,590	7,790	7,990	8,190	8,390	
13	8,780	8,980	9,180	9,380	9,580	9,780	
14	10,040	10,240	10,440	10,640	10,840	11,040	
15	11,240	11,490	11,740	11,990	12,240		
16	12,440	12,640	12,840	13,040	13,240		
17	13,440	13,640	13,840	14,040	14,240		
18	14,800						

"(c) (1) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates						
1	$1,980	$2,040	$2,100	$2,160	$2,220	$2,280	$2,340
2	2,590	2,660	2,730	2,800	2,870	2,940	3,010
3	2,722	2,802	2,882	2,962	3,042	3,122	3,202
4	2,920	3,000	3,080	3,160	3,240	3,320	3,400
5	3,144	3,224	3,304	3,384	3,464	3,544	3,624
6	3,370	3,450	3,530	3,610	3,690	3,770	3,850
7	3,605	3,705	3,805	3,905	4,005	4,105	4,205
8	3,925	4,050	4,175	4,300	4,425	4,550	4,675
9	4,360	4,485	4,610	4,735	4,860	4,985	5,110
10	4,795	4,920	5,045	5,170	5,295	5,420	5,545

"(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $2,870 per annum, and head charwomen working part time at the rate of $3,010 per annum."

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding schedule or longevity rate in effect on and after such date;

(2) If the employee is receiving a rate of basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between 2 scheduled or 2 longevity rates, or between a scheduled rate and a longevity rate, provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the 2 corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

(3) If the employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in any one of the first 10 grades of the General Schedule or in any one of the grades of the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule, and is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive basic compensation without change in rate until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended;

(4) If the employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 11, 12, 13, 14, or 15 of the General Schedule, and is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive basic compensation without change in rate until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

SEC. 102. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by 5 percent, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than $440 per annum or less than $170 per annum.

(b) The limitations of $10,560 and $14,355 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph under the heading "Salaries of Supporting Personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1955, or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

SEC. 103. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 5 percent of the aggregate rate of his rate of basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, the provisions under the heading "Increased Pay for Legislative employees" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, and the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), except that no such officer or employee shall be paid additional compensation at a rate less than $170 per annum or in excess of $440 per annum.

(b) Section 2 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out "$11,646" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,086."

(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

(A) $2,160 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than 3 million;

(B) $2,400 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 3 million or more but less than 5 million;

(C) $3,120 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 5 million or more but less than 10 million; and

(D) $3,180 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 10 million or more.

(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended by striking out "$5,880" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,280"; by striking out "$7,320" and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,620"; and by striking out "$8,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,640."

(d) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the legislative counsel of the Senate, the legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, and the coordinator of information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 5 percent, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than $440 per annum or less than $170 per annum.

(e) (1) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.).

(2) The limitations in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the House" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.), are hereby increased by 5 percent.

(f) The Official Reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection.

(g) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 104. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $14,240 per annum."

SEC. 105. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, 79th Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 5 percent, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than $440 per annum or less than $170 per annum.

(b) Section 8 (d) of Public Law 293, 79th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out "$12,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13,240."

SEC. 106. The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 5 percent, except that no such rate shall be increased by more than $440 per annum or less than $170 per annum.

SEC. 107. The rate of basic compensation of the Treasurer of the United States shall be at the maximum scheduled rate of the highest grade established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, no rate of compensation which is $14,800 or more per annum shall be increased by this act, and no rate of compensation shall be increased by this act to an amount in excess of $14,800 per annum.

SEC. 109. Section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 836) is amended by striking out "$9" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12."

SEC. 110. This title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of its enactment.

TITLE II—POSTAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 201. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) it is both necessary and desirable that an equitable system should be established for the classification of positions and the determination of salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; and

(2) such classification and salary system should be established after a study of all problems relating thereto conducted by a commission composed of representatives of the Congress, the Post Office Department, and postal employees, and through the enactment of appropriate legislation pursuant to recommendations submitted to the Congress by such commission following the completion of such study.

SEC. 202. (a) The rates of basic compensation, other than rates referred to in subsection (b) of this section, of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service whose rates of compensation are prescribed by the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, are hereby increased by 5 percent except that no such rate shall be increased by more than $440 or less than $200 per annum.

(b) (1) That part of the compensation schedule headed "Grades and Salaries of Employees in the Automatic Grades" and contained in section 11A of such act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, which provides hourly rates of compensation, is amended to read as follows:

"Hourly rates

"Clerks in post offices of the 3d class; carriers in village delivery service	$1.435	$1.485	$1.54	$1.59	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Charmen and charwomen	1.495	1.55	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Mail handlers, messengers, watchmen; operators of the pneumatic tube service; garagemen-drivers	1.645	1.695	1.75	1.80	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Special delivery messengers in post offices of the 1st class	1.645	1.695	1.75	1.80	$1.855	$1.905	$1.96	--------	--------
Clerks; carriers in city delivery service; driver mechanics; general mechanics; dispatchers of the pneumatic tube service	1.695	1.75	1.80	1.855	1.905	1.96	2.01	$2.065	$2.115
Postal transportation clerks	1.80	1.855	1.905	1.96	2.01	2.065	2.115	--------	--------
Special mechanics	2.02	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

(2) The rates of basic compensation of postmasters at post offices of the fourth class are hereby increased by 5 percent.

(c) This section shall not apply to skilled-trades employees of the mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees who are paid on a feee or contract basis.

(d) The increases in rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not apply to longevity salary increases.

SEC. 203. Section 16 (r) of such act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, which relates to travel allowances for employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty, is amended by striking out "$6 per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9 per day."

SEC. 204. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of the enactment of this title shall not be considered as an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in the case of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service who transfer or are transferred to positions within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 205. In the exervise of the authority granted by section 81 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended, the Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to grant, as of the effective date of this section, additional compensation to postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, based on the additional compensation granted by this act to similar employees in the field service of the Post Office Department of the United States.

SEC. 206. This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

SEC. 207. (a) Section 7 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

Method of payment

"SEC. 7. (a) The compensation of postmasters and per annum rate employees shall be paid in 26 installments. Each such installment shall be the compensation for a pay period of 2 weeks. The compensation of hourly rate substitute employees and other hourly rate employees shall be computed for each pay period of 2 weeks on the basis of the number of hours of work performed by such employees during such pay period.

"(b) To compute an hourly rate for postmasters and per annum rate employees, the per annum rate shall be divided by 2080.

"(c) To compute a daily rate for postmasters and per annum rate employees, the hourly rate shall be multiplied by the number of daily hours of service required.

"(d) Subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall not apply to carriers in the rural delivery service. Whenever, for pay computation purposes, it is necessary to convert the basic annual rate of compensation of carriers in the rural delivery service to a basic daily or biweekly rate, the following rules shall govern:

"(1) An annual rate shall be divided by 312 to derive a daily rate.

"(2) A daily rate shall be multiplied by 12 to derive a biweekly rate.

"(e) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(f) When a pay period for any postmaster or employee begins in one fiscal year and ends in another fiscal year, the gross amount of the earnings of such postmaster or employee for such pay period may be regarded as a charge against the appropriation or allotment current at the end of such pay period."

(b) Section 8 of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) The salaries of postmasters, assistant postmasters, and supervisors paid under the provisions of this section shall be readjusted at the beginning of the first complete pay period in each fiscal year."

(c) Section 9 (b) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "The salaries of superintendents and assistant superintendents of classified stations shall be readjusted at the beginning of the first complete pay period in each fiscal year."

(d) Section 11A of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out "and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the top automatic grade" and by inserting in lieu thereof "and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the first complete pay period following 52 weeks of satisfactory service in each grade to the next higher grade until they reach the top automatic grade."

(e) Section 13 of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by adding immediately after subsection (a) thereof a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The salaries of employees paid under the provisions of this section shall be readjusted at the beginning of the first complete pay period in each fiscal year."

(f) Section 14 of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by adding immediately after subsection (a) thereof a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The salaries of employees paid under the provisions of this section shall be readjusted at the beginning of the first complete pay period in each fiscal year."

(g) That part of subsection (1) of section 14 of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Temporary employees in the custodial service paid on an annual basis shall be paid at the rates of pay of grade 1 of the position in which employed and shall, at the beginning of the first complete pay period following 52 weeks of satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position; and temporary employees in the custodial service paid on an hourly basis shall be paid at the rates of pay of grade 1 of the position in which employed and shall, at the beginning of the first complete pay period following 52 weeks of satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position."

(h) Section 15 (b) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended by striking out "and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 8", and by inserting in lieu thereof "and shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the first complete pay period following 52 weeks of satisfactory service in each grade until they reach grade 8."

(i) That part of section 18 (f) of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, which precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Each temporary employee in the mail-equipment shops paid on an annual basis shall be paid at the rate of pay of the lowest grade provided for a regular employee in the same type of position in which such temporary employee is employed, and shall, at the beginning of the first complete pay period following 52 weeks of satisfactory service in each pay status, be advanced successively to the rates of pay of the next higher grade of such position."

(j) The first section of the act of April 15, 1947 (Public Law 35, 80th Cong.), as amended, is amended by striking out "shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade" and by inserting in lieu thereof "shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the first complete pay period following 52 weeks of satisfactory service in each grade."

(k) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the amendments made by this section are hereby repealed or modified to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of and conform to such amendments.

SEC. 208. (a) (1) There is hereby established a Commission on Postal Field Service Classification (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission") to be composed of (A) the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, (B) the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, (C) the Postmaster General, (D) two officers or employees of the Post Office Department to be appointed by the President, and (E) two representatives of postal employee organizations to be appointed by the President.

(2) The Postmaster General shall be Chairman of the Commission. Vacancies in the membership of the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. Five of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Commission shall fix the number of members who shall constitute a quorum for each subcommittee thereof.

(b) The Commission, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct or cause to be conducted a thorough investigation and study for the purpose of developing a plan for the establishment of a uniform, integrated, and equitable classification and pay system for all postmasters, officers, employees, and positions in the postal field service.

(c) The Postmaster General is authorized to make available to the Commission such personnel, facilities, and services of the Post Office Department as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of the Representatives are authorized to assign from time to time the members of the staffs of their respective committees to duties and responsibilities in connection with the operation of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, on or before March 1, 1955, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations (including drafts of legislation to carry out such recommendations) as it deems advisable.

SEC. 209. Section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 253, 82d Cong.), as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 210. This title shall take effect as follows:

(1) Sections 206 and 208 and this section, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act;

(2) Sections 202, 204, and 205 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act;

(3) Sections 203 and 209 shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month following the calendar month in which this act is enacted; and

(4) Section 207 shall take effect upon such date, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, as may be designated by the Postmaster General.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader two or three questions without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have sent to the desk an amendment which is the same amendment the committee reported unanimously, which in general would increase the pay 5 percent.

I ask the majority leader if he intends to schedule my bill for consideration. If not, I shall press my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The policy committee met today, and listed a number of bills. I have advised the minority leader that the amount of additional legislation the Senate can consider will depend upon the progress we can make on the schedule of legislation before us at this time.

As I understand the Senator's amendment—and he can correct me if I am mistaken—in effect it attaches the postal pay bill to the pending business before the Senate, which is H. R. 2235, Calendar 1801, reported by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs dealing with a needed dam for water in Santa Maria, which is not to provide power facilities or major irrigation facilities, but merely to conserve the ground waters.

Under the rules of the Senate, of course, there is no rule of germaneness. An amendment might be offered to attach the FEPC bill, the poll-tax bill, or any one of a dozen other nongermane subjects to this or any other bill before the Senate. Of course, almost any bill which we plan to take up could be killed if such a nongermane motion should prevail.

The same thing might be done to the upper Colorado River Basin bill. The same type of nongermane amendment might be offered to the school-construction bill. We expect to take up the railroad retirement bill; and the same type of nongermane amendment might be attached to that.

I would not recommend it, because I think it would jeopardize all of those bills if that were done, in the same way that I would resist attaching an FEPC amendment to a bill which did not relate to that subject matter.

I do not wish to foreclose the Senator's opportunity for discussion. I desire to extend him every courtesy. I think the proposed legislative procedure is wrong in connection with the proceedings of the Senate during consideration of our Legislative Calendar, and after the Senator has made his remarks I intend to move to lay the amendment on the table. Normally I would not move to table a

germane amendment, but I feel amply justified in doing so at the proper time in the case of a nongermane amendment. I thought in fairness to the Senator I should make this explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator has not answered the question which I asked. I want to know if my bill is to receive consideration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I cannot assure the Senator that the bills which we have listed, and concerning which we have advised the minority leader, are to be brought up. A filibuster may develop on a bill during the course of an evening. We have set for consideration tonight about 6 bills. We set No. 2235, on copyrights. That bill has been passed. We set No. 2352, on the Missouri Valley Compact. That has been passed. We have now proceeded to the third bill, which is No. 1801 on the calendar, the Santa Maria project. It looks as though that bill would pass without too much discussion.

After that we have No. 2344, which is Senate bill 3772, to amend the Federal Property Act, which the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is handling.

I had intended to move to consider No. 2000 on the calendar, which is the Colorado River bill, to be followed by the railroad retirement bill.

Even with this limited number of bills listed, I cannot give the Senator assurance that even the next one on the calendar will be reached, because this amendment of the Senator, if my motion to lay on the table does not prevail, may keep us here until time to move to recess.

All I can say to the Senator is that we have been trying to present an orderly program to the Senate, and I shall continue to do so until the leadership of the Senate is taken over by someone else.

I believe that the Senator's amendment is not germane. If he starts this precedent, it may rise to plague him, because someone may decide that an FEPC amendment or some other kind of amendment equally nongermane, should be offered to every other bill before the Senate.

If any such amendment should be offered, I, as majority leader, under the same circumstances, would move to lay the amendment on the table. I must resist this effort to attach the postal bill to the Santa Maria project bill as an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I regret very much to bring it up in this manner, but I am asking at this time that my amendment be considered. This seems to be the only way to obtain a vote on the pay bill.

This pay bill does not involve as large an increase as does the bill sent over from the House to the Senate. The bill which the House passed for postal workers provided a 7-percent increase. The one before us provides only 5 percent.

A summary of the provisions of the reported bill——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quorum call if he is offering an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall request a quorum call a little later.

Mr. President, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in the interest of expediting pay legislation for Federal employees, unanimously voted to strike all after the enacting clause of H. R. 7774 and insert an amendment which appears in italic type in the bill as reported and provides the following:

First. A permanent 5-percent increase in the minimum rate of each grade, through GS–17, of all employees paid under the Classification Act of 1949, with a minimum increase to each employee of $170 a year and a maximum increase of $440 a year. The bill also provides an increase of 5 percent with a minimum of $170 and a maximum of $440 per annum for legislative employees, certain judicial officers and employees, officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and employees in the Foreign Service of the State Department. In addition, the bill contains a provision increasing the maximum compensation payable to officers and employees of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or any production credit corporations, production credit associations, or bank for cooperatives, so as to permit the granting to such employees of increases corresponding to those provided other employees by the bill. No rate of basic compensation which is $14,800 or more per annum shall be increased.

Second. The annual salary for the Treasurer of the United States is increased from GS–16 to GS–18.

Third. An increase in the maximum allowable per diem for Federal employees to $12 per day from the present rate of $9 per day.

Fourth. A permanent 5-percent increase for all postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service with a minimum of $200 and a maximum of $440 except in the case of fourth-class postmasters, hourly rate employees, skilled-trades employees of mail-equipment shops, job cleaners in first- and second-class post offices, and employees paid on a fee or contract basis.

Fifth. An increase of 5 percent (computed to the nearest half cent) with a minimum of $200 in the rate of basic compensation of each employee paid on an hourly basis.

Sixth. An increase of 5 percent in each rate of basic compensation for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class.

Seventh. An increase in the allowable per diem for employees in the transportation service to $9 per day from the present rate of $6 per day.

Eighth. A repeal of present law which restricts the number of permanent appointments, promotions, and transfers in the Federal service.

Ninth. A biweekly pay period for personnel of the postal field service.

Tenth. Establishes a Commission on Postal Field Service Classification to conduct an investigation and study for the purposes of developing a plan for the establishment of a uniform, integrated, and equitable classification and pay system for all postmasters, officers, employees, and positions in the postal field service. The Commission is directed to report the results of its study together with recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives on or before March 1, 1955.

Mr. President, the committee of which the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is chairman, reported the bill unanimously; all members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, voted to report the bill, after the committee had held the hearings. On the question of reporting the bill to the Senate, there was not a dissenting vote in the committee.

So at this time I bring the bill—now submitted as an amendment—to the attention of the Senate, for its consideration.

The bill does not contain a provision regarding postal rates, for we did not hold any hearings on that subject. The committee considered that phase of the matter, and voted unanimously not to take up, this year, a rate bill, because we had not had any hearings on that subject. I wish to call that point to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, this amendment provides for what in my opinion is approximately half of what would be a proper pay increase for the Federal employees, both the postal workers and all other civil-service workers. In this measure, we treat all of them alike.

Someone has said, "In order to provide these workers with a pay increase at this time, provision must be made for raising additional revenue."

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that even if the Senate were to adopt the amendments recommended by the majority leader, the budget of the Post Office Department would not be balanced; in fact, it would not even be half balanced. The budget of the Post Office Department has not been balanced for many years; yet in that period Congress has voted several times to increase the pay of the postal workers.

Furthermore, I desire to call attention to the fact that the other civil service workers, whose departments and agencies also receive their funds from the pockets of the American taxpayers, have received pay increases. Yet when a pay increase is proposed for the postal workers, there always seems to be the cry, "The postal budget must be balanced first."

Mr. President, it is not the fault of the postal workers that the Post Office Department's budget is not balanced. It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to balance the budget of the Post Office Department, after holding adequate hearings, and then deciding which postal rates should be increased.

It may be said that the rates on first-class mail should be increased. However, every hearing held on that subject has brought out the fact that the first-class mail is already paying its way.

It may be said that the rates on second-class mail should be increased, in view of the fact that at this time second-class mail is not paying its way. If that proposal is made, hearings should be held to determine just how much of a rate increase should be made.

These matters must be carefully studied, because they are extremely technical. Any member who has served on the Senate Committee on Post Office

and Civil Service realizes the technicalities involved in increasing the postal rates.

In connection with this measure, Mr. President, the question, as I see it, is whether the Congress is going to pay the Federal workers what they should be paid. That is the question which is before the Congress at the present time. It is for the Senate to decide the position it will take in connection with that question. Thereafter, after all matters in connection with the situation have been properly considered by the Congress, it will be for the Congress to decide what the postal rates should be.

Mr. President, the members of the committee are 100 percent in support of this measure.

At this stage of the session, when we are so close to adjournment, I would not ordinarily bring up a measure of this sort or attempt to have it adopted as an amendment to another bill, if I did not think that was the only means by which we could do justice to the Federal Government employees. But in this situation, I will not remain silent and I will not fail to do my duty as a Senator to see it to that the Federal Government employees are paid what they should be paid.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with the news from the ticker, which quotes the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the distinguished majority policy committee chairman, as follows:

> FERGUSON said no definite plans for adjournment had been discussed at the hour-long session of the policy committee. At one point he said he hoped to finish by tomorrow, then later he said he hoped adjournment will come Friday.

My question is: If the nearly 2 million Federal workers, who have been waiting since the convening of the 83d Congress in January of 1953, are not granted pay increases by the United States Senate between now and tomorrow, if the Senator from Michigan is quoted correctly as chairman of the Republican policy committee, will these 2 million workers, who have been waiting for consideration of their plea for a cost-of-living pay increase by the United States Senate, be given proper treatment?

These workers are organized, of course. They have strong unions. They have as representatives able men who contact the Members of the Senate and Members of the House. But these workers are denied one right which all other labor has, and are justly denied that one right, because they work for the Government. They cannot cause and would not cause a work stoppage, to call attention to their plight and to their inability to meet the cost of living, because they do not have that right, and should never have it. So they have no other forum except this body and the body across the Capitol before which to lay their case. They have presented that case before the House committee and before the Senate committee, and both committees have overwhelmingly—I know in the case of the Senate committee unanimously—resolved that there should be a 5 percent pay increase.

I know the House committee has reported a bill calling for a 5-percent pay increase. I believe it was reported nearly unanimously. Not only that, but the House has passed, by an overwhelming vote, 321 to 29, I believe, a pay raise of 7 percent for the postal workers, which was approved by a yea-and-nay vote in the House.

We are in the closing hours of this session, for the distinguished chairman of the Republican policy committee says that we will adjourn tomorrow, or, at the latest, by Friday. I would much prefer to have this bill put on the calendar in the regular order, rather than to find it necessary to give the Senate a chance to act on the matter by pursuing the course the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina is now proposing.

We have considered bills relating to flood control for Santa Barbara, Calif. I love Santa Barbara, Calif. It is a wonderful place. The 40,000 people there, I believe, are some of the finest people in the world, but they have done without this flood-control project, or this irrigation and reclamation project, for many years of their history. I do not believe this project has the grave urgency possessed by the matter of equity for the Federal employees, the servants of the Government, who have a right to expect from the Senate and from the House of Representatives a determination of whether their case is a good one or not. I think the Senate should be willing to stand up and be counted on this matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, what the Senator from Oklahoma has said is certainly true. If we are to adjourn tomorrow or Friday, if we pass this bill everyone knows it must go to conference, which would take time. After the conference the House conferees will have to report the bill back to the House and the Senate conferees to the Senate—and then the bill will have to be considered again.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I felt that this was the only way for this bill to have any chance whatsoever of being enacted into law.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question with the understanding I shall not lose the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it true that the Senator's amendment is nothing more than the measure which was reported favorably and unanimously by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is exactly true. There is not a word in the amendment which is different from what we reported.

Mr. PASTORE. Is this pay increase the equivalent of 5 percent, as was recommended by the President of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it true that in both instances, postal employees and civil service employees the ceiling is $440?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The ceiling is $440 for both.

Mr. PASTORE. And in the case of the postal employees the floor is $200?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. $200 is the floor for the postal employees.

Mr. PASTORE. And in the case of the civil-service employees the floor is $170?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I desire to make it known to the Senator from California that I am in favor of his bill, and I believe that this action will even help the passage of the bill. If I am any judge of the desires of the Senate, I believe that a majority of the Members of the Senate would like to pay the Federal workers an additional 5 percent. That being so, I offered this provision to this bill. The purpose was not to kill this bill, but to assure that we would have this bill, and in addition, that the Federal workers would receive a 5-percent increase in their pay.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am somewhat disturbed by what the distinguished majority leader said about the irregularity of adding this amendment to this bill. We admit this matter is not germane to the bill of the distinguished junior Senator from California, since the bill deals with a reclamation project for the people of Santa Barbara. I do not like this process. As I said before, however, I do not know any other way that we could vote on this matter, in view of the lateness of the session.

I wonder if the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, the former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the past administration, could tell me if this procedure which we seek to use, in an extreme emergency, in order to give justice to some 2 million workers, is any more unusual than the procedure which was sought to be used by the distinguished majority leader on the calendar call this afternoon, when he attempted to short-circuit completely the work and the hearings and the unanimous decision of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in reporting its bill, by substituting for that bill an amendment prepared by himself which threw into complete reverse the action and the report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

In other words, I can see no more disorderly process in the procedure which the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina is using, from a parliamentary standpoint, than I feel was involved in the effort made this afternoon by the distinguished majority leader to throw into the ash can the year-long work of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in reporting a bill and getting it on the calendar.

Furthermore, when this very bill the Senator is seeking to add as an amendment was unanimously passed by the United States Senate and was in effect for 2 hours, we saw the unusual procedure of the majority leader vacating the action on the Consent Calendar and objecting to its consideration at that time.

So if there is some lack of complete regularity in this proceeding, since it is a rider to this bill, let me say that we have had a lot of irregular parliamentary procedures to prevent the Senate from expressing its will on this 5-percent pay increase.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct. When the majority leader this afternoon sent to the desk an amendment which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had never studied, since the committee had never looked into the question of postal rates—he did withdraw it, but he had it on the desk; so at that time, when he was doing that, we certainly were being afforded an exhibition of a new way of legislating. We have never passed a postal rate bill in the Senate without 30 days of hearings. But we have done a great deal of legislating along the line of what I am trying to do by attaching as an amendment to the pending bill on the floor of the Senate a measure which has been considered by the committee. We had hearings in the committee. The bill was brought to the floor for consideration. So this is nothing new as a procedure at the present time.

We believe this is what ought to be done. I have a little feeling that tells me there are certain things I ought to do and certain things I ought not to do. I ought not to be in favor of having a man work for the Government for a salary lower than he should receive. That is why I bring up the amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator understand that if the majority leader intends to amend the amendment already proposed and lying on the desk, which amendment he proposed this afternoon, that can still be done?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He has a perfect right to send up such an amendment, and we can vote on it. I welcome his sending it up. I believe I know how the Senate would vote on that amendment. I believe it would vote it down. I should like to obtain a record vote on it. My amendment is nothing new, as his amendment is. We reported it 3 weeks ago. The committee bill has been on the desks of all Senators, with the report, awaiting action. I am trying to get a little action tonight.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question with respect to his amendment. If a motion is made by the distinguished majority leader to table the amendment, we shall at least have a vote to show how the Members of the United States Senate feel in relation to whether a pay bill should or should not be passed by this Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is one reason why I have my amendment at the desk. I want Senators to go on record as to how they feel about the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand the situation, the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, in his colloquy with the majority leader, offered to withhold his amendment, pending any assurance—of course, it is not possible to give an ironclad guarantee—which might come from the distinguished majority leadership, giving us a time when the bill would be placed on the list of must legislation, so that we could take it up as a matter of regular Senate procedure and debate. Did not the Senator from South Carolina ask the majority leader whether that would be the situation, before the Senator from South Carolina offered his amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Therefore, a motion to lay on the table would be a motion to determine whether or not we are in favor of voting a 5 percent increase.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	McCarran
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bowring	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Reynolds
Cooper	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kennedy	Russell
Crippa	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smathers
Ellender	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Lehman	Stennis
Frear	Lennon	Symington
Fulbright	Long	Thye
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Goldwater	Malone	Williams
Gore	Mansfield	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] for a brief statement, with the understanding that I shall not lose my rights to the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is placed in a most difficult position by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. Our committee has reported a postal pay-increase bill which also includes the classified workers of this Nation. We did this after holding considerable hearings. We heard representatives of the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, and the leaders of the various organizations who are interested in this proposed legislation. After executive sessions at which we discussed thoroughly the merits and the demerits of pay increases at this time, we reported a bill which provides for a 5 percent increase for both the postal and classified workers, with a minimum and a maximum.

I think it should be stated for the record that this pay bill carries approximately $338 million, including travel allowances for both postal and classified workers, and it is one of the lowest-price pay bills that Congress has considered in many years. Such bills normally run into figures of $600 million or $700 million. I think our committee is entitled to credit for reporting to the Senate a pay bill which percentage increase has administration approval and is so wholeheartedly supported by the employee groups.

Our committee did not recommend pay rates as high as was suggested by leaders of employee groups. We did not go as far as the House did, which has already passed a 7-percent bill.

So I am in a difficult situation because of the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina. I sponsored the bill which is now the pending amendment, and I favor its approval on its own merits.

I wish the RECORD to show that I favor a postal-pay increase but I do not think a postal-pay increase should be tied to postal rates. I wish to state very definitely that I favor an increase in postal rates but I insist increased rates should not be enacted without adequate hearings.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I cannot yield at this moment. I think the RECORD should show that in 1951 our committee, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina was chairman, and of which I was a member, together with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who was the ranking minority member, reported a postal rate bill increasing first-, second-, and third-class rates. The Senate must know that the only place we are going to get substantial money from postal rates is in the first class. We will get about $150 million. This is a class of mail that already is paying its way.

We hear much discussion about increasing second-class rates, and we hear about the deficits caused by carrying second-class mail. This deficit, we are told, is about $250 million. The proposals for a second-class rate increase before the Senate would call for an increase of $13 million in second-class. If we were to adopt the amendment which has been proposed, we would approve these rates for second-class until 1957. The Senate should not take that action without adequate hearings which would permit all affected parties an opportunity to be heard.

The increase in the third class is estimated at $40 million. I contend that we cannot legislate on rates without hearings. Our committee has not held any hearings on those proposed rates. To place a burden of $200 million on the people of this country, without hearings, is something which I as chairman cannot support.

I wish to make this definite statement to the Senate. I made it in committee and I have made it privately. I want to make it a matter of record that at the beginning of the next session of Congress, I as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or, should political fortunes change, as ranking minority member, one of the first things I expect to try to get done is to report to the Senate legislation providing for rate increases.

This Senate authorized the creation of an advisory committee on postal matters which made an extended and thorough study of the Post Office Department.

These hearings and recommendations were printed in Senate Report No. 1086, 83d Congress, 2d session. It is one of the most exhaustive and thorough studies of the Department since its establishment.

Under the circumstances I urge that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina withdraw his amendment. It does not belong on this bill. I think it would be most helpful if the Senate leadership would give serious thought to further consideration of the bill on its own merits.

Again I say that I am very much in favor of a postal pay increase. I think both the postal and the classified workers have demonstrated by their testimony before the committee that they are entitled to this salary increase—it should not and cannot be dependent on other matters.

So I urge, as before, that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina seriously consider withdrawing his amendment. Then I would plead and hope that we might have an opportunity to give a subject of this importance the consideration which it deserves. Again I urge the leadership to give us an opportunity to act directly on a pay increase.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, now that additional Senators have entered the Chamber, I desire to state that this evening we started with a program which the majority leader announced, after consultation with the policy committee and after having advised the minority leadership.

The program started with Calendar No. 2235, H. R. 6616, relating to copyrights. That bill was passed.

Next the Senate considered Calendar No. 2352, S. 2821, dealing with the Missouri River Compact. That bill was passed by the Senate.

We have scheduled next Calendar No. 1801, H. R. 2235, dealing with the Santa Maria water and water storage reservoirs.

The next bill scheduled is Calendar No. 2344, Senate bill 3772, the Federal Property Act.

It is then proposed to proceed to Calendar No. 2000, Senate bill 1555, relating to the Colorado River.

That bill is to be followed by Calendar No. 2249, H. R. 7840, relating to railroad retirement legislation.

That is a pretty full program for the evening. I have made it clear that additional legislation cannot be scheduled beyond today until it can be seen what progress can be made with the program which has been outlined.

The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina is to attach to a bill relating to a local project of great need in the Santa Maria area of California the postal pay bill, an amendment which obviously is not germane. The Senate does not have a rule of germaneness. Similarly, an amendment could be offered to attach the FEPC bill, the poll tax bill, or any other bill which is not germane to the bill under consideration. That practice has been avoided for the most part at this session of the Senate.

I say, on my responsibility as majority leader, that if there were offered to a bill an amendment to attach the FEPC measure to it, which would have the effect of killing the measure, I, on my responsibility as majority leader, would move to table it. That is the motion I intend to make in this case.

Normally, I do not believe in making a motion to table when an amendment is germane to the subject matter of the bill. But these are the closing days of the session. The exact date of adjournment has not been set, because it may depend upon the amount of progress which can be made. I understand that the conference report on the foreign aid bill will be before the Senate tomorrow. The conferees have agreed. The House will meet tomorrow.

It is hoped to act upon a number of other conference reports tomorrow. It is planned to call them up whenever they are ready.

I believe that to propose an amendment such as the Senator from South Carolina has offered in this instance is not orderly legislative procedure. I think it opens up a highly dangerous precedent, both for this and future sessions of the Senate.

I think the Senate might very well live to regret legislating in this manner. I appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle to sustain the leadership. I recognize that the United States Senate has the control of its own destinies. At any time 49 Senators—if all Senators are present—desire to take over or to change the program which the leadership has proposed, they can do so. But if they intend to do so, they should, at least, do it in that manner, and not by attaching a nongermane amendment to a bill of the nature of the Santa Maria bill.

It is only for that reason that I feel I would be justified in making the motion I now intend to make. I feel that any majority leader, whether he sat on the other side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle, having the same responsibility, would act in the same manner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished majority leader is, of course, aware of the substantial amount of sentiment for the consideration at this session of the pending amendment. The normal process is for the Senator's policy committee to consider proposed legislation and to schedule it. Up to this time, the policy committee of the majority has not seen fit to schedule the pay-increase bill. Is the Senator from California in a position to say that within another day or two, or three days, if the policy committee refuses to schedule the bill——

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I have not said that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not ask the Senator from California when he has a gun at his head, to say that he intends to schedule any form of the pending proposal, but I ask the Senator if it is not possible to have the policy committee give further consideration to the pending proposal, in the hope that perhaps Members of the Senate who wish to vote on the question may do so at this session.

I realize that the majority leader made an earnest effort to formulate an amendment which he hoped would be satisfactory. When it was presented this afternoon and discussed within a limited time, it appeared to meet considerable objection. I hope the majority leader will be willing to indicate to the Senate that he will make another attempt to have either the Johnston amendment or a similar proposal presented to the policy committee while the Senate still has plenty of other business to keep it occupied. Two or three conference reports have reached the Senate. Perhaps tomorrow the policy committee can determine whether it will permit a proposal incorporating the Johnston amendment to come before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The members of the policy committee and the majority leader have not closed their minds to any argument, any proposed alternatives, or any suggested amendments which might develop an area of agreement. But the distinguished Senator from Texas knows that I do not wish to mislead the Senate. The bill has not been scheduled. I think I have stated the reasons why. Many bills of great interest, locally, nationally, and areawide, have been scheduled. Senators who are interested in them hope they will be considered, and that they will not be foreclosed. For that matter, any bill on the calendar is still subject to being scheduled, depending upon the amount of progress which can be made on the program tonight, and the amount of progress which can be made on other proposed legislation.

I do not wish to place myself in the position of misleading the minority leader or the Senate. It is my purpose to try, in an orderly way, to make as much progress as possible.

The railroad retirement bill has much support. I believe it passed the House by a vote of 365 to 0. But until tonight it had not been possible to find a place to schedule it. A place has now been found for its consideration, if the bills ahead of it can be cleared. If we are not able to make more progress than we are now making, it will not be possible to

consider the bill. I had hoped the Senate would not have to continue in session beyond 10 o'clock tonight, after the experience of last night. If more progress is not made, it will not be possible to complete consideration of the remainder of the items on tonight's schedule, much less adding bills which have not yet been scheduled.

The policy committee and the majority leader are willing to keep open minds. We shall be glad to consider any arguments presented to us. If the Senator from South Carolina has any other approach to the problem, which might meet the matter of postal revenues part way, we shall be glad to have him tell us, even though he is a member of the Democratic Party. If the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has any ideas on the question, we should like to have him come before the committee. Perhaps there is some area of agreement which can be reached. But I do not like to be placed in the position described by the Senator from Texas, as I think I expressed it earlier, with a gun at my head in the form of an amendment which is not germane to the pending bill, and which I think is conducive to disorder in the legislative procedure, and forced to make a commitment that a particular bill will be brought up. I am not in a position to do that. If I lose in this instance, I shall have to lose, but, so far as I can help it, we are not going to legislate in that manner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The minority leader made it very clear that he was not putting a gun to the head of the majority leader, and he was not asking the Senator to make a hard and fast commitment that the proposal contained in the Johnston amendment would be reported to the Policy Committee at 10 a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But the question I should like answered is whether the majority leader and the Policy Committee are willing to give consideration to scheduling this proposal, and, if necessary, have the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] come before the committee and exchange points of view, to ascertain whether agreement can be reached and to learn whether we can vote either on this proposal or another one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Any Senator who is interested in proposed legislation on the calendar, and feels that there are facts, figures, proposals, alternatives, or amendments which should be submitted, and that the proposed legislation is of sufficient importance that he wants to bring it to the attention of the Policy Committee, can do so. We do not operate with closed minds, as I am sure the Policy Committee on the other side of the aisle does not. We shall be glad to entertain any reasonable proposals or testimony which might be offered, but whether I am to win or lose on the vote, I am not in a position to say to the Senator whether any such proposed legislation is scheduled.

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

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

Mr. THYE. I was impressed with the statement of the Senator from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The Senator has worked hard on a pay increase bill. The House passed a bill which provided for a greater pay increase than is provided in the Senate bill. The House passed a bill which provided for 7 percent increases, with a minimum increase of $200. The House passed the bill by an overwhelming majority, in fact, almost unanimously, 352 Representatives being in favor and 29 opposed.

The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after lengthy study and consideration, recommended a bill to the Senate. The bill is before the Senate. I admit it does not provide for postal rate increases. I personally feel that a postal rate increase is overdue.

I served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for 3 years. I have a slight knowledge of the responsibilities and heavy duties which devolve upon it, and I know the demands that are made upon that committee, particularly if postal rate increases are involved. However, I believe the Senate could act on the pay increase bill. Congress will reconvene in about 5 months' time. Congress could then immediately take up the question of the postal rate increase. I believe the committee staff could give thought and study to the information already contained in its files. I know what material was taken into consideration and was studied regarding postal rates when I was on the committee.

I believe that no more important legislation lies upon the desks of Senators than the proposed pay increase for Federal workers. The younger Federal employees of the Nation, both those employed in the postal service and others, are having an extremely difficult time trying to maintain their homes on the incomes that younger persons in the Federal service receive.

By passing a pay increase bill, I think we would be doing justice and equity to Federal employees, who can neither strike nor make demands, but only appeal to us in Congress to give them relief when their income is insufficient to meet the overhead expenses of their daily lives.

I wish to call the attention not only of the policy committee, but of the very able majority leader, to the fact that the Senator from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has laid before this body a legislative measure which is sound in every conceivable way.

For that reason, if the Senate were to lay it aside and take up a substitute, I think it would err. I think the Senator from South Carolina is wrong in offering an amendment, which is not germane, to another bill. I have served with the Senator from South Carolina on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I wish he would withdraw his amendment, so that we may proceed in an orderly manner, and then the Senate could act on a motion tomorrow to take up the salary increase bill and act on the bill on its own merits, without confusing the situation by trying to add a salary increase to another bill which is before the Senate and ready for passage.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from California realizes that some of us find ourselves in a rather embarrassing position. Some of us have taken the attitude that we would vote for a pay raise for postal employees, and have more or less assured our constituents that we would do so. If this is the only chance we shall have to vote on a pay increase, and if we cannot have assurance that we shall have an opportunity to vote on a pay increase bill at this session, those of us who have more or less committed ourselves that we would vote for a pay increase find ourselves in the awkward position that we would be doing less than keeping our word if we did not vote for the proposal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand the Senator's problem, and I want the Senator to know that the problem I have is not an easy one. I know what I do will be misrepresented, but I have a responsibility to carry out. I have no quarrel with a Senator who thinks that he must vote for such a proposal. However, in the orderly procedure of the Senate, it seems to me this is not a sound way to legislate. It seems to me it would open up dangerous precedents which might rise to plague the Democratic Party, if it became the majority party, as well as to plague the Republican Party, which now is in nominal control.

In the French Chamber of Deputies they have blocs and confusion, and they do not know from day to day where the responsibility rests or who the government is. I think we want to avoid such a situation. We temporarily are charged with setting the legislative program. It seems to me that responsibility should not be taken out of the hands of the majority leader, particularly when we have a schedule. I think we have tried during this session to work out a schedule, and I have tried to give equal concern to those who had problems on the other side of the aisle as I have to Senators on this side of the aisle. Under those circumstances, and considering the delay that this type of maneuver would cause, I can do nothing but resist with all the parliamentary devices I have open to me.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Could not the assurance be given to the Senator from Louisiana—and I feel as he does, that I should like to have a chance to vote on a pay increase—that, in the orderly process, tomorrow we would have a perfect right to make a motion to call up the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senate rules so provide. The wisdom of doing so,

each Senator must decide for himself. In any event, the rules do not limit the making of such a motion to the majority leader. The normal procedure is that such motions are made by the Senator who occupies the majority leader's position, but the rules do not so limit the making of such a motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I intend to vote, as the majority leader has indicated, to table the proposal, because I think there will be a chance to bring up the proposal in an orderly way. As the Senator from Louisiana has done, I have said that I intend to vote for a pay raise. However, I do not believe this is the orderly way to do it.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure the Senator from California realizes that the membership has to sit and wait and listen to what measures are to be voted on largely through the decisions and the responsibilities of the majority and the good intentions of the majority. However, this may be the only opportunity we will have to vote on the question. I do not like the idea of setting precedents of this kind. I did not enter the Chamber in time to hear all the Senator from California had to say. As I understood, he said he had an open mind and had not closed the door to the policy committee's leaving it up to the membership to vote on the question. Is that what the majority leader said?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; in referring to the unscheduled measures on the calendar, of which this is an important one, I said that all of them are open to consideration by the policy committee. Sometimes amendments which develop an area of agreement are suggested, and thus the bill can be supported, whereas otherwise it could not be.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure the Senator cannot speak for other Members; but so far as he knows, will other Members approach this question with the same open mind with which the majority leader has approached it, and will they give honest consideration to the question of finding a place for it on the schedule? I seek information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure they will, in the case of both this and every other piece of proposed legislation on the calendar. Of course, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, under our parliamentary procedure the policy committee does not schedule, and cannot schedule, measures for consideration by the Senate until they have been reported by the standing committees of the Senate. So we are limited to the items which are on the printed calendar.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from California also mentioned the possibility that some other bill could be displaced. No Member desires to try to displace a pending measure, but that may be the only remedy left. The Senator from Mississippi might, tomorrow, support a motion to displace some other bill because, even though I am not sponsoring this bill, I think it should be voted on because it is of national significance and importance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for an observation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not propose to discuss the merits or the demerits of the parliamentary tactics which is now being employed in the Senate, but I have heard several Members speak of it as though it were an innovation. This is no innovation at all, Mr. President. This particular parliamentary tactic has been used time and time again in my 9 years in the Senate. No precedent is being established here tonight as far as parliamentary tactics are concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Martin
Anderson	Hayden	McCarran
Barrett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Beall	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bowring	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bush	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Reynolds
Cooper	Kefauver	Robertson
Cordon	Kennedy	Russell
Crippa	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Knowland	Smathers
Ellender	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Lehman	Stennis
Frear	Lennon	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Watkins
George	Magnuson	Williams
Goldwater	Malone	Young
Gore	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the question on which the yeas and nays have been ordered is on agreeing to my motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea," while the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Bush	Dirksen
Anderson	Butler	Dworshak
Barrett	Carlson	Ellender
Beall	Case	Ferguson
Bennett	Cooper	Frear
Bowring	Cordon	George
Bricker	Crippa	Goldwater

Hayden	Martin	Schoeppel
Hendrickson	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Smith, N. J.
Holland	Payne	Stennis
Johnson, Tex.	Potter	Thye
Kennedy	Reynolds	Watkins
Knowland	Robertson	Williams
Kuchel	Russell	Young
Malone	Saltonstall	

NAYS—30

Chavez	Jackson	Magnuson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Mansfield
Ervin	Johnston, S. C.	McCarran
Fulbright	Kefauver	McClellan
Gore	Kerr	Monroney
Green	Kilgore	Morse
Hennings	Langer	Murray
Hill	Lehman	Neely
Humphrey	Lennon	Pastore
Ives	Long	Smathers

NOT VOTING—19

Bridges	Eastland	Sparkman
Burke	Flanders	Symington
Byrd	Gillette	Upton
Capehart	Jenner	Welker
Daniel	Maybank	Wiley
Douglas	McCarthy	
Duff	Purtell	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina was agreed to.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the bill briefly. I wish to present both sides of this issue.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss this bill briefly because I think it is a mistake in the closing hours of this session of Congress to pass a bill which contains so many sweeping implications as this bill contains, and which I think involves the danger of establishing the precedent that this bill is likely to establish in connection with the conservation of the United States.

This bill, Mr. President, seeks to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a dam and also a reservoir, and the bill involves a substantial amount of money. This is not a particularly small project, Mr. President. It is a very large project, in my judgment, from the standpoint of the policy it is going to determine. It is an irrigation project, but it differs from the usual irrigation project where water is conveyed to lands by pipes or ditches.

Here the landowners get the water from the natural ground-water reservoir underlying the Santa Maria Valley and draw it up by means of well pumps. The purpose of project would be to control the amount of water which flows into the area in streams—holding it to the amount which would fill but not overflow the underground natural reservoir, so as to save water which now goes to the sea during overflow periods. After completion of the project, landowners would still be pumping their water from the underground storage area.

LAW GOVERNING EXCESS LAND

Section 423 (e) of title 43, United States Code, states with reference to irrigation contracts entered into by the Secretary of the Interior and landowners:

Such contract * * * shall further provide that all irrigable land held in private ownership in excess of 160 irrigable acres shall be appraised * * * and the price thereof fixed * * * on the basis of its actual bona fide value at the date of appraisal without reference to the proposed construction of the irrigation works; and that no such excess lands so held shall receive water from any project or division if the owners thereof shall refuse to execute valid recordable contracts for the sale of such lands under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and at prices not to exceed those fixed by the Secretary.

In other words, a land owner may receive water from a Federal reclamation project—and this is one—for only 160 acres—or 320 acres for man and wife—and if his holdings are in excess of that amount he cannot receive water unless he agrees to sell the excess land at price based on reasonable value of land prior to construction of project.

ACREAGE LIMITATION BENEFITS FAMILY-SIZED FARMS

The "160-acre limitation" was written into the Reclamation Act of 1902 to assure that federally financed projects for irrigation would benefit the holders of "family size" farms, and to prevent federally financed water projects from being the means of enriching owners of large tracts of land, with speculators and absentee land owners often holding large acreages of arid land.

There is no question about the fact that Teddy Roosevelt, in his conservation policy, sought to protect the family-size farm. He sought to provide a conservation program whereby Federal funds would be used in reclamation projects for the benefit of American farm families, not for the benefit of large corporate farms, not for the benefit of speculators and absentee landowners.

SHOULD NOT MAKE EXCEPTION TO LAW

I believe we need to keep that in mind, because I care not what language is used in the debate tonight in seeking to justify this proposal as an exception to the 160-acre limitation. The fact remains it is an exception. In my judgment, when we start making exceptions to this very sound conservation policy, we should be extremely careful to determine where the exceptions will lead us. It does not take very many exceptions to destroy a rule. It is all very well to say that every rule has its exception. But when a rule becomes honeycombed with exceptions, it ceases to be a rule.

CONSERVATION POLICY UNDERMINED

I am afraid—and I speak out of deep conviction on this subject, Mr. President—that we are on our way tonight to undermine the 160-acre limitation conservation policy which has been in effect since 1902.

In my judgment, that policy, adopted in 1902, follows the idea of having the Government do for the people what they cannot possibly do for themselves. Small farmers could not themselves build dams and projects. Big land companies could possibly do so. Holders of large tracts of land do not lose anything if they sell off excess land, and then they and the purchasers all benefit to the extent of getting irrigation for 160 acres each.

PUBLIC POLICY CONCERNED

When I deal with the so-called excess land ownership involved in this case, from the standpoint of public policy it would be much to be preferred that the excess land be sold to farm families. It would be preferable to bring some families into this area, to use the water which will be made available by the expenditure of tax dollars paid into the United States Treasury by all the people of the country.

The Santa Maria project area is about 50,000 acres. One-fourth of the land in the area is held by "excess" holders. Benefits of project will be realized immediately by owners in so-called upper area in which there are 11 excess holders, and eventually in lower area in which there are 2 excess holders. In other words, 13 excess holders, among them corporation and absentee landlords, own 25 percent of land in area to be benefited by the expenditure of this large sum of money, which is being made available for this project, not by the taxpayers of California alone, but by the taxpayers of all the 48 States.

Mr. President, when we have our attention focused on a project in our own State, it is easy, somehow, to get into our heads the idea that that project is different from a similar project located in another State.

SHOULD PUT ASIDE SPECIAL PLEADING

I speak most respectfully, because I am very fond of the junior Senator from California—in fact, I can say that both Senators from California are my personal friends—when I say that we ought always to recognize the fact when we come to deal with an argument of Senators from a given State in which a project is located, we ought to follow the practice that good lawyers follow in the courtroom when they have witnesses before them who they know have special pleading interests.

That is no criticism. The Senators from California unquestionably have a special interest in the pending bill, and I say that every consideration should be given to their arguments, but I also contend their arguments should be judged in the light of the fact that they are the Senators from the State in which the project is located.

Therefore, we ought to take a good look at what we are doing to a conservation policy which has existed in this country since 1902.

BILL EXEMPTS SANTA MARIA PROJECT FROM RECLAMATION LAW

This bill excepts the Santa Maria project from the 160-acre limitation by this proviso. It is an interesting one, and I shall offer an amendment that seeks to strike it out:

Provided, That in view of the special circumstances of the Santa Maria project, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable thereto so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir.

The proponents of the bill claim the 160-acre limitation is unworkable in the Santa Maria case. They argue that with the usual project, water can be refused to those who do not execute required contracts to sell excess land, but

here there would be no mechanical control.

They argue that if one landowner refused to execute a contract and held excess lands, and the project were built, he could draw project water along with natural water from his pumps, and that there is no way to separate the intermingled waters. Then they argue that in order to build the project, every landowner in the area which would be benefited would first have to execute a contract. If only one refused, the project could not be built.

ARGUMENTS OF CALIFORNIA OPPONENTS OF BILL

The opponents of the bill say—and I use the arguments of the opponents of the bill in California, because this bill does not come to the Senate of the United States with any unanimous support from groups in California who are vitally interested in reclamation projects in the State of California—the opponents say there is no reason to assume all will not agree to execute the contracts. They say, further, that if the people in the area want the project for the common good, it should be up to the local people to secure agreement on the part of the 13 who hold 25 percent of the land in the area as excess land. It should not be a case of Congress being blackjacked into making an exception, by a threat on the part of one or a handful of persons who might say that they will not agree, unless they can have an exception which will allow them to draw water out of the project financed by Federal dollars to be used on land far in excess of the 160-acre limitation.

There are many attacks on the 160-acre limitation now being made by those who want to get Federal projects for the benefit of big landowners, particularly in California, where the fight has raged for years to remove the limitation in connection with the Central Valley project.

PRECEDENT FOR EXCEPTION IN CENTRAL VALLEY

There are those in California who fear that if we start this exception tonight by passage of this bill there will be more and more exceptions, and that we will strengthen the position of those who want the whole Central California Valley project made an exception to the 160-acre limitation.

There seems to be a case for the two excess holders in the lower area where benefits will not be received for some time in the future. It seems to me this could be met by allowing them to hold the lands which are in excess of 160 acres until the time when the benefits may reasonably be expected to occur. They could be required to deposit contracts with the Secretary of the Interior before the project is built, and contracts would have the condition precedent that the benefits would occur.

It is argued by the proponents of the bill that Representative JACK SHELLEY agreed to this bill, and he is known to be one of the outstanding conservationists in the State of California and is known to be one of the most ardent supporters of the 160-acre limitation policy, but in this instance he went along with the exception.

I do not propose to speak for Mr. SHELLEY, but I do propose to speak to the record in respect to his participation. There is no doubt about the fact, Mr. President, that at least at one time in the House of Representatives, when this issue was before the House, he went along with the exception. Before I conclude I shall quote from an insertion which he put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the House action on this bill, including an insertion containing material from the Veterans of Foreign Wars in opposition to the bill. But I shall let Mr. SHELLEY's statement speak for itself.

If Mr. SHELLEY is still for this exception, I think he is making a mistake, and a great many of his friends in California likewise think he is making a mistake if he is still for the exception.

I wish to invite attention to the position taken by one of the recognized conservation authorities in the State of California, Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California, an authority in this field and an ardent opponent of this bill. In a letter which I received from him under date of August 16—and I shall not burden the RECORD with the personal reference he makes in the letter concerning my opposition to this bill, but he wrote to thank me for my opposition to the bill—he said:

> California is now undertaking to get itself organized on the water and power issue and is holding a Statewide meeting sponsored by the State Grange on August 28 in Sacramento.

He goes on to say, Mr. President, that he believes there will come out of the movement which is developing in California now in opposition to this bill a program which will be much to the benefit of the development of reclamation projects in the State of California and which will serve as a basis for a greater unanimity of opinion on a program in California. He tells me in his letter to me that he hopes I can get a delay in the consideration of this bill until the next session, because he thinks that if the Senate will wait for the reaction in California to develop between now and the next session of Congress with respect to this bill and certain other California bills which are on the calendar we would not, come January, pass this bill at all.

Mr. President, on February 4 of this year, subsequent to House action on this bill, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows the following:

> Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the House action on February 2 in passing House bill 2235, authorizing construction of the Santa Maria project, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on the bill prepared by Comdr. Gordon H. Winton, Jr., Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars. The statement, unfortunately, was received too late to be presented to the House prior to or during the course of debate on the bill.
>
> However, in view of the strong defense of the 160-acre-limitation provisions of reclamation law which Commander Winton presents, I feel that his statement can be read with profit by all concerned with the problem. The Members of the House will remember that before passage of H. R. 2235 I offered an amendment to the bill to make it completely clear that we were in no way compromising the Congress' traditional position in opposition to attempts to eliminate the 160-acre limitation as a cornerstone of national reclamation policy. The fact that my amendment was overwhelmingly approved by the House again confirms that position.
>
> The statement follows:
>
> "Modern veterans, like their predecessors for two centuries, have a strong stake in the preservation and enforcement of the Nation's land and water policy. Ever since colonial times it has been customary for this country to take special measures to help veterans obtain a portion of the soil for which they fought, to make a home upon it, and a living for themselves and their families.
>
> "Congress has written that policy into law time after time by granting soldiers' scrip good for homesteading on the public domain, by helping veterans to buy farms on favorable financial terms, by giving veterans preference on reclaimed public lands, and by striking at those age-old twin enemies that throttle opportunity for veterans or any other qualified persons seeking to obtain farm homes: viz, private monopoly and speculation.
>
> "The purpose of the Preemption Act of 1841 and the Homestead Act of 1862 was to favor the actual settler on the land. During the debates on the homestead bill that President Abraham Lincoln made into law by his signature, a Congressman from Indiana expressed the spirit that animated the measure in these words: 'Instead of baronial possessions, let us facilitate the increase of independent homesteads. Let us keep the plow in the hands of the owner. Every new home that is established, the independent possessor of which cultivates his own freehold is establishing a new republic within the old, and adding a new and strong pillar to the edifice of the State.'
>
> "When western settlements crossed the 100th meridian, water became of equal importance with land. Maj. John Wesley Powell, a wounded veteran of the Civil War, foresaw the necessity for conserving water, and the dangers inherent in permitting its monopolization by the few. In the 1870's he wrote in his famous Report on the Lands of the Arid Region of the United States: 'The question for legislators to solve is to devise some practical means by which water rights may be distributed among individual farmers and water monopolies prevented.'
>
> "By 1902 Congress got around to devising a practical method of helping to develop waters for irrigation. It passed the national reclamation law, signed by President Theodore Roosevelt, giving generous aid to water development, including aid to private landholders with insufficient water supplies of their own. As justification for this extension of public help for private benefit, and mindful of the warning by Major Powell, Congress wrote the famous 160-acre provision into the reclamation law as assurance that large landowners could never monopolize publicly developed waters nor speculate in the huge incremental values they would create. In this way the purposes of the Preemption and Homestead Acts were applied also to western waters."

Mr. President, I digress to apply this observation or policy to the bill. In this instance, 25 percent of 50,000 acres is held by 13 owners. In my judgment, considering that physical-acreage fact, the bill cannot be spoken of as a bill which aids homesteaders, because a large percentage of the acreage is not owned by homesteaders having the so-called family-size farms.

I resume reading from the statement by the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

> Families seeking homes on the land were to find opportunity kept open, not foreclosed.

Settlers were to be spared the burden of excessive debt to speculating landowners astride the sources of water. Sound, balanced communities were to be created, with opportunities for business and professional men as well as for independent farm operators and above all for the building of homes.

The California Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has endorsed these purposes of reclamation law repeatedly, and has been engaged actively for a full decade in defending acreage limitation against one attempt after another, some frontal and some from flank or rear, to remove or to weaken its enforcement. We have fought equally against efforts to undermine it in Congress, and against the laxity of indifferent, harassed, insensitive, or unsympathetic administrators.

At our latest encampment, in June 1953, the California Department, VFW, passed the following resolution:

"Whereas when waterpower and natural resources are developed by the Bureau of Reclamation, the 160-acre limitation of the Reclamation Act of 1902 is in full force and effect; and

"Whereas when such power and resources are developed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, such acreage limitation is evaded; and

"Whereas unless the 160-acre limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902 is strictly enforced there will be no land available to veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Department of California, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in encampment assembled at Oakland, Calif., June 21 through 24, 1953, again affirm its support to the Bureau of Reclamation and commend those officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior who steadfastly work to carry out the intent and purposes of the law in the face of powerful pressure upon them to do otherwise; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the work of the Bureau of Reclamation is expanded so as to make more land available to veterans, and that we oppose any attempts to nullify or evade the 160-acre limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902."

The California VFW is fully aware of the long-standing necessity for vigilance if the reclamation law is to achieve its purposes. The chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands found it necessary to warn in 1871 of loopholes in the homestead law that permitted speculators to foreclose opportunity to the pioneers. Land Commissioner Sparks complained in 1885 that "the public domain was being made the prey of unscrupulous speculations and the worst forms of land monopoly through systematic frauds carried on and consummated under the public-land laws." Meanwhile, in our own State, the Visalia Delta was giving ominous warning against the growing aggregations of landholdings on May 5, 1877, that the people "will find themselves confronted by an array of force and talent to secure to capital the ownership of the water as well as the land." In 1924 President Calvin Coolidge transmitted the famous Fact-Finding Report to Congress as basis for the strengthening of legislation.

It contained this trenchant declaration under the title "Homesteader Versus Speculator": "It was hoped that the homesteader under the Federal irrigation works would settle upon the land with a strong determination to subdue the soil, to build a home, and to add another rural farmstead to the thousands which form the stable foundation of our Republic." The man who had served as secretary of the Fact-Finders Committee, Dr. John A. Widtsoe, distinguished citizen of Utah and noted authority on irrigation, wrote: "In future as in earlier irrigation enterprises, large holdings will give most vexation. * * * In the future it will be even more necessary to insist that large holdings shall not receive water from Government supplies, unless divided into farm units of proper size, and offered to intending purchasers at reasonable terms. Speculators must be rigidly excluded from the benefits that flow from the operation of the Reclamation Act."

No group of citizens has been more aware of these perils from those whose interests lead them to seek to break down the excess-lands provisions of reclamation law than the VFW. We have repeatedly and publicly opposed every effort to obtain exemptions from public control of monopoly and speculation. We have called attention also to the efforts of excess landowners to thwart enforcement of the law and to the hazards from administrators who toy with the idea of letting them crawl through legal loopholes to nullify the law. On October 11, 1951, for example, the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carried our warning of these dangers on Kings and Kern Rivers in California. In issuing that statement we took our position squarely beside the Task Force Report of the Hoover Commission, and invited all friends of this Nation's land and water policy to join with us in its preservation against the pressures of excess landowners seeking nullification whether legal technicalities or subservient administration. That warning and invitation to resist its threat still stand.

After the Veterans of Foreign Wars, California chapter, had set forth this very concise and accurate synopsis of the historic development of the 160-acre limitation rule, which in 1902 received the stamp of Teddy Roosevelt, one of the greatest liberal Republicans who ever lived, and one of the most noted conservationists ever to have been a member of either party, the Veterans of Foreign Wars then proceeded in a short statement to discuss the bill which is now before the Senate. Listen to what they said. These are Californians speaking, Mr. President. They said:

An immediate danger to reclamation law is H. R. 2235, that has tied an exemption, like a tin can to a dog's tail, to the authorization of Santa Maria project in California. We favor reclamation projects, and have no reason to suppose that Santa Maria project is not a very fine well-bred "dog." But we insist that Congress cut the tin can from its tail.

The report of the House committee recommending exemption alleges that special circumstances justify exemption. Like most similar attempts to escape the law, this claim is spurious, as a careful examination of the public record plainly discloses. There are 13 excess landholders on the project, among them corporations and absentees, and they own about one-fourth of all the agricultural land in the project. As prospective beneficiaries of Federal expenditures estimated to average $700 or more per acre, for irrigation and flood control, the landowners of Santa Maria project are seeking public help on terms that surely are generous. Should 13 of them, in addition to help on this scale, be excused from the general law that applies to all citizens in similar situations? To exempt them means less opportunity for veterans and other qualified citizens who are entitled to have access to publicly developed water.

The House committee's spurious argument that special circumstances arising from the underground water conditions make enforcement of acreage limitation impossible was used also in 1944 and 1947 in an effort to persuade people that acreage limitation was unenforceable in Central Valley. It is nonsense, as the record of enforceable contracts covering all the first-class waters of Friant-Kern Canal abundantly proves. Congress need only include in H. R. 2235 a simple provision that no Federal funds shall be expended for construction of the project that is being requested until all excess landholders on the project sign recordable contracts to comply with the acreage limitation law. This procedure has ample precedent in law and in administrative practice. No businessman in his senses would think of doing otherwise.

It is curious that while the House committee report describes the Santa Maria project as special, the opponents of acreage limitation, speaking among themselves, do not accept this view. They hail the committee's recommendation for exemption as nothing less than a precedent warranting general defiance of the law by excess landholders elsewhere. On November 12, 1953, a California State senator publicly said the Santa Maria committee exemption is being recommended by the committee "simply because the landowners and water users flatly refused to accept" acreage limitation. He was confident that Congress will bow to the excess landholders, adding: "Is the Santa Maria project to be abandoned because of this situation? Hardly. Both of these two Federal agencies (the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation) plan to go ahead without delay whenever the appropriations are made available. Thus falls another invulnerable shibboleth of straw without even a gesture of hail and farewell. Why should we be afraid of all or any of these arbitrary and unilateral restrictions?"

Of course, this is simply special pleading; reclamation law is neither arbitrary nor unilateral. It is a 51-year-old statute of Congress, and it bestows liberal benefits, even on the holders of excess lands.

As veterans, we see no reason for making an exception for excess landholders on Santa Maria project, and thereby encouraging excess landholders everywhere else to defy the law. We believe the interests of veterans, as of the American people generally, are not promoted by giving public special encouragement to private landholdings of 1,000 or 10,000, or 20,000 irrigated acres, each. Equality of opportunity, political stability and the general welfare are promoted by multiplication of homes on the land. Americans have known this simple truth since colonial times. In these latter days let us not turn against the wisdom of our forebears.

COMMENTS ON VFW STATEMENT

Mr. President, that is the argument of the California chapter of the Veterans of Foreign Wars against the bill. I say it is a compelling argument. It is an argument which ought to cause the Senate tonight to delay action on the bill. We ought to wait until January, until after the kind of conference to which Mr. Taylor, of the University of California, refers in the letter, a portion of which I read earlier in my argument tonight. We ought to go slow, and not, in the dying hours of this session of the Congress, when Senators are tired—and apparently many of them are hungry, too, judging from the empty seats—and when every Senator knows that the controlling question in his mind is, "When will Congress adjourn?"

The Senator from Oregon knows as well as anyone else that making an argument on a matter so serious as this, at this late hour, not only tonight, but in this session, is arguing against terrific odds. Nevertheless, I still have not given up hope in miracles—even legislative miracles. Until the last moment, I shall still hope that a majority in the Senate

will take their stand with the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the State of California, heed their warning, and wait at least a few months until we can take a calm and thorough look at this particular project.

CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE DELAYED

I think my suggestion for delay has some other benefits. It may awaken not only the small landowners who would benefit from the project, but the 13 large landowners. It may have the effect of having small landowners do what we all know can be done in our local communities in matters of great concern such as this, in connection with a project which would benefit the entire community. They can bring to bear on the 13 large landowners what we call the pressure of public opinion. I do not know of a more effective policeman than that.

PUBLIC OPINION AROUSED

I know of nothing that does a better policing job in the body politic of our Republic than an aroused local public-opinion; and there is no question about the fact that public opinion in California is becoming aroused in regard to this threat to the 160-acre limitation; it is becoming aroused because of the plea the Veterans of Foreign Wars in California are making in opposition to the Santa Maria bill. It is becoming aroused by the case which is being made against the bill in California public opinion by such leaders and authorities as Mr. Taylor.

Consider, for example, that at one point in the memorandum, Mr. Taylor says, in arguing in support of this limitation:

> There are few excess-land-holders involved in this case, but they are excess-land-holders with very substantial holdings, some of them corporations in absentia. All of these excess-land-holders will gain tremendous benefits from this expenditure of Federal tax dollars on this project, and sooner or later they will reap a harvest of profit.

Mr. President, I simply cannot square with sound public policy the appropriation from the Federal Treasury, of the funds which will be called for by the bill, for the benefit of 13 excess-land-holders in that area.

OWNERS SHOULD SELL EXCESS HOLDINGS

I am perfectly willing to support the bill if it contains a requirement that the excess-land-holders sell their holdings within the area of the project.

I believe I have at least made a record on the basis of the major thesis of the opponents of the bill.

I would that we could obtain an agreement to postpone until January action on the bill, but I have little hope of that. Therefore, I offer the following amendment: On page 2 of the bill, strike out all of line 1 and all of the following lines, through the word "further", in line 7.

At this point I shall read the portion of the bill which my amendment proposes to strike out; and then I shall briefly explain the effect of the amendment, after which I shall yield the floor.

I propose to strike from the bill the following language:

> That in view of the special circumstances of the Santa Maria project, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable thereto so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir: *Provided further.*

In other words, Mr. President, I propose to strike from the bill the provision which, in the case of this project, seeks to make an exception to the 160-acre limitation.

My amendment will leave in the bill the additional proviso—

> That a repayment contract not exceeding a period of 50 years be executed prior to commencement of construction of the works herein authorized.

Mr. President, one concluding word on the alleged special circumstances: There really are no special circumstances which justify making an exception to the 160-acre limitation; but the special circumstances which are claimed deal with a physical fact, namely, that the project calls for the building of a dam and reservoir to store water which will percolate into the soil and, by means of that process, will fill an underground reservoir, and then will be pumped onto the land, from the underground reservoir—which really will be built with Federal tax dollars, in the sense that the project is to be federally financed under the reclamation law.

NO NEED FOR EXCEPTION SHOWN

It is claimed that because the water which will percolate as a result of the construction of the project will intermingle with water which would percolate anyway, even if the project were not built—but not in such quantity as that which the dam proposed to be constructed will cause to percolate—therefore it is necessary to make an exception to the 160-acre limitation or rule. I say that simply is not so.

So the question before the Senate is a very simple one. We simply say to this area of California, "Get busy with local public opinion, which, after all, is your great policeman when you really want to bring a community betterment; and make perfectly clear to the 13 excess-land-holders that they have the duty—and a patriotic duty it is, too—to yield to the rule that what promotes the welfare of the greatest number is the policy which those who have any real interest in the development of a community should follow."

SHOULD HEED WARNING BY VETERANS

Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senate of the United States should not tonight make an exception simply because there may be 13 excess-land-holders who may be so selfish that they do not wish to yield to the common good in this particular area. But, Mr. President, time works wonders, and reflection works wonders. They should get it through their heads that the Senate cannot be steamrollered into passing the bill on the ground of an argument which, in my judgment, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of California have completely demolished in the brief which JACK SHELLEY had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after the bill passed the House of Representatives. I say that in view of the argument set forth in the brief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Senate should not be hurried into acting on the bill tonight.

Mr. President, I think my amendment at least should be adopted. If it is not adopted, I shall have a motion to make.

But I hope my amendment will be adopted, because it will make it possible for the bill in principle to be passed; and the amendment will make it possible to obtain Senate sanction, and thereby congressional sanction, of the objectives of the project; but the amendment will see to it that the 13 excess-land holders will not be allowed in the name of special circumstances to undermine a very sound water policy which has existed in the United States since 1902; and by adopting the amendment, the Senate will be stating that it is not going to surrender or be blackjacked into yielding to the selfish demands of these 13 excess-land holders.

Mr. President, I offer my amendment, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out:

> That in view of the special circumstances of the Santa Maria project, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable thereto so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir: *Provided further.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have listened to the comments which have been made by my friend, the junior Senator from Oregon. He speaks about an aroused populace in the State of California. He suggests that he argues on the floor of the Senate against tremendous odds. He indicates that the bill which now is before us for what I hope will be final passage, constitutes a murderous assault upon a policy originally laid down by Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this point, for one moment?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I did not use the language the Senator from California has just used, but I am very happy to adopt it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to say that the recommendations embodied in the bill are not new. Originally, the Department of the Interior, under the Presidency of Mr. Truman, not of Mr. Eisenhower, recommended it.

From the very beginning it was indicated that feasibility—economic and otherwise—in that area militated against the additional expenditure required to put in surface works to deliver water.

One of those known in California as an ardent, constant, vigorous supporter of the 160-acre limitation is a gentle-

man by the name of Mr. Richard Boke, who used to be connected with the Department of the Interior in California. I have before me the 1952 recommendations of Mr. Boke. I have also—and I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss them, Mr. President—the recommendations of the head of the Bureau of Reclamation, under Mr. Oscar Chapman, in support of this bill.

So we deal here, at least in the beginning, with nothing new. We deal with a recommendation for a reservoir which, in round numbers, will cost $16 million, which the agencies of the Federal Government together find is includible, so far as flood control is concerned, to the extent of $3 million, and the balance will be paid back by the district.

It is true, Mr. President, that of the area involved—roughly 40,000 acres—26 percent is owned by excess-land owners. And there is no question that two of those excess-land owners are corporations.

In the feasibility decisions of the Engineers of the United States Government, I think I can say that the identity of those who own property there, personal or corporate, is an irrelevant consideration. They found that a dam or a reservoir which would percolate the water down the dry stream was the way the underground water table could be raised and the intrusion of sea water avoided.

But the facts are, Mr. President, that the excess-land owners are located in the western part of this general area of 40,000 acres, more or less. They do not have the continuing and mounting hazard of loss of water which the individual farmers who are located to the east in that district have. They will pay, as a part of the local special assessment district located there, in proportion with their holdings. But it is those who are located in the other end of the whole Santa Maria area, Mr. President, who are faced with a constant hazard of loss of water; so much so that running all through the hearings of 1952 and 1953 is the repeated warning that thousands of acres there will have to go back to dry farming because there will not be any water.

I am not going to read into the RECORD all the information I have. I have a resolution from the local Federation of Labor in Santa Barbara, in favor of this bill.

On the floor of the House of Representatives one Representative after another, each of whom has been noted for his continuous belief in the protection of the 160-acre limitation, spoke and voted in favor of this bill.

It seems to me that my friend, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], is wrong when he suggests that a letter from someone connected with the University of California and a resolution adopted at a convention ought to be used as a reason not to pass this bill tonight. I suggest, Mr. President, that there was not one individual who appeared either in the House committee hearing or in the Senate committee hearing in opposition to this bill. I suggest that I, in part, represent the people of California in the Senate, and the individual from the university might well have written to the junior Senator from California, if he had any good faith objection to this legislation. I did not receive any such letter of objection.

I suggest, Mr. President, that this bill happens to be just one more example of a carefully considered piece of proposed legislation which enjoys today, under President Eisenhower, and which enjoyed under President Truman, the complete approval of the agencies. It is another reclamation project as to which there is an element of flood control and as to which the irrigation costs will be reimbursed entirely by the district which has been created under the laws of the State of California.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. What does the Senator from California think about the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KUCHEL. I object to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, I will say to my friend from Florida, for the simple reason that there is no legal or engineering or other opportunity to measure the water which percolates down into the ground, feeds the underground water table, and then by pumps on the various parcels of property in this area is brought to the surface to assist the farmers of the particular area. There is no way to do that, let me say to the Senator, and there is no one who in the record contradicts the statement. There is no one who will say that there is a valid means to measure underground water from the percolation which has taken place from the surface down.

To my mind, let me say to the Senator from Florida, the record being what it is, the Senator from Oregon is wrong in offering his amendment to this bill.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply will be very brief. First let us consider the landowners in the so-called western end or lower end of this project. The fact remains they still do not have enough water for their land at the present time to make it a very profitable agricultural operation. To make it a profitable agricultural operation, they need the water which is going to be supplied by the expenditure of Federal tax dollars. This is a Federal project, and, Mr. President, once we start pouring the taxpayers' money into this project, then I think the national land and water policy ought to apply.

Second, I may say, Mr. President, it is not for me to discuss why California groups have communicated with me on this matter rather than with someone else. All that I am interested in are the merits of the arguments they have presented. I suggest, Mr. President, they are very meritorious arguments. We are dealing here, in my judgment, with a Federal reclamation project which involves the expenditure of Federal tax dollars for the purpose of supplying water to land, and the 160-acre limitation, in my judgment, should be applied to that project as well as to all other irrigation projects.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the vote now on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer have the clerk read the amendment which seeks to eliminate the exception to the 160-acre limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out "That in view of the special circumstances of the Santa Maria project, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable thereto so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir: *Provided further,*"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. 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 senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent by leave of the Senate. The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr.

YOUNG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. LENNON], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would each vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—17

Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Frear	Kefauver	Morse
Fulbright	Kerr	Murray
Gore	Kilgore	Neely
Green	Lehman	Pastore
Hennings	Magnuson	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Ferguson	McClellan
Barrett	Goldwater	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bowring	Holland	Potter
Bricker	Ives	Reynolds
Bush	Jackson	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Case	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Crippa	Long	Stennis
Dirksen	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Williams

NOT VOTING—34

Anderson	Flanders	McCarthy
Bridges	George	Purtell
Burke	Gillette	Robertson
Byrd	Hayden	Russell
Capehart	Hill	Sparkman
Cooper	Jenner	Symington
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Upton
Daniel	Kennedy	Welker
Douglas	Langer	Wiley
Duff	Lennon	Young
Eastland	Maybank	
Ervin	McCarran	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about ready to move that the Senate recess; but first I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2000, Senate bill 1555, the upper Colorado River project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1555) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, 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. 1555) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES WRITTEN BY MEMBERS OF THE SENATE DURING THE 83D CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the course of recent studies, it became necessary for me to go to the Library of Congress to look up source material. While I was there, I became very much impressed with the number of times I saw the names of my colleagues on reference cards.

Thinking it might be of interest to the entire Senate, I asked Mr. Norman D. Burch, of the History and General Research Division, to prepare for me a list of books and articles which had been written by Members of the Senate in the 83d Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the list to which I have referred.

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

ARTICLES BY THE MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT SENATE (83D CONG.)

AIKEN, GEORGE D.: Big Debate: Here's What It Boils Down To, Farm Journal, volume 78; pages 32–33, March 1954.

ANDERSON, CLINTON P.: Big Debate: Here's What It Boils Down To, Farm Journal, volume 78; pages 32–33, March 1954. Best Advice I Ever Had, Reader's Digest, volume 63, pages 51–52, July 1953.

BRICKER, JOHN W.: Curtail the Treatymaking Power, Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 32; page 5, May 15, 1953. Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government, Oklahoma Bar Association Journal, volume 21; pages 639–645, April 29, 1950. Making Treaties and Other International Agreements. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 289; pages 134–144, September 1953. Shall the United Nations Make Our Laws? American Mercury, volume 77; pages 39–45, October 1953.

BRIDGES, STYLES, and SYMINGTON, W. S.: Waste in Aid; Defenses Weak; Competitors Subsidized; excerpts from report on European trip; U. S. News & World Report, volume 36, pages 107–108, June 11, 1954. Korea: A Positive Proposal, American Mercury, volume 75; pages 11–19, November 1952. Senator BRIDGES on the Seizure of the Steel Mills, American Mercury, volume 75; pages 81–84, June 1952. Where Do You Stand on the Gravest Question of Our Time? Colliers, volume 133; pages 36–39, January 8, 1954.

BUSH, PRESCOTT S.: Fair Play in the Senate; Code of Fair Procedures, Business Week, page 164, June 5, 1954.

BYRD, HARRY F.: Size and Cost of Our Government, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 292; pages 11–17, March 1954.

CAPEHART, HOMER E.: Price Control: Prospect and Retrospect, a Symposium; Current Developments in Price Control Legislation: A Safe Middle Way, by H. E. Capehart, Iowa Law Review, volume 38, pages 209–333, winter 1953.

DOUGLAS, PAUL H.: Best Advice I Ever Had, Reader's Digest, volume 64, pages 31–32, June 1954. Antitrust Policies and the New Attack on the Federal Trade Commission, R. A. Wallace and P. H. Douglas, University of Chicago Law Review, volume 19, pages 684–723, summer 1952. Colossus on the Potomac, Harper, volume 207, pages 10–11, 21–27, July 1953.

DOUGLAS, PAUL H., and Bolling, Richard: Action To Prevent Depression, New Republic, volume 130: pages 9–13, March 22, 1954.

DOUGLAS, PAUL H.: Fight Against the Filibuster, New Republic, volume 128, pages 6–8, January 12, 1953. Four Challenges to the Nation, New York Times magazine, page 7, January 6, 1952. Gap Between Congress and Main Street, New York Times magazine, page 13, September 16, 1951. Greatness Came Late, Saturday Review, volume 35, page 24, April 19, 1952. Help Wanted in Washington, American magazine, volume 152, page 21, October 1951. Hero as a Politician, New Republic, volume 129, pages 16–17, December 14, 1953. High Cost of Elections, New Republic, volume 127, pages 8–9, December 22, 1952. Improvement of Ethical Standards in the Federal Government—Problems and Proposals, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 280, pages 149–157, March 1952. Let the People In, New Republic, volume 126, pages 14–15, March 31, 1952. Opposition's Job as a Democrat Sees It, New York Times magazine, page 11, February 22, 1953. Politics and Postmen, New Republic, volume 127, page 2, July 14, 1952. Sliding Toward a Depression, New Republic, volume 130, page 14, January 11, 1954. Thirty-eighth Parallel, Indefensible Line, U. S. News & World Report, volume 31, pages 20–21, July 20, 1951. United to Enforce Peace, Foreign Affairs, volume 30, pages 1–16, October 1951. Washington Is Not the United States, New York Times magazine, page 7, November 16, 1952. We Can Cut the Budget, Coronet, volume 30, pages 41–43, September 1951. We Have Means To Stop a Depression, Saturday Evening Post, volume 226, page 10, March 13, 1954. We Need a New Code for Washington, New York Times magazine, page 12, April 1, 1951. Same abridged with title "We Need a Code of Official Conduct," Reader's Digest, volume 58, pages 4–6, June 1951. What It Costs To Run, excerpt from Ethics in Government, Atlantic, volume 190, pages 43–46, August 1952. Why I'm for KEFAUVER, Collier's, volume 130, page 20, July 19, 1952. Why Not Defend Freedom Everywhere We Can? Reader's Digest, volume 59, pages 10–15, August 1951.

ELLENDER, ALLEN J.: Big Debate: Here's What It Boils Down To, Farm Journal, volume 78, pages 32–33, March 1954.

FLANDERS, RALPH E.: Future of the Republican Party, Virginia Quarterly Review, volume 28, No. 2, pages 176–182, April 1952. How Are Top Executive Decisions Made? American Economic Review, volume 41, pages

93–97, May 1951. What Ails the United States Senate? New York Times magazine, page 13, May 9, 1954.

FULBRIGHT, JAMES W.: Congressional Investigations, a Symposium, Significance for Legislative Process, by J. W. FULBRIGHT, University of Chicago Law Review, volume 18, pages 421–661, spring 1951. How To Get Better Men Elected, Ladies Home Journal, volume 68, page 52, November 1951. Moral Standards of Governmental Conduct, New Republic, volume 124, page 8, April 9, 1951. Same abridged with title "Something To Paste in Your Hat," Life, volume 30, page 42, April 9, 1951. Same abridged with title "Moral Threat to America," Reader's Digest, volume 58, pages 1–4, June 1951. Open Doors, Not Iron Curtains, New York Times magazine, page 18, August 5, 1951.

GILLETTE, GUY M.: Senate in Foreign Relations: Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 289, pages 49–57, September 1953.

HILL, LISTER: Bonanza for Education, Harper, volume 204, pages 28–31, March 1952. Freedom and Responsibility in Publishing, Publishers' Weekly, volume 163, pages 123–124, January 10, 1953. Oil Rush of '53, New Republic, volume 28, pages 12–13, March 2, 1953. Where Are We Democrats Going? Reporter, volume 9, pages 12–15, November 24, 1953.

HUMPHREY, HUBERT H.: Ethical Standards in American Legislative Chambers, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 280, pages 51–59, March 1952. FEPC, the Challenge for the Democrats, New Republic, volume 127, pages 14–15, July 21, 1952. Now That We're Out, New Republic, volume 127, pages 8–9, November 17, 1952.

JOHNSON, EDWIN C.: Proposed Senate Action on Airmail Subsidies, Journal of Air Law and Commerce, volume 17, pages 253–258, summer 1950. Universal Military Training: Boobytrap, Nation, volume 174, pages 75–76, January 26, 1952. What Worries the West, Look magazine, volume 18, page 34, April 6, 1954.

JACKSON, HENRY M.: Congress and the Atom, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 290, pages 76–81, November 1953.

KEFAUVER, ESTES: Can Bipartisanship Be Restored in Foreign Policy? Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 33, page 5, June 15, 1954. Crime in the United States, Saturday Evening Post, volume 223, pages 19–21, April 7; pages 24–25, April 14; pages 26–27, April 21; page 30, April 28, 1951. Same abridged, Reader's Digest, volume 59, pages 42–48, July 1951. Crime Is International, U. N. World, volume 5, pages 17–20, September 1951. Executive-Congressional Liaison, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 289, pages 108–113, September 1953. Fair Conduct Code for Congress, New Republic, volume 128, pages 14–15, March 16, 1953. Indictment of the Political Convention, New York Times magazine, page 9, March 16, 1952. Man, Not Principles, New Republic, volume 127, pages 10–11, November 17, 1952. Message to the High-School Students of America, Scholastic, volume 58, page 9, April 11, 1951. Need for Boldness, Nation, volume 174, page 557, June 7, 1952. Past and Present Standards of Public Ethics in America: Are We Improving? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 280, pages 1–8, March 1952. Public Defender: Pro, E. KEFAUVER; Con, W. S. Stewart, Virginia Law Weekly Dicta Compilation, volume 1, pages 64–72, 1949. Senator KEFAUVER on Social Progress and Foreign Policy, American Mercury, volume 74, pages 88–90, April 1952. Senator KEFAUVER on the Democratic Platform, American Mercury, volume 74, pages 87–88, June 1952.

KENNEDY, JOHN F.: Floor Beneath Wages Is Gone, New Republic, volume 128, pages 14–15, July 20, 1953. New England and the South, Atlantic, volume 193, pages 32–36, January 1954. What should United States Do in Indochina?, Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 33, page 4, May 15, 1954. What's the Matter With New England?, New York Times Magazine, page 12, November 8, 1953. What's Wrong With Social Security?, American magazine, volume 156, page 19, October 1953.

KILGORE, HARLEY M.: Literacy and the National Welfare, School Life, volume 34, pages 90–91, March 1952. Effort To Intimidate the Press, American Mercury, volume 75, page 7, November 1952.

KNOWLAND, WILLIAM F.: Instant Retaliation Policy Defended, New York Times Magazine, page 11, March 21, 1954. Our Policy in the Far East, a Debate, New York Times magazine, page 12, May 16, 1954. Senator on Sing Sheng, Scholastic, volume 60, page 19, March 5, 1952. What Should United States Do in Indochina?, Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 33, pages 5–6, May 15, 1954.

LEHMAN, HERBERT H.: Future: Four Views, New York Times magazine, part 2, page 64, February 1, 1953. National Origin, Fraud, and Threat, New Republic, volume 128, pages 8–9, February 16, 1953.

MCCARRAN, PATRICK A.: Divorce and Domestic Relations—a Compilation, Full Faith by P. MCCARRAN, Virginia Law Weekly Dicta Compilation, volume 2, pages 1–130, 1949–50. Internal Security Act of 1950, Columbia Law Review, volume 51, pages 606–660, May 1951. Internal Security Act of 1950, University of Pittsburgh Law Review, volume 12, pages 481–513, summer 1951. Supreme Court and the Loyalty Program: The Effect of Refugee Committee v. McGrath, American Bar Association Journal, volume 37, pages 434–437, 476–477, June 1951. Three Years of Federal Administrative Procedure Act, a Study in Legislation. Georgetown Law Journal, volume 38, pages 574–589, May 1950. Value of the Ex-Communist, American Mercury, volume 73, pages 3–10, November 1951. Why Shouldn't the Spanish Fight for Us? Saturday Evening Post, volume 223, page 25, April 28, 1951.

MALONE, GEORGE W.: Should United States Import More? Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 33; page 4, March 15, 1954.

MANSFIELD, MICHAEL J.: Meaning of the Term "Advice and Consent," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 289; pages 127–133, September 1953. Our Policy in the Far East, a Debate, New York Times magazine, page 12, May 16, 1954.

MONRONEY, ALMER S. M.: Elect Stevenson, Collier's, volume 130, page 21, October 25, 1952. Formula for Clean Government, New York Times magazine, page 16, January 27, 1952.

MORSE, WAYNE L.: GOP Platform, New Republic, volume 127, pages 12–13, August 4, 1952. My Personal Declaration of Independence, New Republic, volume 128, pages 13–14, July 6, 1953. Progress of the Crusade, New Republic, volume 129, pages 15–16, August 31, 1953. Reading for Republicans, Nation, volume 175, pages 13–14, July 5, 1952. Universal Military Training; National Need, Nation, volume 174, page 74, January 26, 1952. Wait Until the Voters Find Out, New Republic, volume 127, pages 11–12, November 17, 1952. Wanted Fair Procedures, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, volume 9, pages 211–214, July 1953. Why I Opposed Wilson, New Republic, volume 128, pages 7–9, February 2, 1953.

MUNDT, KARL E.: How Harry Dexter White Pulled Wires for Russia, U. S. News & World Report, volume 35, pages 82–86, December 25, 1953. I Believe, Country Gentleman, volume 124, page 12, May 1954. Oahe Dam; Unrecorded, Unorthodox History, America, volume 89, page 330, June 27, 1953. Political Economy, New Republic, volume 128, page 8, June 15, 1953. Should the GOP Merge With the Dixiecrats? Collier's, volume 128, page 20, July 28, 1951.

PURTELL, WILLIAM A.: I'm a Boss, and What's Wrong With That? Saturday Evening Post, volume 224, page 25, April 5, 1952.

RUSSELL, RICHARD B.: For the Prisoners Who Broke, Kindness or Punishment? U. S. News & World Report, volume 35, pages 51–53, October 16, 1953. Senator RUSSELL on the Steel Mills Seizure and FEPC, American Mercury, volume 74, pages 84–87, June 1952.

SALTONSTALL, LEVERETT: Ike Should Be Nominated, Collier's, volume 130, page 23, July 5, 1952. What the GOP Must Do To Win, American magazine, volume 152, pages 32–33, October 1951.

SMITH, HOWARD ALEXANDER: Can Bipartisanship Be Restored in Foreign Policy? Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 33, page 4, June 15, 1954. Information and Intelligence for Congress, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 289, pages 114–119, September 1953. Party Quiz on Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 32, page 1, October 15, 1952. Sanctions Against Peiping, Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 30, pages 1–2, March 23, 1951.

SMITH, MARGARET CHASE: No Place for a Woman? Ladies Home Journal, volume 69, page 50, February 1952. Russia's Rebirth, Collier's, volume 128, page 83, October 27, 1951. We Can Forfeit Freedom, Nation, volume 173, page 13, July 7, 1951. Why Vote for Eisenhower? Woman's Home Companion, volume 79, pages 38–39, November 1952.

SPARKMAN, JOHN J.: Administration of title II, First War Powers Act, 1941, University of Pittsburgh Law Review, volume 14, pages 303–318, spring 1953. Big Problem: Saving Small Business, New York Times magazine, page 14, June 17, 1951. China: United States Blockade or U. N. Embargo? New Republic, volume 128, pages 10–11, February 23, 1953. Foreign Policy in the Presidential Campaign. Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 32, page 5, September 15, 1952. Foundations of Current American Foreign Policy, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 282, pages 8–11, July 1952. Legislative History and the Interpretation of Laws, Alabama Law Review, volume 2, pages 189–206, spring 1950. Notes on the Japanese Peace Treaty. Journal of Public Law, volume I, pages 109–116, spring 1952.

WATKINS, ARTHUR V.: What Should the New Administration Do About World Trade? Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 32, pages 5–6, February 15, 1953.

WILEY, ALEXANDER: Call For Action, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, volume 9, page 243, September 1953. Committee on Foreign Relations, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 289, pages 58–65, September 1953. Wiley proposes 6-Point Program for United States Leadership, Foreign Policy Bulletin, volume 30, pages 3–4, April 20, 1951.

YOUNG, MILTON R.: Big Debate: Here's What it Boils Down To. Farm Journal, volume 78, pages 32–33, March 1954.

BOOKS BY THE MEMBERS OF THE PRESENT SENATE (83D CONG.)

DOUGLAS, PAUL H.: Economy in the National Government, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952, 277 pages. Ethics in Government, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1952, 114 pages. (Godkin lectures at Harvard, 1951.)

FLANDERS, RALPH E.: The American City, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1950, 101 pages. The Function of Management in American Life, lectures delivered at the Seventh Annual Stanford Business Conference, July 19–23, 1948, Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stanford University (1949), 52 pages.

HUMPHREY, HUBERT H.: The Stranger at Our Gates: America's Immigration Policy, New York, Public Affairs Committee, 1954, 28 pages. Tax Loopholes, Washington, Public Affairs Institute, 1952, 31 pages.

KEFAUVER, ESTES: Crime in America, by ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee (May 10, 1950–May 1, 1951). Edited and with an introduction by Sidney Shalett. (1st edition.) Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1951.

MCCARTHY, JOSEPH R.: America's Retreat From Victory; the Story of George C. Marshall, New York, Devin-Adair, 1951, 187 pages. McCarthyism, the Fight for America; documented answers to questions by friend and foe, New York, Devin-Adair, 1952, 101 pages. The Story of General George C. Marshall, 1952, 187 pages.

WILEY, ALEXANDER: Laughing With Congress, New York, Crown Publishers, 1947, 228 pages.

Sources: Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, July 1954; Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, April 1953 to February 1954.

For articles: Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, April 1951 to March 1953; Index to Legal Periodicals, August 1949 to July 1952; Index to Legal Periodicals, August 1952 to July 1953.

For books: Library of Congress main catalog.

(EXPLANATORY NOTE.—No attempt has been made to include statements made on the Senate floor which were reprinted in full or in part in various publications. No attempt has been made to include addresses which were reprinted, nor to include the various U. S. Government documents which came out under the name of a particular Member. The references included in this bibliography are limited to those written by the Members while serving in the U. S. Senate. One further limitation with reference to the articles is that they represent only the above sources as listed.)

COMPENSATION FOR CARRYING MAIL ON WATER ROUTES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 361) to provide for the renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes, which was, in line 4, strike out all after "434)," down through line 7, inclusive, and insert "are amended by striking out the words "star-route or screen vehicle service" wherever they appear in such paragraphs and inserting in lieu thereof "star-route, screen vehicle service, or inland water-route"."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have discussed the House amendment with the minority leader and with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. They have no objection to the consideration of the amendment.

The amendment proposed by the House limits the bill strictly to inland waterways. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3627) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, which was, on page 2, line 5, after "requirement." insert "Any officer or employee who shall have given notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act pursuant to the last paragraph of section 3 (a) of this act shall be deemed for the purposes of this requirement to have been subject to the provisions of this act during any period of service or part thereof ending not later than September 30, 1954, with respect to which there shall have been deposited the amounts specified in section 9."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have similarly discussed this House amendment with the minority leader and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and they have no objection to the consideration of the amendment of the House.

The amendment provides for a clarification in the Legislative Retirement Act of last year. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by Joseph C. Ellis, financial clerk of the Senate.

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

AUGUST 14, 1954.

S. 3627 as passed by the Senate and H. R. 9586, as passed by the House of Representatives, both contain a requirement of 1 year of creditable civilian service subject to the Retirement Act in the 2-year period preceding separation in order that title to annuity rights be based on such separation. The language "subject to the Retirement Act" has been interpreted to mean service creditable for retirement and during which deductions were withheld from the salary of the employee.

Public Law 303, 83d Congress, approved March 6, 1954, provided that employees of the legislative branch serving on the date of enactment, March 6, 1954, could give notice to come within the purview of the Retirement Act prior to September 7, 1954. Due to the increased benefits provided by Public Law 303 a considerable number of employees exercised this option, many of them making service credit deposits to cover the last 5 years of service. It is anticipated that some employees will exercise this option before September 7, 1954. Should any of these employees be separated in January as a result of the expiration of the Member's term they would not be eligible for annuity if the proposed legislation is enacted as is, since they could not possibly have had deductions withheld from their salaries for the required 1 year. The attached language is suggested to remedy this situation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION OF TREATIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to advise the acting minority leader that I have had a request from the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate consider tomorrow, or on Friday, if the Senate is still in session, the treaties on the executive calendar. I understood the matter was being discussed with the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The treaties will not be called up tonight; I merely desired to have the RECORD show that before final adjournment it is intended to take up the several treaties on the executive calendar.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

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

S. 2230. A bill for the relief of Louis S. Thomas and D. Grace Thomas (Rept. No. 2500).

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following additional favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

William Z. Fairbanks, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Edward A. Towse; and

Albert M. Felix, of Hawaii, to be third judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

INCREASE OF THE DUTY ON WATCHES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, which I send to the desk.

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

CONSUMERS HIT BY WRONG KIND OF WATCH SUBSIDY

President Eisenhower has yielded to the recommendation of the Tariff Commission to raise the duty on Swiss watch movements by about 50 percent.

The Tariff Commission urged the duty hike more for defense purposes than the benefit of the four domestic-jeweled watchmakers. It said the watchmakers' skills would be needed in any emergency, and that therefore the industry, with its force of trained workers, should be better protected against Swiss competition.

Nevertheless, we believe the Commission and the President have made a mistake.

Evidence is divided both on whether the jeweled-watch industry could survive without the extra duty protection and its importance to defense. But that is not the main point. What seems clear to us is the fact if it was deemed necessary to subsidize the industry there were better ways of doing it than a tariff hike.

The course taken will, by raising retail prices, result in socking consumers about five times as much as the subsidy it is expected to provide for the watchmakers. It will give a black eye to this country's professions on foreign-trade promotion, and by needlessly taking advantage of an escape clause in the trade treaty with Switzerland, it will put a bad taste in the mouth of a people who buy from us much more than they sell to us.

Consider the beating the consumers will take. The duty raise ranges from 9 cents to $1.15 per watch movement, with the average on popular timepieces estimated at around $1. In usual trade practices that calls for an extra markup of 50 cents by the importer, making the total $1.50. The retailers would double that, making the aver-

age increase in the price to consumers around $3 (unless the trade absorbs some of the duty). On 10 million Swiss movements a year that means $30 million to be charged up to the consumers. If people cut the number of watches they buy, it will mean pinching what they consider their standard of living, and of course it would hurt both foreign and domestic business.

It is not by any means certain how much good the duty hike will do the domestic industry. Dealers say the Swiss movements have been underselling the domestic by 50 percent and with the tariff lift, will still undersell them by more than 30 percent.

But if the domestic makers get all the benefit intended what will it amount to? The Tariff Commission said the domestic output should be kept at at least 2 million movements yearly in order to have a good base to expand on in case of a defense emergency. The current output now is around 1.7 million. The indicated expansion of 300,000 movements at $15 (roughly the average wholesale) would bring them $4.5 million. Meanwhile the consumer would be paying some $30 million extra by reason of the duty and attendant markups.

The Government has made this case into a defense matter. In this situation why not provide a direct defense subsidy through the purchase, say, of timing devices and instruments at remunerative prices. Wouldn't that be preferable to hitting consumers for $30 million in duties, placing a burden on trade with a good customer like Switzerland, and raising doubts in the minds of a lot of other customers about our foreign trade development policies?

Maybe we, as a people, don't like to be taxed to pay direct subsidies to manufacturers (even though we pay them to others). But neither can we like being tagged for an indirect subsidy five times as much as the direct subsidy would cost, and have a monkey wrench thrown into our trade relations as well.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, August 19, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 18 (legislative day of August 5), 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 2 to class 1.

Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 4 to class 3.

Hermann F. Eilts, of Pennsylvania, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4.

Herbert E. Weiner, of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles H. Pletcher, of Minnesota, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 1 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

R. Borden Reams, of Pennsylvania.
Arthur L. Richards, of California.

R. Smith Simpson, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Ernest H. Fisk, of Ohio.
Elvin Seibert, of New York.

Robert B. Dreessen, of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Joseph B. Phillips, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edmund H. Kellogg, of Virginia.
William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Hubert M. Curry, of Illinois.
Roy I. Kimmel, of New Mexico.
James H. Lewis, of Pennsylvania.
Edward A. Mag, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James N. Cortada, of Florida.
Theo E. Hall, of Kansas.
Guy O. Long, of Pennsylvania.
George Moffitt, Jr., of Connecticut.
Stephen C. Worster, of Maine.

Miss Anna E. Simmons, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Katherine S. Chase, of Connecticut.
William A. Hayne, of California.
James R. Huntley, of Washington.
Laurence G. Pickering, of Nebraska.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Sofia P. Kearney, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
Roland W. Kenney, of Connecticut.
J. H. Cameron Peake, of New York.
Robert L. Ware, Jr., of New Jersey.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Vincent J. Augliere, of Virginia.
J. Raymond Ylitalo, of Minnesota.

George H. Owen, of New York, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 18 (legislative day of August 5), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Herbert Hoover, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY

Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington.

Frank H. Higgins, of New York.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Lyle S. Garlock, of Minnesota.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

William Birrell Franke, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Robert McClintock, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Charles J. Vogel, of North Dakota, to be United States circuit judge, eighth circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Henry L. Brooks, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the western district of Kentucky.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Jay Neal, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas.

William C. Littlefield, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF, ARMY FIELD FORCES, WITH RANK OF GENERAL

Lt. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist, O7120, Army of the United States, to be chief, Army Field Forces, with the rank of general and as general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

COMMANDING GENERAL, VII CORPS

Maj. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845, to be commanding general, VII Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

COMMANDING GENERAL, I CORPS

Maj. Gen. John Howell Collier, O12388, to be commanding general, I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

COMMANDING GENERAL, V CORPS

Maj. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788, to be commanding general, V Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

VETERINARY CORPS

Col. Elmer William Young, O16298, Veterinary Corps, United States Army, to be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. James Holden Phillips, O12331.
Brig. Gen. Mark McClure, O14935.
Brig. Gen. Francis Marion Day, O15614.
Brig. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952.
Brig. Gen. Arthur Lawrence Marshall, O38593.
Brig. Gen. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., O16055.
Brig. Gen. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099.
Brig. Gen. Frank Coffin Holbrook, O16654.
Brig. Gen. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, O17174.
Brig. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., O18662.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Gerald Edward Galloway, O16043.
Col. Edwin Bascum Kearns, Jr., O16224.
Col. Russell Thomas Finn, O16237.
Col. Donald Dunford, O16267.
Col. Benjamin Franklin Modisett, O39526.
Col. Harry Warren Johnson, O16391.

Col. William Jesse Deyo, Jr., O16449.
Col. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451.
Col. George Olaf Norman Lodoen, O16580.
Col. Mason Harley Lucas, O16633.
Col. Albert Gallatin Franklin, Jr., O16642.
Col. Francis Anthony Kreidel, O39553.
Col. Theodore Addison Weyher, O16738.
Col. Bertram Arthur Holtzworth, O16804.
Col. Olaf Helgesen Kyster, Jr., O16830.
Col. Martin Joseph Morin, O16911.
Col. David William Traub, O17110.
Col. William Henry Hennig, O17122.
Col. Garrison Barkley Coverdale, O17148.
Col. William Mattingly Breckinridge, O17210.
Col. Thomas Jahn Sands, O17521.
Col. Ralph Robert Mace, O17578.
Col. James Bernard Quill, O17673.
Col. Fred Winchester Sladen, Jr., O17677.
Col. Charles Greene Calloway, O17690.
Col. Herbert John Vander Heide, O17754.
Col. Sidney Clay Wooten, O18126.
Col. Walter Bernard Yeager, O29464.
Col. Miller Osborne Perry, O18427.
Col. Louis Victor Hightower, O18502.
Col. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709.
Col. Floyd Allan Hansen, O18767.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Philip Charles Bettenburg, O171936, Minnesota National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Carl Otha DeBard, O288794, Indiana National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Heber Leutner Edwards, O172673, North Dakota National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Rhodolph Leslie Esmay, O165227, Wyoming National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Luis Raul Esteves, O170507, Puerto Rico National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Walter Jones Hanna, O171549, Alabama National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Roy Washington Kenny, O176730, Oklahoma National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Mark Walter Lance, O243398, Florida National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Gordon Alexander MacDonald, O193923, Michigan National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Evelyn Nelson, O241830, Minnesota National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Frederick Gates Reincke, O322850, Connecticut National Guard.
Maj. Gen. Charles Gurdon Sage, O171863, New Mexico National Guard.
Maj. Gen. John Edward Walsh, O256059, Idaho National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Wayne Carlos Bailey, O281317, California National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Richard Cook, O107835, Minnesota National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Gerald Edward DuBois, O340176, Iowa National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Clifford Hodgin, O120835, Illinois National Guard.
Brig. Gen. John Francis Homfeld, O253221, Illinois National Guard.
Brig. Gen. John Jacobson, Jr., O102326, New Hampshire National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Cecil Joseph Kenney, O243189, Michigan National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Harry Atkins Markle, Jr., O271409, Pennsylvania National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Loren Gregory Windom, O275591, Ohio National Guard.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS

The following-named officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bruce E. Bradley, Medical Corps.
Irwin L. V. Norman, Medical Corps.
William L. Knickerbocker, Supply Corps.
Thomas L. Becknell, Jr., Supply Corps.
James W. Boundy, Supply Corps.
William Sihler, Civil Engineer Corps.
Robert H. Meade, Civil Engineer Corps.
Ralph W. Taylor, Dental Corps.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George W. Anderson, Jr.	Albert G. Mumma
Harold M. Briggs	Joseph N. Murphy
Henry H. Caldwell	Henry S. Persons
Robert W. Cavenagh	Paul H. Ramsey
Clifford S. Cooper	Robert H. Rice
Lawrence R. Daspit	Walter F. Rodee
William A. Dolan, Jr.	William K. Romoser
Robert B. Ellis	Harry E. Sears
Frank W. Fenno, Jr.	Allen Smith, Jr.
William E. Ferrall	Philip W. Snyder
Charles D. Griffin	Frederick C. Stelter, Jr.
Miles H. Hubbard	James H. Ward
William J. Marshall	George C. Weaver
Benjamin E. Moore	

PERMANENT PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of George M. Chaffin and 8,403 other officers for permanent promotion in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on July 30, 1954, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of George E. Chaffin, which appears on page 12742, and ending with the name of John A. Ricci, which is shown on page 12759.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Rev. A. Cecil Cooper, Anglican bishop of Korea, offered the following prayer:

O God, the creator and sustainer of all things in heaven and earth, in the knowledge of, and in obedience to whose will alone can true freedom be found, we praise and thank Thee that Thou hast revealed Thy will to the world in Thy son Jesus Christ our Lord, and hast called our Nation to witness to Thy truth.

Grant to us, we pray Thee, the guidance of Thy holy spirit, that in all our deliberations and decisions Thy will may be done, and Thy name glorified among men. In Thee alone can mankind find lasting peace, concord, and freedom. Look down in mercy on the millions in bondage under totalitarian oppression, deprived of all freedom of action, speech, and thought. Relieve the millions who suffer, especially in lands devastated by war.

Grant us the power not only to seek to relieve their bodily sufferings but also to witness to, and forward through truths by which alone mankind can obtain Thy peace and the spirit of brotherhood. That Thou wilt use us for the working out of Thy eternal purpose, we ask in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, who, with the Father and holy spirit liveth and reigneth, God, forever and ever.

A Member of this House passed to rest yesterday, so we stand for a moment in silence and pray God he may rest in peace and comfort for his family. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 316):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate recesses it be as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6287. An act to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951;

H. R. 9709. An act to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program;

H. R. 9756. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation;

H. R. 9859. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9909. An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3248. An act to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; and

S. 3868. An act authorizing the payment of salary to any individual given a recess appointment as Comptroller General of the United States before the beginning of the 84th Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2308. An act to authorize and direct the investigation by the Attorney General of certain offenses, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9936) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 27, 30, 31, 38, 39, 40, 46, 49, 52, 56, 61, 62, 71½, 74, 79, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 99 100, 104, 110, 115, 116, 119, 122, 127, 128, 129, 132, 134, 136, 147, 148, 154, 155, 164, 168, and 187 to the above-entitled bill: Be it further

Resolved, That the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 151; be it further