

I have made in and out of the Congress on a number of occasions, and which, as an American, I shall continue to make because I consider it my duty to do so, that the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military power and strength greater than they possess.

And with such a force, with the spiritual values of America, with public opinion when aroused, and a united America, we can approach the trying days that lie ahead with confidence and success.

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the month of December I headed a group committee representing the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which had an audience with the Bureau of the Budget, in Washington, regarding the civil functions at the coming session of Congress. This group included representatives from the States of California, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Iowa, and the District of Columbia, and they undertook to state the case for flood control and rivers and harbors work to the Bureau of Budget for every section of the Nation. Following this, the

National Rivers and Harbors Congress sent out to its members a newsletter, a copy of which is presented for inclusion in my remarks. I think this matter is an extremely important one and will be of interest to every Member of the Congress. The newsletter is as follows:

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS,

Washington, D. C., December 27, 1954.

To the Members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

During the course of the current month, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress took strong action to help build up the budget recommendations for civil functions in the coming session of Congress. President OVERTON BROOKS led a strong committee from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which called up the Budget Bureau and talked to its officials for over an hour. On this committee were representatives from the States of California, Florida, Maryland, Louisiana, Idaho, and the District of Columbia; and the committee therefore spoke for the entire country.

We pointed out to the Bureau of Budget that for the last 4 years budget recommendations for rivers, harbors, and flood control work had been steadily falling in the face of further inflation which constantly lessened the purchasing power of the dollar. We further pointed out that the needs of the country have been steadily increasing with our growing population and that the pressure due to long delay in starting projects had been steadily increasing. We showed that this was the case although our national policy had been to pour billions of dollars into foreign aid, neglecting or postponing the development of internal improvement in our own Nation.

Your committee recommended to the Bureau of Budget three important policies, namely:

1. A larger yearly budget for civil functions until this recommended budget shall reach the figure of \$650 million per year.

2. A policy of recommending new starts in order that many projects approved for years may be given the green light.

3. The build-up of a backlog of new projects badly needed by this country in the rapid development of our internal resources. In other words, waterway development should keep pace with road, highway, and airway development.

Officials of the Bureau of Budget to whom we talked made no comment regarding the backlog. In reference to the first suggestion, namely, an increased overall budget, these officials indicated that some relief could be expected in recommendations made year after next to the Congress. During that year, some of the very large multiple-purpose dams will be completed and funds will then be available.

Mr. Carl H. Schwartz, Chief, Resources and Civil Works Division, made the statement in reference to the second suggestion that consideration was being given to "new starts" to be recommended to Congress for approval for the coming fiscal year; and that information regarding this matter would be released to the public during the early part of 1955. While we did not get all that we wanted, I feel that our committee accomplished a very useful mission on behalf of our membership and as your president, I am passing this information on to you.

Yours for a happy and prosperous New Year,

Cordially yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
President.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1955

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

O Thou companion of the pilgrim years, as with renewed powers and with restored souls, Thy servants in the ministry of public affairs face the high tasks of this National Chamber of deliberation, help them in all things, we pray, to be masters of themselves that they may indeed be the servants of others.

With the dim lamps of our own devices we cannot find a sure and clear path through the tangled maze of this stricken generation. Be Thou the guardian and guide of the unbeaten way our feet must take. Above all, give us a consuming passion, not to have our own way, but to find Thy holy will. May no cherished resentment, no camouflaged selfishness, no small loyalties nor ingrained prejudices, choke and clog the channels of our national service. Enlarge our spirits to meet the stupendous dimensions of these epic days. O God, to whom the future belongs, use us as pioneers of a better world for ourselves and for all peoples. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1955, was dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Mr. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to recommendations for further developing the foreign economic policy of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 62)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to activities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which was read

and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today.)

REPORT OF TRADE AGREEMENT ESCAPE CLAUSES — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to a report on trade agreement escape clauses, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of today.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS ON OPERATIONS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of operations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, together with a report of the "on-farm" assistance through direct act to rehabilitate farm land damaged by disastrous floods, and a report of the operations under the emergency wind erosion control program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on the reapportionment of an appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Grants to States for Public Assistance," which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN CITIZENS OR NATIONALS OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper) to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE FACILITIES ACT RELATING TO FACILITIES NECESSARY FOR TRAINING OF UNITS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSERVATION AND OPERATION OF THE NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL-SHALE RESERVES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENLISTMENT CONTRACTS OR PERIODS OF OBLIGATED SERVICE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets or midshipmen at the Military, Naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard Academies, or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CREDITING OF CERTAIN SERVICE TOWARD RETIREMENT OF RESERVE PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the crediting of certain service toward retirement of reserve personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMPENSATION OF ACADEMIC DEAN OF UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the annual compensation of the academic dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY OFFICERS OF NAVAL SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), to permit the retirement of temporary officers of the naval service after completion of more than 20 years of active service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPEAL OF ACT RELATING TO LIMIT OF DATE OF FILING CLAIMS FOR RETAINER PAY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of January 19, 1929 (ch. 86, 45 Stat. 1090), entitled "An act to limit the date of filing claims for retainer pay" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

VESSEL TONNAGE COMPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the tonnage composition of the United States Navy with respect to vessels, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS NOW INCLUDED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT AND CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN ADJUSTMENTS IN DATES OF RANK IN THE REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROFESSIONAL EXAMINATIONS FOR PROMOTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal certain laws relating to

professional examinations for promotion of medical, dental, and veterinary officers of the Army and Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY AND AIR FORCE NURSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATISTICAL STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the secret semiannual Statistical Stockpile Report for the period January 1 through June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB

A letter from the National Shipwriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that club, as of April 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Facilities Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on tin operations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE, HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Commission of Licensure, under the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 RELATING TO VETERANS RIGHTS FOR CERTAIN SERVICEMEN

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 300 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in relation to the entitlement of servicemen discharged or dismissed by court martial to veterans rights (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the 38th annual report of that Commission, for the period October 1, 1953, through September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVISION OF STRATEGIC TRADE CONTROLS

A letter from the Deputy Director for Mutual Defense Assistance Control, Foreign Operations Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Revision of Strategic Trade Controls," for the first half of the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to law, a confidential semiannual report of that Board for the period July 1 to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECIPROCAL FIRE PROTECTION AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC OR PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize reciprocal fire protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, RELATING TO DONATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to donate certain property to the American National Red Cross (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the operations of the General Accounting Office, fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CONCESSION CONTRACTS IN CERTAIN RECREATIONAL AREAS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed awards of concession contracts in Mount Ranier National Park, Wash. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF COST OF REHABILITATION AND REPAIR OF DAMAGES CAUSED BY THE NAVY AT MERCER COUNTY AIRPORT, TRENTON, N. J.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the certification by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States Navy at Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AUTHORIZATION TO TRANSFER CERTAIN PROPERTY TO PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer certain property to the

Panama Canal Company, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIFE PRESERVERS FOR RIVER STEAMERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475) relating to life preservers for river steamers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO VERIFICATION UNDER OATH OF CERTAIN CERTIFICATES OF INSPECTION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR HONORABLE SERVICE IN THE NAVY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the naturalization of certain persons by reason of honorable service in the United States Navy prior to December 24, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES OCCASIONED BY ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

G. F. ALLEN, DECEASED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of G. F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST PRESIDENT-AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend 18 U. S. C. 871 to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Nick A. Mavros or Nicholas P. Climeon or Nicholas Simeon or Nicholas Symeon from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 1, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Committee, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the accounts of that organization for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN INEQUITIES BY FIXING HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION PRACTICES

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation to remove certain inequities by fixing the hours of work and overtime compensation practices in the case of certain employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

UNIFORM RETIREMENT DATE FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HUGH S. GIBSON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say a few words concerning the recent death of one of my old and dear friends, the Honorable Hugh S. Gibson.

Hugh Gibson was one of the finest diplomats and most energetic humani-

tarians America has ever produced. He devoted his entire life to the promotion of international understanding and to the betterment of men's lives everywhere.

For 30 years Hugh Gibson played a role in almost every major development in international affairs. He entered the Foreign Service in 1908 as secretary at the Legation in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. From 1911 to 1913 he was secretary to the legation in Habana, Cuba, and in 1915 he moved to a similar post in Brussels.

It was when Hugh was secretary to the Embassy in Brussels that I first became acquainted with him. We were both identified at the time with former President Hoover's Commission for the Relief of Belgium, just after World War I broke out. It will be recalled that Hugh Gibson, acting under Ambassador Brand Whitlock, made the noble effort which, unfortunately, was unavailing, to save the life of the famous nurse, Edith Cavell, who was condemned to death by the German occupation in Belgium, and who was shot by a firing squad on the charge of being a spy.

From the time of the early organization of the famous Commission for the Relief of Belgium to the time of his death I had the privilege of being a close friend of Hugh Gibson, and of serving with him in many common undertakings initiated by former President Hoover.

After brief service as first secretary to the United States Embassy in Paris, Hugh became, in 1918, Director General of the American Relief Administration, which provided food to the war-torn countries of Europe. With the exception of that Administration's Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover, no man did more to help the people of the ravaged countries of Europe survive those terrible postwar months. At the same time Hugh Gibson served on the Inter-Allied Commission that made the first postwar survey of conditions in the Balkans.

In 1919 he was appointed Minister to Poland, and from 1924 to 1927 he served as Minister to Switzerland. In this latter capacity he played a large part in the preparation for the Geneva Conference of 1927 on disarmament. In the same year he was chairman of the United States delegation to the Conference for Limitation of Naval Rearmament.

In 1927 he returned to Belgium, where he served as our Ambassador from 1927 to 1933. As Ambassador to Brazil from 1933 to 1937, he played a decisive role in bringing the conflict between Bolivia and Paraguay to an end.

From 1937 until his retirement in 1938 he was again our Ambassador to Belgium.

From 1938 until his death last month Hugh Gibson continued to contribute to international understanding by his many books and articles on international affairs, some of which were written with the collaboration of former President Hoover.

His great diplomatic experience, his knowledge of relief programs, and the

high regard in which he was held by all European leaders, led to his appointment as Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, a post which he held until his death.

Few men have contributed so much for the betterment of mankind. The people of Europe and of America will not soon forget his great services.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of December 13, 1954, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of December 13, 1954, both extolling the wonderful career of former Ambassador Hugh Gibson.

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

[From the New York Times of December 13, 1954]

HUGH GIBSON

Hugh Gibson, who died yesterday in Geneva, Switzerland, at the age of 71, was not only a distinguished career diplomat—he might also be called a career humanitarian. Whether the enterprise at hand was the vain one of trying to save Edith Cavell from a German firing squad in the First World War, or ending the war in the Chaco, or administering vast war or postwar relief projects; whether it was working for disarmament or considering, as in one book he did, *The Problems of Lasting Peace*; whether it was representing his own Government with effectiveness and dignity or directing a committee for finding new homes for refugees and migrants—the work on which he was engaged when he died—Hugh Gibson gave to the task a brilliant mind, a deep understanding of other persons and nations and a profound sympathy.

Never advertising his own virtues or achievements, always giving himself unselfishly and single-mindedly, he was not in his later years much in the public eye. He took his joy in the useful work he was able to do, and it was his good fortune to go on doing it to the very day of his death.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 13, 1954]

Hugh Gibson, who has just died in Geneva at the age of 71, was one of the most devoted, energetic and resourceful emissaries America ever sent forth into the world of diplomacy. He once referred to himself as a diplomat who did "not wear spats." He might have said with equal accuracy that he was a diplomat who was not afraid to roll up his sleeves, and a human being whose concern was for people as well as for nations. When to these traits were added his capacity to make friendships, his abilities as an organizer, and his talents as a writer, a picture of Mr. Gibson's unusual attainments began to emerge.

From 1914 to 1938 hardly a great event in international affairs took place in which Mr. Gibson did not play some part. As secretary of the American Legation in Brussels in 1914 he did what he could to mitigate the effects of warfare upon the populace, and his strenuous efforts on behalf of Edith Cavell, the English nurse executed by the Germans, brought him wide notice. Later on he represented America in many countries, holding the ambassadorships to Switzerland, Belgium, and Brazil. A close friend of President Hoover, he continued in the diplomatic service under President Roosevelt, retiring in 1938.

Although he left the diplomatic service years ago, Mr. Gibson never ceased his efforts to bring help and hope to the international scene. Since 1951 he had been direc-

tor of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, organized by 20 nations. He was in the midst of work on its behalf when he collapsed, dying as he had lived, in the service of his fellow men.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. With the resolution, I also submit a report (No. 2) of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, let me say this has been a very controversial subject for some time before the Senate. The Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am still chairman, assured this body on more than one occasion that it would complete its hearings and would report immediately to the Senate. The action I now take is in compliance with the statement I have made to the Senate.

I may say that the original resolution being reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration follows the report of the subcommittee, which was unanimously approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 17), reported by Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"5. The following shall be the rules of the standing committees of the Senate and subcommittees thereof, and the term 'committee' as used in this subsection (except in paragraphs (b) and (c)) means any such committee or subcommittee:

"(a) Special meetings: In addition to meetings called pursuant to section 133 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, a majority of the membership of any committee may call a special meeting of the committee by filing a notice thereof with the committee clerk, whose duty it shall be to notify each member.

"(b) Subcommittees: A subcommittee of any standing committee shall be established by majority vote of such committee.

"(c) Committee staffs: The professional and clerical staff personnel of each standing committee and subcommittee thereof shall be appointed, and the services of such personnel terminated, by majority vote of such standing committee.

"(d) Subpenas: The authority to issue subpoenas or otherwise to require the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary material may be delegated by majority vote of any committee to its chairman or to any member.

"(e) Interrogation of witnesses: The interrogation of witnesses at committee hearings shall be conducted, on behalf of the committee, by members and authorized staff personnel only.

"(f) Executive session testimony: No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly released in any form unless such release has been authorized by the committee before which the testimony was given.

"(g) Notice to witnesses: The subject matter of the investigation in which he is called to testify shall be stated to each witness prior to his appearance, for his information only, and not as a limitation upon the scope

of the interrogation to be conducted at the hearing.

"(h) Counsel for witnesses: Unless otherwise provided by a majority of the committee members present at the hearing, a witness may be accompanied by counsel.

"(i) Statements: Witnesses shall be required, so far as practicable, to submit written statements of their proposed testimony in advance of the hearing at which they testify.

"(j) Distraction by communications equipment: A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, or physical discomfort, that during his testimony television, motion picture, and other cameras and lights shall not be directed at him; such request to be ruled on by the committee members present at the hearing.

"(k) Transcripts: Accurate verbatim transcripts shall be made of all committee hearings where witnesses testify under oath. Transcripts of testimony given at public hearings shall be made available for inspection or purchase by witnesses and persons mentioned therein.

"(l) Requests for remedial action: Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified, and who believes that testimony or other evidence presented at a public hearing of a committee, or comment made by a committee member or counsel at such a hearing, tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, may (a) request to appear personally before the committee to testify in his own behalf, or (b) file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony or other evidence or comment complained of. Such requests and such statements shall be submitted to the committee concerned for its action.

"(m) Reports: No measure or recommendation shall be reported by a committee unless a majority of its membership is actually present at the meeting at which such action is taken.

"(n) Controversy as to jurisdiction: In any case in which a controversy arises between committees as to the jurisdiction of any committee of the Senate to make any inquiry or investigation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate without debate, but such decision shall be subject to an appeal. Such decision finally arrived at, with or without appeal, shall not operate to invalidate proceedings of the committee prior thereto.

"(o) Notice to Senate: The chairman of each committee shall from time to time and at the earliest date practicable report to the Senate the general nature of inquiries or investigations the committee proposes to undertake, or, in any case he deems the national security might be endangered by such report, he shall in writing advise the President of the Senate of that fact."

REPORT ON SUBVERSION AND ESPIONAGE IN DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS AND INDUSTRY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 189, 83d Congress, I submit a report (No. 3) of that committee on investigation of subversion and espionage in defense establishments and industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—(S. REPT. NO. 4)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations,

I submit the annual report of that committee. The report is entitled "The Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations." I ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

CONTINUATION OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation realizes the tremendously vital job which has been and is being performed by the various investigating committees exposing the Communist conspiracy in our land and throughout the world.

I was pleased, therefore, to receive from Miles D. Kennedy, director of the American Legion's National Legislative Commission, the text of a resolution which had been adopted at the 1954 national convention urging continuation of the respective investigating committees and subcommittees.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION No. 74

SUPPORT CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Whereas the Congress of the United States through its duly constituted committees has performed an outstanding service to the United States and the people thereof by continued investigating and exposing the activities of the Communist conspiracy and the individuals participating in the Communist conspiracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Washington, D. C., August 30-September 2, 1954, hereby commends the House Un-American Activities Committee, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, House Committee To Investigate the Seizure and Forced Incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and strongly recommends the continuation of these committees with no limitation of their present powers and with ample funds for their proper function so vital to the national defense and internal security of the United States.

UNITY OF IRELAND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I submitted a Senate resolution, which was given the number 11, relating to the unity of Ireland. Since that time the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURCELL] and the Senator from Montana

[Mr. MANSFIELD] have desired to join in the sponsorship of that resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Senate resolution 11 be reprinted showing the names of those two Senators as additional cosponsors of the resolution.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 172. A bill to establish a board of claims within the Atomic Energy Commission to hear and determine claims for injury to or loss of livestock as a result of any nuclear or thermonuclear explosion caused by any agency of the United States; to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for suit in certain cases upon such claims in the district courts of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Georges and Athena Demetelin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 174. A bill for the relief of Rosa Tomasina Maria Puglisi (Rosa Tomasina Maria Sano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 175. A bill to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 176. A bill for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 177. A bill for the relief of Porfirio Punciana Vila, his wife, Tatiana Abatooroff Vila, and children, Porfirio P. Vila, Jr., Anne Marie Vila, and Josephine Anne Vila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the West San Joaquin division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the last above named bill.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONROE):

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 181. A bill for the relief of Manhay Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 182. A bill to require a premarital examination of all applicants for marriage licenses in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 183. A bill for the relief of Shima Shinohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 184. A bill to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 185. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Thompson (nee Mannhardt);

S. 186. A bill for the relief of Spirodon Karousatos;

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Goto;

S. 188. A bill for the relief of Paul Ichikawa;

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Manuel Rodrigues;

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Krete Pantulin;

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand;

S. 192. A bill for the relief of Borys Naumenko; and

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Hsi-Lin Tung;

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi;

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Olivia M. Orouich;

S. 197. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata;

S. 198. A bill for the relief of Filippo Mastrolanni; and

S. 199. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. F. M. S. Shu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 200. A bill to authorize the sale of Welles Village War Housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the housing authority of the town of Glastonbury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 201. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., lands surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 202. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain submarginal lands acquired by the United States in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana; and

S. 203. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain feed and seed loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 204. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN,

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. IVES, Mr. LANGER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 205. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 206. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the observance of the 25th anniversary of National Cotton Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 207. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or

insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 208. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 209. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Magdalena Slania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 210. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 211. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 212. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Impostato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg K. Karde;

S. 214. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut; and

S. 215. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 216. A bill to establish a separate custom collection district comprising the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance;

S. 217. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil erosion prevention for the Pecos River watershed in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Public Works;

S. 218. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce;

S. 219. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusatague), Jose Maria de Amusatague O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusatague O'Malley;

S. 220. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising as a result of the construction by the United States of Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande;

S. 221. A bill for the relief of Dora Papara and Ethel Stathis Papara;

S. 222. A bill for the relief of Ariadni Vasiliiki G. Stathis; and

S. 223. A bill for the relief of Mary Freida Poeltl Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER (for Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 224. A bill to prohibit aid to foreign countries which carry on trade with Communist China while American citizens are being held prisoner by Communist China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 225. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 226. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Shawnee Mission as a national monument;

S. 227. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing as a national monument a site on the Old Santa Fe Trail near Dodge City, Kans.;

S. 228. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Hays as a national monument;

S. 229. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Alcove Springs, located in Marshall County, Kans., as a national monument;

S. 230. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Larned as a national monument;

S. 231. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the Medicine Lodge Indian Peace Treaty site as a national monument and historic shrine; and

S. 232. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Waconda Spring, Mitchell County, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 233. A bill for the relief of Rev. Arno A. Lehmann;

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negrodo Lazaro;

S. 235. A bill for the relief of Melanie Schaffner Baker; and

S. 236. A bill for the relief of Johanna Schmid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 237. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. Tomaschewski;

S. 238. A bill for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto);

S. 239. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Vasilis Perras; and

S. 240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Jamil Bou-Monsour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Shizue Yoshimi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 243. A bill for the relief of Szjena Pelson and David Pelson;

S. 244. A bill for the relief of Anna C. Giese;

S. 245. A bill for the relief of Ahmet Hal-dun Koca Taskin;

S. 246. A bill for the relief of Marina Bernardis Zivolich and Mirko Zivolich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 247. A bill to increase the national minimum wage to \$1 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 248. 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; and

S. 249. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of certain radiological detection instruments, devices, and equipment, and the leasing thereof to the States for civil defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 250. A bill for the relief of Iris Olsson;

S. 251. A bill amending the Communist Control Act of 1954 and repealing the first sentence of subsection 4f of the Internal Security Act of 1950, so as to provide penalties for membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering revolutionary conspiracy;

S. 252. A bill for the relief of Sono Mary Theresa Nishimura;

S. 253. A bill for the relief of Sumie Legasse; and

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Cervi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):
S. 255. A bill to authorize free medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization at Public Health Service hospitals for seamen having at least a certain period of maritime service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 256. A bill to eliminate cumulative voting of shares of stock in the election of directors of national banking associations unless provided for in the articles of association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 257. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 258. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of Irvin Scranton Ross; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 259. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 260. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 261. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 262. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 263. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 264. A bill to increase the minimum national marketing quota for cotton to 11,500,000 bales; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 265. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the non-mineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; and

S. 266. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 267. A bill for the relief of Ellen Kjosnes and Unni Kjosnes;

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Georgios Aslanis; and

S. 269. A bill for the relief of Berc I. Parsigyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 270. A bill to protect trade-mark owners, producers, distributors, and the general public against injuries and uneconomic practices in the distribution of competitive commodities bearing a distinguishing trade-mark, brand, or name in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;

S. 271. A bill for the relief of June Rose McHenry; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. 272. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to authorize the disposal of certain Federal surplus property to State and local units of the United States Civil Defense Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 273. A bill to amend section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the maximum amounts and terms for which loans may be made under such section; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 274. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from \$10,000 to \$15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the individual exemption for income-tax purposes from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 276. A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations;

S. 277. A bill for the relief of Jean Pfeifer;

S. 278. A bill for the relief of Otto Dahn, Sr.;

S. 279. A bill for the relief of Stanley Ryd-

zoon and Alexander F. Anderson;

S. 280. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

S. 281. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. McNulty and Eugenia Mary McNulty;

S. 282. A bill for the relief of Tom Hell-

ander Co., Superior, Nebr.;

S. 283. A bill for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger;

S. 284. A bill for the relief of Margarita Oy Wan Chan;

S. 285. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Astri Gro Anderson;

S. 286. A bill for the relief of Alexander Abdul Ghane Tasse;

S. 287. A bill for the relief of Melitta Elizabeth Rhone;

S. 288. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior;

S. 289. A bill for the relief of Johanna Rampitsch and Frederick Rampitsch;

S. 290. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward J. Smith (nee Concetta Chiodo) and her daughter, Roberta Smith;

S. 291. A bill for the relief of Joseph Eugene Minasian;

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Ahamad Meah;

S. 293. A bill for the relief of Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman;

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Arakas; and

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Leon Roman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 296. A bill to provide for loans to individuals for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a college or university education; and

S. 297. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to pay a certain sum for school construction under the provisions of Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to Underwood School District No. 8, Underwood, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 298. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Mintz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 299. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 300. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 10. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for nomination of

candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. J. Res. 11. A joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. J. Res. 12. A joint resolution to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. J. Res. 13. A joint resolution to create an advisory commission for the Department of State to assist in determining title to Chamizal Zone, between United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 14. A joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic Games at Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL UNITS OF CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to construct additional units of the great Central Valley project in California. These are the Trinity and San Luis features, which are essential to advancing our ambitious irrigation, reclamation, and power program which is contributing so much to the progress, wealth, and good of our Nation.

This measure, of which my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is a cosponsor, would assure supplemental and additional water for vital sections of our rapidly growing State, and would utilize the hydroelectric potentialities of untapped streams. It is similar to proposals which were presented in the last Congress, and it authorizes a development which has been under consideration for many years.

The Trinity-San Luis undertaking will supply some 600,000 acres of land in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. It also will provide an additional supply of necessary electric power to satisfy the ever-expanding market. From an economic standpoint, the combined Trinity and San Luis units make up one of the soundest and most attractive projects remaining in the West.

I wish to advise my colleagues that the proposal has the endorsement of Governor Knight, on behalf of California. In his message to the legislature, last week, on the occasion of his inauguration, Governor Knight declared the project is feasible from both engineering and economic viewpoints, and should be constructed as rapidly as possible. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record, at the conclusion of my remarks, appropriate excerpts from Governor Knight's inaugural address.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, because of the increasing need for additional water and power, I trust that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will give this bill early and favorable consideration. The urgency of this matter is clearly apparent. In some areas to be served by the Trinity-San Luis development, the water table is dropping rapidly, and lands already are being withdrawn from cultivation. In some sections the supply for municipal use is unfit for drinking purposes, and water has to be imported at almost excessive cost.

The Trinity-San Luis features of the Central Valley project would be a boon to the entire State of California, and would carry forward the constructive program which is making possible utilization of tremendous resources of this wide and rich area.

The magnitude and diversity of the Central Valley development require that the Trinity-San Luis project be carried on under Federal auspices. This undertaking, which would transfer both water and power for considerable distances, and would be integrated with the Central Valley project, is in complete accord with established Federal principles. I hope and believe that it will have the support of the Congress of the United States and of the Department of Interior, just as it has the backing of the people of the State of California.

EXHIBIT A

EXCERPTS FROM MESSAGE TO CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE BY GOVERNOR KNIGHT, JANUARY 3, 1955

WATER PROBLEMS

The careful conservation and development of our water resources is of paramount importance to the people of our State.

We can anticipate the construction in the near future of two more mammoth projects which will insure extensive additional supplies of water and power for our expanding population. These are the Feather River project and the Trinity River project. The Feather River project is a major unit of our long-range California water plan and will be financed, constructed, and operated by the State of California. The State engineer will present a report of this session of the legislature which will contain a step-by-step construction program for the project, a schedule of deliveries from the project, an estimate of the funds which will be required for construction and suggested means of financing. When this report is presented to the legislature, we will have ended the era of planning on the Feather River project, and we will have entered the era of financing and construction. There is immediate need for the project. I urgently recommend that the legislature take immediate steps to determine the proper and most effective means of raising the funds necessary for construction, for without affirmative action, the project will remain only a grandiose dream. I am hopeful that you will act expeditiously, so that right-of-way acquisition can begin without delay and that initial phases of construction may be under way by this time a year hence.

NOW BEING PLANNED

The Trinity River project is now being planned by the Federal Government. California has informed the Secretary of the Interior that the project is feasible from an economic and an engineering standpoint and should be constructed at the earliest possible date. I recommend that this session of the legislature approve a joint resolution urging

the Congress to begin consideration of this construction project, including all of its power facilities, at the earliest possible date.

Studies have been made by both State and Federal agencies on the San Luis project on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. This project could utilize surplus waters obtained from either the Trinity River or Feather River projects. There are conflicting views on whether the San Luis project should be a part of one or the other. My view is that we should endeavor to include the San Luis development in whichever project will be finished first.

I oppose the State purchase of the Central Valley project at this time. The United States Government has indicated that it has no interest in selling the project. We have greater and more immediate needs for the construction of the Feather River project, the Trinity River project, and other necessary State water-and-power developments on which we can use the several hundred million dollars which the Central Valley project would undoubtedly cost.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 178) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain as additions to the Central Valley project, California, the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit of the west San Joaquin division, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the further development of public library services in rural areas, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me setting forth the reasons why prompt passage of this proposed legislation is desirable, together with a section by section analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 205) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement and analysis presented by Mr. HILL are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

I believe everyone will agree that our farm and other rural families can and should have the same advantages as urban dwellers now enjoy and profit by through the ready access to books, newspapers, magazines, and other

sources of information which our well-developed city library systems provide.

Rural America lives in a rapidly changing and extremely complex world. In its day-to-day life, the farm family in America needs to keep abreast of new ideas and current facts regarding new products, new markets, new methods of farming, new sources of income, and new ways of farm family living. As responsible citizens, our rural people are just as concerned as their city friends in keeping up with those rapidly changing developments in the Nation and the world which must be understood by all of us if we are to cope with the many problems that threaten the economic strength and security of our country and the peace of the world.

Over 26 million Americans, some 90 percent of whom live on farms or in small communities, are still without access to modern library services. The bill which I shall introduce today and which will be cosponsored by Senators AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont; DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois; JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington; MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas; IVES, Republican, of New York; and LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, aims at filling this important gap in our educational machinery. It is based on a 5-year program of grants to be used by State library agencies to foster the development of rural library services. It is, of course, so drafted as to guarantee that there can be no possibility of Federal interference with or control over State or local library agencies. The cost of the program, not to exceed \$7½ million per year, will depend on how rapidly the States move to improve and extend library services.

The bill has the support of the American Library Association, which realizes that in spite of its importance to democracy the public library, like the public school, has been neglected. The Senate in twice approving Federal aid to education has recognized the national crisis that exists in our public schools. The Senate by approving a bill similar to that being introduced today has also recognized the need for public library service throughout the Nation as an aid to education.

As I have already said, over 26 million people in the Nation are today without library service. Ninety percent of these live on farms and in small communities. More than 400 counties, or, roughly, 1 out of every 6, in this richest country on earth have no public libraries at all.

The urgent need for strengthening our public schools and library service is once again proven by the high rate of rejection of men under Selective Service for educational deficiencies.

We are experiencing again the same waste of manpower demonstrated in the last war through failure to gear our education system to meet the rising requirements of national security. Since Korea over 750,000 men have been rejected under Selective Service for educational deficiencies. That is the equivalent of some 40 infantry divisions. This is a loss too serious to disregard.

Reports by both House and Senate committees during the last session of Congress have made it crystal clear that the quality of public education in the United States is suffering by virtue of the great financial hardship under which our public schools are struggling. The detailed survey of the need for school construction throughout the United States released by the Office of Education last year portrayed a situation which is nothing short of appalling. The President himself told us just last week that immediate action must be taken in an attempt to correct this situation. Nonetheless, and even if this Congress does act promptly and effectively—as I hope it will—to pass legislation calling for school construction, it will be some years before the deterioration in the

quality of public school instruction which has occurred in this country can be corrected. In the meantime, those young people who have been and are being deprived of the proper quality of education must look to the public library system to help make up the deficiency.

Library service complements and supplements the work of our schools by carrying the school into the home. Schools cannot serve their maximum usefulness without adequate libraries to provide home reading and other educational materials. The public library extends the educational process for the adult who may find that his schooling of 10 or 20 years ago is inadequate in meeting today's problems. This bill provides the cheapest and most effective way I know for bringing within the reach of every citizen the tools for continuous education.

Never in our history have the people had greater need for knowledge upon which to base their opinions and build their decisions. With the many grave problems facing our Nation today our national welfare demands that the ordinary citizen be able to get books, newspapers, and other sources of knowledge about the world he lives in.

The tasks of peace are the most difficult ever to challenge the genius of a nation. A highly trained, fully informed citizenry is essential to the defense of our freedom, the preservation of our country, and the building of lasting peace.

ANALYSIS OF THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2: (a) Its purpose is to stimulate the States to extend public library services to small towns, villages, and farming communities, now without such services or with inadequate services. By definition, no incorporated or unincorporated town with a population of more than 10,000 is eligible for the benefits of the act. The term "State" includes all the States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The term "public library" means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

(b) Specific safeguards are set up to prevent Federal control. The act stipulates that the States and local communities are to have full power over the management of the public library services carried on with the aid of the Federal grants, over the appointment of librarians and other library workers, and over the selection of books, periodicals, films, recordings, and other library materials. In addition, the act specifies that the States and local communities shall determine what constitutes the best use of the funds in attaining the objectives of the legislation. Furthermore, in section 5c, the State library administrative agency is given the authority to decide which areas in the State have inadequate library service. As provided in section 5b, the Commissioner of Education is required to approve any State plan which fulfills the specifications set forth in section 5a.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 3: The act would authorize an annual appropriation of \$7,500,000 to the States for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. In order to receive the payments, a State must submit to and have approved by the Commissioner of Education a State plan for the extension of public library service to rural areas, which have either no service or else inadequate service.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Section 4: (a) Of the \$7,500,000 to be appropriated each fiscal year during the 5-year period, the Commissioner of Education would allot \$10,000 to the Virgin Islands and \$40,000 to each of the other States. Of the remainder of the \$7,500,000 after

these initial allotments, the Commissioner would allot to each State an additional amount based on the ratio of the rural population of the State to the total rural population of the United States according to the 1950 decennial census.

(b) If any part of the allotment to a State remains unpaid at the end of a fiscal year, it would be available to that State until the end of the next fiscal year, under the conditions governing the payments to the State as set forth in section 6. A State must exhaust this carried-over allotment before it can receive any payment out of the allotment in that following fiscal year.

STATE PLANS

Section 5: (a) In order to receive approval, a State plan for the further extension of public library services must include the following:

1. Provision for the administration, or the supervision of the administration, of the plan by the official State agency charged by State law with the extension and development of public library services throughout the State. It must show that this State agency has adequate authority under the State law to administer the plan in accordance with its proposals and the provisions of the act.

2. Provision for the receipt and safekeeping by the appropriate State officer of all funds paid to the State under the terms of this act. Provision must be made also for guaranteeing that the funds will be expended solely for the purpose of the act and for the repayment by the States to the United States of any funds which are lost or not spent in accordance with the purposes of the act.

3. Provision for establishing policies and administrative methods to be followed in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State plan for extending public library services to rural areas. The State library agency administering the plan must certify that the policies and methods proposed will, in its judgment, assure the use of the funds to maximum advantage in attaining the objectives of the act.

4. Provision for the State library agency administering the plan to make reports on such items of information as the Commissioner of Education may reasonably require from time to time to keep the Congress and the public informed.

5. Provision that any public library services furnished to an area under the plan shall be made available free of charge, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Section 6: (a) The Secretary of the Treasury would pay from time to time to each State with an approved plan an amount equal to the computed Federal share of the total sums expended by the State and local communities for extending public library services to the specified areas. No payment would be made to a State until the Commissioner of Education finds for the fiscal year in question that—

1. The State or local communities will have available sufficient funds which would entitle them to receive at least the minimum Federal allotment of \$40,000, and \$10,000 in the case of the Virgin Islands.

2. That the total amount available for public library services from State and local sources in the area under consideration for the fiscal year in question will not be less than the total amount actually expended for public library services from State and local sources for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

3. That the amount of State aid for public library services in the fiscal year under consideration will not be reduced below the amount of State aid actually expended for public library services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) The Commissioner of Education would be required, at least semiannually and prior to the period for which a payment is to be made, to estimate the amount likely to be needed to pay the Federal share of expenditures for carrying out the approved State plan for the period in question. The Commissioner would then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury this estimated amount, reduced or increased by a sum depending on whether his estimate for a prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to a State for that prior period. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to pay to the State, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, the amount certified by the Commissioner and at the time or times fixed by him.

(c) In the calculation of the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out an approved State plan, the formula used for the purpose of matching takes into account the relative ability of the States to pay which is explained in section 6d. As stipulated in the act, the Federal share for any State is 100 percent less the State percentage. This State percentage is that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska). In other words, if a State with a per capita income of \$1,544, as compared with the national per capita income of \$1,645, is entitled to a maximum Federal allotment of \$131,560 (the flat allotment of \$40,000 plus the \$91,560 based on the rural population ratio), it must put up \$116,199 from State and local sources to obtain that amount of Federal money.

The calculations for the State used as an example are as follows:

Ratio of State per capita income to the per capita income of continental United States (excluding Alaska)—

$$1544 \div 1645 = 0.9386$$

Ratio of State share to 50 percent is the same as the ratio derived above, or

$$\frac{\text{State share}}{50} = 0.9386$$

$$\text{State share} = 0.9386 \times 50 = 46.9 \text{ percent}$$

$$\text{Federal share} = 100 - 46.9 = 53.1 \text{ percent}$$

To obtain the maximum Federal amount available, \$131,560, the State must match in the ratio of—

$$\begin{aligned} 46.9 \text{ to } 53.1, \text{ or} \\ \text{State share } (x) : 131,560 \text{ as } 46.9 \text{ is to } 53.1 \\ 53.1 x = 61,701,640 \\ \text{State share} = 116,199 \end{aligned}$$

Ceilings and floors have been placed on the Federal shares. In no case can it be more than 66 percent nor less than 33 percent. Furthermore, the Federal share in the case of Hawaii is to be 50 percent, and in the case of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, it is to be 66 percent.

(d) The Commissioner of Education would be required to announce officially between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year the Federal percentage of the total expenditure for public library services under the plan for each State. This Federal percentage would be calculated on the basis of the averages of the per capita incomes of States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such official announcement would be in effect for each of the 2 fiscal years beginning with the first July 1 which follows the official announcement establishing the Federal percentage. The Commissioner would be required, however, to announce the Federal percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of the Library Services Act, and these percentages would be in effect until July 1, 1956.

(e) States are prohibited from purchasing or erecting any building or buildings, or purchasing any land by the use, directly or

indirectly, of any Federal money paid to it under the provisions of this act.

(f) Federal funds can be used only to provide or improve public library services in rural areas which are defined as areas not including an incorporated or unincorporated town with a population of more than 10,000. However, the State library agencies may utilize existing public libraries in urban areas to extend library service to the rural areas, provided such a proposal has been included in the approved State plan.

WITHHOLDING

Section 7: The Commissioner must withhold further payments to a State, if he finds (1) that the State plan has been so changed as to be no longer in accordance with the requirements of the Library Services Act, or (2) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the provisions required and set forth in the State plan. Before such action is taken, the Commissioner must give reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the previously approved State plan. The Commissioner is required to make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury until he is satisfied that the State is no longer failing to comply with the requirements of the Library Services Act.

ADMINISTRATION

Section 8: (a) The Commissioner of Education would administer the act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and would issue, with the approval of the Secretary, such regulations as might be necessary for the administration of the act.

(b) The Commissioner would be authorized also to make such studies, investigations, and reports as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. This would include among other things periodic reports for public distribution on the values, methods, and results of the various State activities in the extension of public library services in rural areas, undertaken under this act.

(c) Authorization would be given for the appropriation of such sums as would be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education to carry out the functions required by this Library Services Act.

ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL SERIES OF POSTAGE STAMPS IN COMMEMORATION OF 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL COTTON WEEK

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the observance of National Cotton Week, and ask that it be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I hope that the Postmaster General will cooperate with this effort to encourage and generate the sale of cotton goods throughout the United States. Such a program will do much good for the cotton growers, the cotton industry, and the people of America as a whole.

National Cotton Week will be used by an estimated 16,000 retail stores this year as the basis for special promotions for cotton goods. The fact that the number of stores cooperating in the nationwide promotion increases each year is effective proof of the sales generating value of National Cotton Week. During the week, local newspaper ad-

vertising featuring cotton goods, as well as store displays, reach their peak.

National Cotton Week is America's number one fiber promotion. None of the other fibers have a promotion scheme which remotely approaches cotton week in scope and effectiveness. It provides a showcase for cotton products.

Moreover, cotton week serves the important purpose of reminding the retailer and the public of the vital part cotton plays in our everyday life. About 12 million persons depend directly or indirectly upon cotton for their livelihood. Through the medium of cotton week, the Nation is reminded of the importance of cotton to the country's overall economy.

Cotton week also serves to dramatize the desire of the cotton farmer and others in the industry to move more cotton and cotton goods into consumption. Farmers want and desperately need the market for cotton expansion. For this reason they and other segments of the industry contribute to the financing of cotton week and other activities designed to increase the consumption of cotton.

A commemorative stamp would give added emphasis to cotton week. It could be used as a springboard for vast amounts of publicity. Additional stores would be persuaded to participate. The added publicity created by a special stamp would encourage all stores to expand their promotion efforts such as newspaper, radio and TV ads, and window displays. Special editions of newspapers and special celebrations in cotton-growing areas could be built around the stamp. It would offer an excellent opportunity for stepped-up campaigns to sell more cotton and cotton products.

The current prospects indicate that the carryover of cotton in this country on August 1, 1955, will be slightly larger than a year earlier. This is in spite of full compliance by cotton farmers in the 1954 acreage-reduction program and an estimated increase in both domestic consumption and exports during the current year. Exports and consumption are expected to total almost 13½ million bales this year, which is about a million bales more than the previous year. With no reduction in the surplus, a further reduction in acreage allotments has been called for in 1955 under the present law. The 10-million-bale quota set for the 1955 crop by the Department is about 40 percent below the average production in the years 1951, 1952, and 1953.

In the face of this situation, the cotton industry is redoubling its efforts to further expand the markets for American cotton. Domestically, cotton is facing its stiffest competition in many years. For the first time in history, synthetic-fiber manufacturers are operating their plants at only about two-thirds of capacity. They cannot let these costly facilities lie idle long. Already they have sharply stepped up their research and sales-promotion efforts. They realize that the sales-promotion program of the cotton industry has successfully told the story of cotton's superior qualities and is primarily the reason why consumers prefer and insist on cotton for many household and apparel items. Finding it increas-

ingly difficult to take additional markets, they are encouraging cotton mills, through the most aggressive type of selling methods, to blend synthetic fibers with cotton in many items previously made exclusively of cotton. They have just recently been able to get manufacturers to use synthetics in the tapelike border of towels. In the last few months, they have introduced a newly developed fiber which is taking over a substantial part of the very large outlet for cotton rugs and carpets.

The cotton industry must—and is—fighting this war of competition with every means at its command. One of the principal sales-promotion campaigns conducted by the cotton industry is National Cotton Week. In 1955, the week of May 9–14 has been selected. It will mark the 25th anniversary of this event.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 206) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the observance of the 25th anniversary of National Cotton Week, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATIONS OF COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY AND SUBVERSION

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 53 other Senators, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the need for continuing vigorous and diligent investigation of the Communist conspiracy and subversion.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors and the full text of the resolution appear at this point in my remarks.

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

Mr. DANIEL (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. THYE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. BUSH, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. LONG, Mr. KERRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. POTTER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JENNER, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. FLANDERS).

TEXT OF RESOLUTION (S. RES. 18)

Resolved, That the Communist Party of the United States is recognized to be a part of the international Communist conspiracy against the United States and all democratic forms of government. It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and combat this conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith, including the

completion of all pending and unfinished investigations of such nature.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended to 4 minutes in order that I may make a few remarks concerning the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DANIEL. During the recent special session, the then Senator from Colorado, Mr. Johnson, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and I twice offered amendments to the censure resolution having a purpose and wording similar to that of the resolution I am now submitting. Charges had been made that the Senate would terminate or soften its investigation of communism and subversion. Some said that criticism even of unrelated actions of a Senator who conducted such investigations would give comfort to the Communist Party. Knowing that this was quite contrary to the attitude and intention of the Senate, we offered our amendments to express the true sense of the Senate on this subject. These were objected to on the ground that they were not germane to the pending resolution, and the objections were sustained.

Although not widespread, there has been enough continued misinterpretation of the attitude of the Senate toward the investigation of communism and subversion to lead many of us to believe that it is still appropriate for the Senate to express itself on this subject. In fact, it is my opinion that this should be one of the first expressions of the Senate as we begin the new session.

Every Member of this body, and a majority of the people of the country, undoubtedly know that Members of the Senate of the United States yield to no one in their opposition to and their fight against the Communist conspiracy. Our recent actions during the 83d Congress speak louder than words. During 1954 the Congress passed perhaps more anti-subversive measures than during any peacetime year. Eight bills were enacted into law, including one which outlawed the Communist Party. In addition, the Senate passed two other antisubversive bills which were not acted upon by the House.

The Senate was liberal in providing all funds requested by its committees investigating communism and subversion. We cited for contempt several witnesses who refused to testify before our committees, and in many other ways indicated by decisive action the true attitude of this body against the conspiracy which would overthrow and destroy our Government.

Likewise, I am sure that actions will speak louder than words on this subject in the present Congress. Under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] it is certain that the pending and unfinished investigations of subversion in Government agencies will be completed by his committee with dispatch. The experience, ability, and attitude of the Senator from Arkansas on this subject inspire great confidence among us all,

and the purpose of this resolution with respect to him and his committee is more in the nature of approving and supporting what we know they will do. They need no suggestion or direction in this regard, but it will of course strengthen and encourage them and the members of other appropriate committees in the work already planned if the Senate makes a renewed expression of its approval and support of diligent and vigorous investigations of the Communist conspiracy and subversive elements and persons connected therewith.

The resolution, although not naming the pending case of a member of the Communist Party, that of Maj. Irving Peress, is broad enough to include our approval of the completion of that investigation. In fact, I consider it to be one of the most important pending items of unfinished business. After being advised of the intention of the Senator from Arkansas and his committee, as well as the possible interest of other committees and of the purpose of this resolution, the Secretary of the Army decided Friday to make public the facts of his investigation and his report on the promotion and honorable discharge of Major Peress. This action was long overdue. It is probable that it will answer most of the questions concerning this particular case, but our committees will be able to determine this after studying the evidence now made available to them for the first time.

It is likely that the Peress case will be remembered in the future not so much for the bungling and inefficiency which resulted in a member of the Communist Party receiving a promotion and honorable discharge from the Army, but for the confusion, suspicion, and discord which can result when the cloak of secrecy and censorship is thrown around the actions of public agencies on matters of public concern.

The Peress case is an outstanding example of the misunderstanding and discord which can result when facts about the people's business are unnecessarily withheld from the Congress and the public. At least a great deal of the fear, doubt, and disunity could have been avoided by a full disclosure of the facts long ago.

Let us hope that the resulting harm from long delay in disclosing the facts in this case will serve to convince other public agencies that there should be the fullest possible disclosure to Congress and the people of nonsecurity information.

While we may rightfully fear unauthorized disclosures of information affecting our national security, we have more to fear from unwarranted concealment of such information. This was one of my first utterances as a Member of the Senate when on April 15, 1953, in a speech entitled "Information on the People's Business—Time for a New Policy," I called upon President Eisenhower to revoke Executive Order 10290—the Truman censorship order. The order has been improved materially by modification, but much yet remains to be done to change the spirit of secrecy and censorship which remains in some of our public agencies.

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the cosponsors of this resolution are from both political parties and of various shades of opinion on other subjects. It is heartening that so many not only can agree but are willing to join together in clearing the atmosphere and beginning this new session of Congress with a united expression supporting vigorous and diligent investigation and exposure of those who would destroy our way of life. If there is one subject upon which we should have sincere unity and common purpose of action, this should be it.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his complimentary reference to the senior Senator from Arkansas. I can assure the Senator from Texas and all other Members of this body that such unfinished business as may be in the files of the investigating subcommittee when the Democrats take control of it and organize it will be given early attention.

That includes the matter which the distinguished Senator has identified as the Peress case. A few days ago, when interrogated upon this subject by the press, I stated that I regarded the Peress case as coming in the category of unfinished business. I think that was before the report of the Secretary of the Army to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

I have not seen the report which came to the Senator from Massachusetts. All I know about it at present is what I have read in the press. However, let me say to the distinguished Senator that the Peress case will be regarded and treated as unfinished business. It will be given prompt consideration by the committee, and we shall undertake to make such final disposition of it as, in our judgment, is warranted by the circumstances.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I reiterate what I previously said with respect to the Senator and his committee. I am sure that by adopting this resolution the Senate merely would be approving and supporting what the Senator and his committee intend to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, and will lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 18), submitted by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and other Senators), was received and ordered to lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$250,000 (in addition to amounts heretofore made available for such purposes), shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

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

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Statement prepared by him on the President's state of the Union address.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Address entitled "Congress Charts a New Course for Agriculture," delivered by him before the American Farm Bureau Federation, at its 36th annual meeting, in New York City, on December 15, 1954.

CONDITIONS IN EUROPE AND ASIA—ADDRESSES BY SENATOR MANSFIELD AND GEN. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on December 8 I had the privilege of appearing with General William J. Donovan before the Academy of Political Science, in New York City. Of course, everyone knows that General Donovan is the former head of the OSS, and our former Ambassador to Thailand.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the address entitled "Germany and the Future of Europe," delivered by me on that occasion. I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD the address entitled "The Asiatic Question and Its Relation to Europe," which was delivered by General Donovan on that occasion. I suggest to the Senate that it read very carefully General Donovan's remarks, because in them there is much to think about.

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

GERMANY AND THE FUTURE OF EUROPE

(Text of Remarks of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, at fall meeting of the Academy of Political Science, December 8, 1954, Hotel Astor, New York City)

In the interim between the rejection of the European Defense Community by the French parliament and the London-Paris Conferences, I had a conversation with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in Germany. Mr. Adenauer made a significant comment in discussing the collapse of EDC, a comment which he has since repeated in public, "The best Europeans," the Chancellor said somewhat despairingly, "live in the United States." The remark expressed the disappointment of many dedicated Europeans at the failure of EDC. It was also an acknowledgment of the strenuous but unsuccessful

efforts of this country to secure its acceptance.

It seems to me that the observation, pointed as it is, obscures one important fact. Removed as we are from the fears and pressures of the continent, it is easier to be a dedicated "European" in the United States. It is easier to ask and even to ask with some impatience, "Why don't they get together?" It is as easy as a Member of Congress urging the elimination of the tariff on wool, provided his district is in the city of New York.

I am afraid, therefore, that I must take issue with Chancellor Adenauer's observation. His great contribution to the cause of western unity in itself, is evidence that the best Europeans live not in the United States, but in Europe.

If that were not the case the future would hold little promise for the free nations. For it is in Europe that there has unfolded one of the principal challenges to freedom in our times. It is in Europe that it must be faced and it is primarily by Europeans that it must be overcome.

The challenge is the challenge of unity. The nations of Western Europe are confronted with the necessity of developing a pattern of progressive integration within the larger but looser unity of the North Atlantic Community. If Western Europe does devise such a pattern, we may look forward to an era of peace and material progress and we may anticipate a steady growth of those concepts of the freedom of man which give meaning and dignity to human life.

If Western Europe fails, however, the future promises little more than an extension of the decade of fear through which we have just passed. Sooner or later, in the years ahead lies inevitable war, an age of chaos and an enlargement of the totalitarian void which already spreads over vast areas of the globe. It is possible that the price of failure may even be the extinction of human life itself.

I have deliberately stated the challenge to Europe in the positive terms of unity rather than in terms of defense against the Communist threat as it is usually defined. I do so with the full awareness of the destructive implications of communism. Few movements in history have been more erosive of the foundations of our civilization.

The growth of totalitarian communism, however, is more a measure of the weakness of the free nations, particularly in Western Europe, than of the inherent strength of the Communist ideology. I think it essential to recognize and to emphasize this distinction. Failure to do so, is to concede the superiority of totalitarianism over freedom as a motivator of mankind, a concession which I, for one, cannot make.

Communism has intensified the need for European integration within the larger community of free nations. It has highlighted the challenge of unity that confronts the West. But only a dangerous misreading of history would suggest that communism created the need. Even if Communist pressures should abate, as they well may do for the moment, the urgent necessity for unity would remain.

Twice in this century, our civilization has skirted the edge of doom. Twice our heritage has been tossed recklessly into the fires of war. Both conflicts began within Western Europe and both spread great damage in that region. Communism fed on these conflagrations. After the wars had burned themselves out, the Communists probed among the charred and smoking ruins. They tore down nations and ideals which had been severely weakened by the conflicts; some might have been salvaged had they not been subjected to this second onslaught. That is the destructive role which communism occupies in the contemporary world and we must not lose sight of it. By the same token, however, it is essential not to permit this destructiveness to obscure the fact that the

greatest damage to the free nations has been largely self-inflicted. It has resulted from their own inner disunity, and particularly the disunity of the Western European region.

Both great wars of this century, in the first instance were attempted suicides on the part of Western Europe. The critical danger of communism came after, not before, these massive assaults which the region launched upon itself. And only as a way is found to cope with tendencies of this kind will the free nations develop real security against communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

The most dangerous of these tendencies is associated with the inability of modern Germany to find a stable place in the common destiny of Western Europe. Many explanations have been offered for this phenomenon. Historians have attributed it to the policies of the Germans, the French, and the British and to numerous other causes. Regardless at what door or doors responsibility is laid, however, there can be little doubt that this failure, more than any other has gnawed at the vitals of our civilization during the last half century.

It is to this problem, the problem of Germany's place in the European community, that I wish to address the main body of my remarks tonight. More specifically, I want to consider with you the solution to the problem which is proposed in the recent London-Paris accords. On this solution hinges the future of Europe, and in a larger sense the fate of all the free nations.

The London-Paris accords are primarily mechanisms by which Western Germany is to be brought into the Western European and North Atlantic communities on what is hoped will be a stable and enduring basis. In this respect, in principal objective, they do not differ substantially from the EDC. The differences that do exist are essentially those of method and degree of integration. In the present accords the links are not as tight as were contemplated in the EDC. They are not as clearly the ties of a supranationalism.

The retreat from that ideal has been deplored by many in Europe and in this country. It is understandable that men of the caliber of Spaak, of Belgium, and Schuman, of France, who had done so much to further Europeanism should be deeply disappointed by this development. The concept, however, is not dead and will not die. Europeanism is a force which will make itself felt in everything that happens in Europe. But Europeanism, like all great ideals, to grow strongly must be rooted in the acceptance of the people who are to live by it. And the simple fact is that European integration of the depth and degree contemplated in EDC was not possible at this time.

At the London-Paris Conferences, therefore, a shattered promise of far-reaching unity was exchanged for a new promise of lesser dimensions. In substituting the recent accords for the EDC the Europeans did not abandon the ideal of Europeanism nor did they give up anything which had actually been achieved toward its realization. The retreat, if it may properly be called that, was from a hope not an actuality. Viewed in this light, the present agreements are not necessarily a step away from unity. They may yet prove to be a step toward it.

The speed with which the London-Paris accords were reached after the rejection of EDC is a tribute to the Europeanism of the present leaders of the Continent, and particularly to Adenauer, Eden, and Mendes-France. It is also striking evidence of the vitality of the European idea. Most significant, perhaps, it may indicate widespread recognition in Europe that the time to move positively toward integration is now or never.

Under the terms of the London-Paris accords, the people of Western Germany will regain sovereignty and so achieve coequal national status with the other free nations

of Europe. Western Germany will adhere to the Brussels Treaty of 1948, thereby becoming a full-fledged member of the Western European community. The Germans will also enter directly into the larger grouping of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Each of these provisions is an interlocking part of a grand design. Taken together, they hold the promise of providing a stable and more permanent place for Germany in the Western World.

Also involved in the design, however, is the rearmament of Western Germany. This question, more than any other, has heretofore stood in the way of the integration of Western Europe. To put the problem bluntly, many Europeans including Germans have had doubts as to the wisdom of German rearmament. These are not solely Communist doubts, the purposes of which are clear—to keep Western Germany defenseless and ripe for totalitarian absorption. They are for the most part the doubts of sincere people who in this generation have learned first-hand to associate the appalling devastation of war with a militant Germany on the march. The grim reminders of this association are still to be seen in many cities of Europe. A decade of rebuilding has not fully obliterated the scars of war.

From our vantage point in the United States we should not dismiss such fears lightly. It is to the credit of the European countries that in spite of these fears they have recognized the more immediate and overwhelming menace of Soviet expansionism. They have understood that a disarmed Germany is a greater danger to peace than a Germany with some capacity to defend itself.

In the London-Paris accords, Western Europe now has a plan for West German rearmament with certain safeguards. A new German national army of 500,000 men will join those of other continental powers under the NATO commander in the common defense of the West. Western Germany pledges never to employ these forces to change existing frontiers or to achieve unification with Eastern Germany.

There are technical safeguards against a resurgent German militarism in these accords which take the form of maximum level of forces and prohibitions on the manufacture of certain types of offensive armaments in Germany. Perhaps the most significant deterrent, however, is that provided by the United Kingdom. The British have committed four divisions and a tactical air force to the mainland of Europe. In so doing they have clearly bound their future with that of the Continent for the first time in centuries. It was a transcendent decision, and they made it courageously and unequivocally.

For the first time in modern history the three great powers in the core of Europe—the United Kingdom, Germany, and France—will be linked in specific arrangements for the common defense. These ties are reinforced by the pledges of continuing concern in Europe's future which the President and Secretary of State have made on behalf of this country. Partnership, I am glad to say, is now the keynote in our relations with the Western European countries.

That, in bare outline is the substance of the London-Paris accords. In part, the significance of the agreements lies in the provision they make for the creation of 12 German divisions. I do not mean to suggest that this increase in the armed power of Western Europe will be decisive in discouraging a massive Soviet assault on that area. The deterrent to aggression of this type remains, as it has been since the end of World War II, the superiority of the total strength of the free nations as against that of the Soviet bloc. In this broad equation of power, the German divisions will not make a substantial difference, for total strength is meas-

ured not only in conventional military factors, but in atomic, economic, diplomatic, and others as well.

In many ways we have been prepared for a decade to deal with a massive Soviet assault, a test of total strength. In the present administration the phrase "instant retaliation" has been coined to describe at least the atomic aspect of these preparations. But while the Communist advance has continued in a confounding fashion, there has not been a situation in which to retaliate instantly.

What is the explanation of this dilemma? It is simply that the pattern of postwar Soviet expansionism has not been by massive assault which we have spent billions in preparing to meet. Rather, the pattern has been, as I mentioned previously, an expansion by scavenging among war-weakened nations. It is an advance carried out largely, not by Russian soldiers—few have died in combat since the end of World War II—but by millions of the disinherited, the discontented, and the driven of many lands who have been caught up in the growing web of international communism.

It is with this kind of an advance that we have had the greatest difficulty in coping in the past and it is evident that the Soviet Union had hoped to employ the same techniques throughout a war-devastated Germany. The chosen instruments were the satellite government in the Eastern Zone and the German Communist Party. Both have failed miserably in their mission. In the Eastern Zone, the Berlin riots of 1953 suggest that the very existence of the satellite government depends upon Russian bayonets. In Western Germany, the remarkable recovery from the war appears to make the area increasingly invulnerable to Communists' tactics of erosion and infiltration.

There is, however, in the East German Communist army and police still another potential instrument of Communist advance. It is in deterring a sudden coup by this force of 250,000 armed men in a Korean-type internal aggression, that the proposed West German divisions can be most effective.

In this limited sense and in linking the German divisions with NATO, the London-Paris accords add to the military bulwark against further Communist penetration of Western Europe. Important as this contribution may be, however, it is not the principal promise of the agreements.

I began my remarks tonight by stressing that the issue facing Western Europe and, in a broader sense, other free nations is the positive challenge of unity. It is in this connection that the London-Paris accords may eventually make their most significant contribution. The agreements, of course, must first be ratified. Ratification alone, however, is not enough. They must be carried out with some sense of the cooperation and national forbearance that characterized their formation.

If these conditions are fulfilled, then the accords can and should lead first toward a unified Germany. No issue in Germany is more compelling. It has so far been held in reasonable perspective by the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer. Even during the difficult months of drift on the ratification of EDC, Adenauer insisted that a united Germany before firm ties had been established with Western Europe could mean only a satellite Germany. He stood firm in the face of mounting political pressure on the principle of first things first.

Once the London-Paris agreements have been ratified, however, it may be expected that the demands for unification will grow rapidly inside Germany. Unification will inevitably become the primary objective of any sovereign German Government. It is a valid objective, as valid today as in the days of Bismarck. The reasons why it must be sought are sound in a political, economic, and moral sense. Until it is achieved, there can be little hope of stability in Europe.

What is of primary concern to Western Europe and to this country is the way unification is pursued. We have a right to insist that the Germans seek their unification peacefully and patiently, with full recognition that what is at stake is not only their own future but the future of the entire continent; in short, that they continue to follow the course which has been set by Adenauer.

So long as they do so, the West Germans warrant the full support of Western Europe and ourselves in their quest for unification with their eastern provinces. Nor is it sufficient in our policies to pay lip service to the principle of unification. It must be clear to the German people that the western nations are prepared to go far in settling this issue with the Soviet Union. All proposals should be explored which offer promise that a unified Germany shall be a peaceful and independent Germany able to participate in the common development of Europe and to cooperate with free nations everywhere.

So far the Soviet Union has shown no inclination to negotiate German unification on these terms. This does not mean that the objective must be abandoned. Nor does it mean that the only alternative to its abandonment is a western equivalent of the Communist war of liberation to regain the eastern provinces.

It is possible that the Soviet Union may be impelled to accept genuine German unification by rising tide of public insistence in Germany and by other pressures. A development of this kind, however, will not come easily. It is likely to appear only if the policy of the West German Government and the western powers with respect to unification is just, restrained, and compassionate.

In the pursuit of such a policy, time can be on the side of the free nations. There are indications that the weight of disunity, disillusion, and discontent is being felt on the Communist side. That this is so is suggested, for example, by the Berlin rioting last year and the incessant flow of refugees. So long as a high rate of economic, political, and social progress is maintained in the Western Zone, it is bound to act as an attraction to those Germans living in the East and the difficulties of the Soviet Union in maintaining totalitarian control over them will multiply. A situation could develop where the Soviet pattern of advance into weakness may operate in reverse. The Russians may be compelled to withdraw from the Eastern Zone and permit unification not because of military pressure from outside but because of the crumbling of their position from within.

It is possible that the Russians may risk the resurgence of German militarism rather than face the inevitable prospect of a unified Germany integrated with Western Europe. If they choose this course, they are in a position to make important economic, territorial, and other concessions to the Germans. Moreover, they could withdraw their occupation forces and expand the nucleus of German militarism which already exists in the East German Communist Army. They could, in other words, offer Germany a unification with real nationalistic inducements and ask in return only that the Germans separate themselves from Western Europe.

I do not know if a Soviet attempt of this kind to split the western nations and lay the groundwork for a new world conflict would succeed. It would depend, I suppose, ostensibly on the German people, since they would make the final decision for unity or chaos, for peace or ultimate war. The decision, however, would not occur in a vacuum. It would be governed by many factors, none more significant than the London-Paris accords.

That is a principal reason why these agreements must be something more than an ingenious device to create 12 German

divisions against a Soviet advance. They must begin at once to fulfill their larger promise, the promise of progressive European integration within the larger grouping of the North Atlantic community.

Under the agreements immediate progress in this direction will have been made in the integration of the military power of the Western European nations and of the members of NATO. It is essential to perfect these military relationships, but that alone is not enough. The hope of freedom is not only to die together in the defense of freedom if that should be necessary but to live together in its light.

In this sense, the challenge of unity is much broader than integrated military defense. It means a deepening of the integration of the Western European nations in the economic field, in the political field, in all matters in which governments can better serve their citizens by working together rather than separately. It means, above all, a willingness to face common problems together and to work together with national restraint in their solution. The need for an approach of this kind is urgent in Western Europe; it is necessary throughout the Western World; it is desirable with all nations who are free to cooperate wherever they may be on the globe. On my return from Europe several months ago, I reported to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that the immediate need was for a series of special economic conferences which might serve to define boldly and clearly the economic problems which must be overcome if the nations of Western Europe and the North Atlantic community are to maintain sound economies, and to lay the groundwork for their solution. I reiterate that view tonight. In doing so, I am aware that most free nations are in a relatively prosperous state, but that is precisely the time to act to avert a collapse. And an economic collapse could be the shoal on which the hope for unity would founder.

What, then, if this challenge of unity is met? Where does it lead? If this challenge is met, we shall see, in my opinion, an end to the erosion of western civilization. We shall see a vast growth in the strength of free nations built not primarily on a military base, but on the power of their creative accomplishments and the power of their ideals to inspire the faith of mankind. We shall see a positive but patient leadership in the world, a leadership of freemen who will not concede that any part of the human race, regardless of its present status is forever beyond the reach of liberty. We shall see, in short, the beginning of a new cycle and I trust a peaceful cycle, in the never-ending struggle between tyranny and freedom. This cycle will belong to freedom.

THE ASIATIC QUESTION AND ITS RELATION TO EUROPE

(Address by Gen. William J. Donovan before the Academy of Political Science at the Hotel Astor, New York City, December 8, 1954)

To us in America the Asian question is: "What are Communist China and Soviet Russia going to do?" How far will they go in their aggression?

To the Asians, this is not "the Asian question," although it is a question many of them are also asking. To them, the Asian question is tied in with the issue of nationalism and self-assertion. Many of them are still thinking as recently liberated colonial peoples, long dominated by Western powers.

Of course this is an oversimplification. We cannot speak correctly of a single Asian question nor for that matter, of a single Asia. There are many Asias—each with its own point of view, its own problems and questions. There are many nations in Asia,

many political groups, many ethnic and racial groups, many economic interests.

We must start with the assumption that our major problems are not necessarily their major problems. They have different points of view from ours concerning communism and the U. S. S. R.

What are we doing to understand Asia and Asian problems? We must present our needs and our interests in the light of their problems.

In the last 10 years, we have watched a course of dynamic changes in southeast Asia—the key strategic position across the main lines of communication between Europe and the Far East.

This area has a population of some 600 million people—4 times the population of the United States; 3 times the population of the Soviet Union; 12 times the population of the United Kingdom.

These changes are the continuing repercussions of that "shot heard round the world" which a New England Minute Man aimed at a representative of colonialism in 1776. We have learned since then to understand and to cherish the culture and history inherited from Europe. This appreciation was only possible after we had become confident that our independence was secure.

It is in the context of the colonial past that we must interpret the bitterness and distrust we find inherent in many of the new nations of Asia against their former governors.

There are two approaches to policy: One short run, one long run. Far from being exclusive, they must be mutually supporting.

We found in Europe that our objectives were reasonably long term. As a result, the United States never lost sight of the ultimate objective of European unity, and our policies on the whole have therefore been successful.

The Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Alliance, and now the Paris Treaty have helped reestablish the balance of power in the West.

In the Far East our policies have not had that long-range point of view. Too often there we have been forced to respond in haste to an immediate military thrust of attempted Communist expansion.

For that reason our policies have seemed conflicting not only to our friends but to ourselves. For instance, we excluded Korea from our "defensive perimeter." Yet we fought a long, costly, and indecisive war to keep South Korea free. In Indochina we announced our intention to resist any further Communist advance. The time for decision found us unready, and by the middle of 1954 we had to accept an agreement at Geneva which now puts the survival of Vietnam in doubt.

Our partnership in Europe creates problems and paradoxes for our policy in Asia. The interests of the European Continent are not always the same as our own interests. We cannot ignore the fact that when Dien Bien Phu fell it carried a government in Paris with it. Yet on the same occasion we were concerned lest the peoples of Asia associate our interests with those of the colonial powers.

An example is our aid program to Indochina which, until a few months ago, was operated through French channels. It is no secret that only American dollars enabled the French Union forces to remain in Vietnam. That aid was extended to give resistance to Viet Minh aggression. But this honorable goal did not prevent the defeat of French arms. In fact, it encouraged delay with regard to European integration.

Communist propaganda associated us in Asian eyes with an archaic and detested form of colonialism. This was certainly not our intention. We had hoped that by supporting the French forces we would gain time to allow Vietnamese nationalism to gather

strength for its struggle against the well-organized Communist-supported Viet Minh. Our military aid was doomed to be ineffective as long as the needed political and economic reforms were not forthcoming. We believe in the cause of Vietnamese nationalism enough to invest nearly \$2 billion of assistance.

We did not underestimate the sacrifices and difficulties which confronted France as a result of the Indochina conflict. A frank and honest conference with France and interested Asian countries would have done much to dispel the suspicion of our motives. They would have seen that our compelling thought was the preservation of the opportunity for Vietnam to become an independent nation.

Instead, Asian observers concluded that our interest in a European Defense Community was paramount and that to secure that objective we were prepared to join forces against Asian nationalism. This is an ironic twist of history for a country which less than a decade ago risked the esteem of its European friends by supporting the independence movements in India and Indonesia.

One of the main criticisms Asians address to us is that we seem to treat Asia as an appendage of Europe. There is some truth in this criticism. Although we recognize the importance of the Far East—and sometimes even become emotional about it—there is still a tendency to approach our relations with Asia as accessory to our relations with Europe.

The same Communist conspiracy faces us in Europe and Asia, but in each area this conspiracy takes on a different form. There are substantial differences in every major field—political, economic and military.

In Europe in good measure, we share a common culture with long-established national states, the structure of which is not unlike our own.

A very different situation prevails in Asia. Nationalism is the dynamic unifying force. A new leadership began to emerge early in the 20th century. With great skill it used the rising tide of popular discontent to further the cause of national independence from colonial domination.

World War II was a powerful stimulus to the colonial revolt.

We should be ready to support Asian nationalism wherever it is clearly manifest. In the East this is the reality of tomorrow.

The Asian leaders are only beginning to recognize that independence is not the final word. They must now tackle the complex problems arising out of the revolutionary changes in Southeast Asia.

We have used our support of nationalism as an expression of policy. At the same time we have urged the colonial powers to associate themselves with us in the crusade against Communism.

In our political efforts we must be careful to dispel any impression that we are seeking to take the place of the former colonial governors.

What is necessary is that we ask the countries of Asia to be our partners in economic and military assistance. This we have successfully accomplished in Europe.

In the military field, we are also inclined to carry over the experience gained in Europe to the challenge in Asia. Although the threat is the same to both continents this is not so with Communist tactics.

Direct aggression is the principal threat in Europe. In Asia with the exception of Viet Nam and Formosa, the Communists may be relying on their subversive forces to gain their victory. For that reason, the theory of massive retaliation is not a completely effective answer.

It can hardly be applicable where there is no industrial mass to retaliate against. Nor should we expect NATO to be our prototype because there is no counterpart in Asia to

that military strength of England, France, and Germany which gives substance to our defense in Europe.

If the new nations of Asia can maintain their own internal stability we have won a substantial victory.

It is in no one's interest to allow our military assistance to be taken for granted. We cannot help other countries unless they want us to help them. It is the task of our leaders to seek first a basis of mutual confidence and good will before offering our armies and our resources.

We were informed yesterday that our Government would submit to the next Congress a program for economic development in Asia. It was said that the principle of economic aid reflected a recognition that the struggle between the free and Communist world had shifted to some extent, for the time being perhaps, from military to economic competition. The national composition of such an aid program is an extremely delicate matter. And the inclusion or exclusion of certain nations must be determined by a number of factors. These factors are political and psychological as well as economic. Perhaps not the least obstacle in that part of the world is the unwillingness of certain countries to work together under any circumstances so far envisaged.

Red China leads from strength in that part of the world at this moment. It has the political advantage of its recent victory in Indochina and a psychological advantage that it is an Asian nation.

In the economic field she can impress her neighbors with an impressive rate of industrialization. It doesn't matter that this is being accomplished at great social cost, and on human hardships and sacrifices. To offset this approach to the people of southeast Asia the West must present its competing programs.

In the field of economic assistance it should be remembered that the conditions in Europe that brought the response of the Marshall plan were very different from those which confront Asia today. Europe was a mature, industrial economy whose production capacities were shattered in the destruction of two world wars.

Asia, with Japan the exception, has but the bare beginnings of an industrial fabric. Her basic ventures are agricultural—and even those are built on methods which centuries have left unchanged. In Europe we faced the threat that communism would come to power through the dissatisfaction of unemployment and disregard of progressive welfare measures; in Asia, the populations are concerned with equitable land reform and the results of public-health programs. The great emphasis that writers put on the problems of food shortages in Asia must be looked at against a background of the basic problem of distribution.

Thailand, for example, would like nothing more than markets for its rice. It is not reasonable for us to distribute our surpluses of rice and wheat in Asian markets and then wonder at an imbalance in the economy of Thailand because she cannot dispose of her growing bulk of rice which has always been a major export and dollar earner.

Economic development should not be considered the panacea which will stop Communist subversion in Asia. Blind economic development destructive of existing cultural patterns may be itself a source of instability which the Communist conspiracy can and will exploit. The effectiveness of our aid programs in Europe—but especially in Asia—cannot be measured by their cost. Nor can technical assistance be considered the solution to every problem. What is important is not how much but how. The main issue is the reconciliation of new skills and ancient cultures. This again is a problem best considered and solved by Asian effort. There is the responsibility to fix the pace for raising the standards of living for their countrymen,

and they can best suggest the means to integrate the methods of 20th century technology into the ways of their distinguished cultures.

In seeking an approach to reconcile the interests and conflicts between Europe and Asia we would do well to remember the course President Eisenhower so eloquently defined last week. It is the courage to be patient while making certain that our efforts to promote peace are not interpreted as appeasement or any purchase of immediate favor at the cost of principle.

Our global responsibilities have involved us in a substantial way in both Europe and Asia. What we do or fail to do in Europe is of crucial importance but we will be guilty of misjudging the future unless we regard our decisions in Asia of at least equal importance.

THE CASE OF DR. IRVING PERESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, during the second session of the 83d Congress the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate held a number of hearings on personnel security in the armed services. At that time the Peress case was discussed on a number of occasions. Another committee of the Senate was given the task of studying the matter, but the Committee on Armed Services did not abandon its investigation.

During the period after the other committee's report was made public, I made a number of efforts to get from the Pentagon a complete chronology of the Peress case. I was unable to get a satisfactory report, even though a chronology dated November 3 was published. I did not feel that the chronology contained all the answers, so during the debate on the select committee's report I made personal inquiries, and held several personal interviews with secretaries from the Pentagon. A complete and a sufficiently suitable chronology, however, was not made available.

On January 6, 1955, I wrote Secretary of Defense Wilson, urging that a complete chronology be made available to the Members of the Senate. I received an answer to my letter on January 8, 1955, enclosing a chronology which had been made public by Secretary of the Army Stevens. I also received a letter from the Secretary dated January 7, 1955.

I believe this information should be made available to all Members of the Senate, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the letters and the chronology be published in the body of the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 6, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last December there was much debate in the Senate concerning the promotion and discharge of one Major Peress. During the course of that debate, I attempted to get a full understanding of the picture regarding the enlistment, the promotion, and the discharge of Major Peress. I was unable to do so to my satisfaction and consequently said nothing on the subject. There is, I believe, a great misunderstanding and possible misinterpretation of the facts concerning this matter.

During the current session of the Congress, the Department of Defense will have before it some very important legislation involving the security of our country. There will be the problem of reserve training, of pay increases, of the size of the forces, and other matters of equal importance. I believe it will accelerate the consideration of these important questions if this misunderstanding regarding the service of Major Peress is cleared up at once clearly and with no holding back by the Department of Defense or the Department of the Army of any information that can be properly made public.

Unquestionably, there were mistakes and errors of judgment in the handling of this case. A clean breast of the whole situation should be made in order that the misunderstandings may be cleared up and the records of responsible officers who are patriotic citizens, may be cleared from misinterpretations of their actions being placed upon them.

For all these reasons, I have joined in a resolution to be offered by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, concerning communism and as a part of that resolution a request that the Senate and the American people be given the facts about this case. I enclose copy of the resolution.

As former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I was disappointed that I was not given any information last December. As one who has given close consideration and much thought to the security of our country and the problems that come before us in Congress involving security, I am hopeful that you will give me now in view of the difficult problems that face us a complete statement regarding the case. In this way, I believe the misunderstandings and misinterpretations may be cleared up once and for all.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 8, 1955.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Since receipt of your letter of January 5, 1955, in regard to the question of Major Peress, the Secretary of the Army has written you a letter in which he informs you that he is releasing to the press a detailed chronology of the military record in the case of Dr. Irving Peress.

I feel sure that the chronology which Secretary Stevens has made public, copy of which is attached, answers the questions which were raised in your letter to me.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

C. E. WILSON.

JANUARY 7, 1955.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Reports in the press indicate that there has been renewed interest by Members of Congress in obtaining further details on the handling of the Peress matter. I further understand you have requested that a chronological record of the Peress case be released to the public. Accordingly, I am taking the liberty of sending you a detailed chronology of the military record of Dr. Irving Peress, and I am also making this chronology available to several other Members of Congress and to the press. The substance of most of the information in this chronology has already been furnished to Members of Congress and the public with the exception of the names of the individuals themselves.

I call your particular attention to my letter of June 23, 1954, to the acting chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations wherein I referred to a list of individuals, as prepared by the Inspector General,

who had some connection with the case. I requested that the names be held in confidence because, while there was evidence of administrative errors, there was no evidence of culpability or subversion. My request for confidential handling of these names was respected and the names have not been made public to date. However, since this handling of those names has been misinterpreted in some places, I have concluded that a detailed chronology should be prepared in order to furnish the details and the names of the individuals themselves in one document.

It so happens that I was en route home from the Far East at the time Peress was honorably discharged and knew nothing about the case. I have cooperated in every way in correcting the faults in the administrative system, and have caused them to be rectified.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MILITARY RECORD OF DR. IRVING PERESS WITH APPENDIX CONTAINING SERVICE HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERSONNEL MENTIONED IN THE CHRONOLOGY

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MILITARY RECORD OF DR. IRVING PERESS

According to his statements, Dr. Irving Peress was born in the Bronx, New York City, N. Y., on July 31, 1917. Irving Peress was graduated from the School of Dentistry, New York University, in 1940 with a D. D. S. degree, was licensed to practice dentistry by the State of New York in August 1940, and subsequently practiced dentistry from September 1940 to January 1, 1953, when he entered military service.

Since Dr. Peress was not a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, he was subject to the provisions of Public Law 779, 81st Congress, September 9, 1950 (Doctors Draft Act), which amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories. Dr. Peress had no prior service in any of the Armed Forces, and had not received specialized training at Government expense during World War II, so he was classified in the third priority for the purposes of induction.

Local board No. 59, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y., reported that Dr. Peress registered with that board on January 15, 1951. On May 26, 1952, he accomplished DD Form 390 (Initial Data for Classification and Commissioning in Medical Services for Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps), in triplicate. The box in item 30 of DD Form 390 was checked to read:

"I do hereby apply for a commission."

Item 31, Remarks, is completed in hand lettering as follows:

"I apply for a commission if I am selected for military service."

Item 32 thereof, as completed, reads:

"I am not, nor have I been, a conscientious objector, and I am not now and have not been a member of any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons advocating a subversive policy, or seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

All copies of this form were later forwarded to headquarters, First Army (hereinafter referred to as "First Army") in New York City.

On July 14, 1952, Dr. Peress accomplished standard form 89 (Report of Medical History) and was medically examined at the New York City recruiting and induction main station on the same date. He was hospitalized at the United States army hospital, Fort Hamilton, N. Y., on July 15, 1952 for further examination. The results of these

examinations were recorded on Standard Form 88 (Report of Medical Examination). On August 11, 1952, the report of the medical examination and allied papers, including the DD form 390, in triplicate, were received by First Army, from the New York Recruiting and Induction Main Station, New York City. On August 12, 1952, Dr. Peress was determined to be physically qualified for general military service, by the Medical Section, First Army. On September 12, 1952 he was notified by letter that he had been found to be physically qualified and information regarding the date he preferred to be called to duty was requested. This letter was signed by Captain F. E. Van Sickle, Jr., MSC, Office of the Surgeon, First Army.

Maj. Vernon McKenzie of the Office of the Surgeon General in Washington drafted a message for dispatch by The Adjutant General on August 20, 1952 notifying all major commanders of the October draft requirement for medical doctors and dentists. The message was dispatched on the same day.

Since Dr. Peress had applied for a commission and had been selected for induction by the Selective Service System, he was notified by letter of September 25, 1952 that he was scheduled for induction and if he still desired a commission to contact First Army. This letter was signed by a Capt. F. E. Van Sickle, Jr., MSC, in the Office of The Surgeon, First Army. On the same date Dr. Peress requested by telephone that he be commissioned in the Dental Corps Reserve.

On October 4, 1952, Captain Van Sickle prepared a recommendation to the Reserve Forces Division, First Army, that Dr. Peress be tendered an appointment in the Dental Corps Reserve in the grade of captain, stating that the applicant was physically and professionally qualified. This recommendation was signed by Lt. Col. G. H. Hage, Chief of the Personnel Division of the Medical Section, First Army.

Based upon this recommendation, Capt. Curtis R. Kirkland, Assistant Adjutant General, Reserve Forces Division, First Army, prepared and dispatched a letter to Dr. Peress on October 10, 1952. This letter inclosed, among other material, (1) a letter of appointment as captain, USAR, dated October 7, 1952, (2) oath of office, (3) WD AGO form 170 (Application for Appointment and Statement of Preferences for Reserve Officers), (4) DD form 98 loyalty certificate, and (5) two copies of DD form 398 (Statement of Personal History). Instructions directed completion and return of the oath of office within 72 hours of date of receipt. The remaining forms were required to be completed and returned as soon as possible but in any event not later than 15 days from date of receipt.

Dr. Peress executed his oath of office form before a notary public on October 15, 1952, thereby accepting the Reserve commission in this language:

"I, Irving Peress, O1893643, having been appointed a Reserve commissioned officer in the grade of captain in the Army of the United States, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign or domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter; so help me God."

The oath of office form was mailed to First Army as required.

Under date of October 27, 1952, Peress completed the WD AGO Form 170 (Application for Appointment) in which he indicated that he was not a conscientious objector, that his application was submitted pursuant to regulations governing appointment of Reserve officers of medical, dental, and veterinary specialties, and that he had read and understood the regulations con-

cerning the rejection for military service of disloyal or subversive personnel.

On October 28, 1952, Peress completed DD Form 398 (Statement of Personal History), in duplicate, in which he claimed Federal constitutional privilege in answering items pertaining to membership in Communist, Fascist, or other organization, association, movements, group or combination of persons which advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government. He signed these forms as the person completing them and also as witnessing officer.

On the same date, in completing DD form 98, the loyalty certificate, he certified that he had not engaged in any conduct specified therein as undesirable. However, he claimed Federal constitutional privilege in answering questions concerning membership or association with cited organizations. This form was witnessed by Capt. Charles A. Lyon, who was assigned at that time as unit advisor, AGC-USAR Postal Units, 30 West 44th Street, New York City. Captain Lyon witnessed the execution of the form by Peress and returned it to him. Peress then departed with the form.

The procedure followed by First Army in tendering an appointment to Peress prior to execution by him of forms 170, 398, and 98 was in accordance with the provisions of the then applicable regulations which were designed to expedite appointment of medical, dental, and veterinarian specialists as Reserve officers. This procedure provided for the commissioning of these specialists prior to completion of these forms, although personnel being commissioned in other branches of the Army were requested to execute the forms prior to commissioning. (This procedure was subsequently changed on November 28, 1952, to require that all applicants for a commission execute form 98 (loyalty certificate) before being tendered an appointment.)

After receipt of the oath of office from Peress, and before his executed forms 170, 398, and 98 were returned, Captain Van Sickle of First Army notified the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, in Washington, that Peress and others, as Dental Corps Reserve officers in priority III of the so-called Doctor Draft Act, had received notice of induction for the period October 21-31, 1952, prior to accepting a commission. This report indicated that Peress and others were available for call to active duty.

Based on this information, Maj. Arthur E. Britt, MSC, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, notified First Army on November 5, 1952 to issue orders calling Peress, among others, to active duty. This notification also included instructions to assign Peress to the Student Detachment, Medical Field Service School, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., for the purpose of attending the Associate Medical Service Company officers' course, reporting thereat not later than January 7, 1953. On November 10, 1952, First Army issued orders in compliance with these instructions. These orders were authenticated by Capt. A. E. Moreda, Assistant Adjutant General, First Army.

It cannot be definitely established whether DD forms 398 and 98, executed by Peress on October 28, 1952, had been received by First Army prior to the issuance of these orders calling him to active duty. The presence or absence of these forms, however, would have had no effect on the call to active duty of Peress since the provisions of the then applicable regulations stated in effect that Reserve personnel would not be deferred or rejected for nonvoluntary active duty for disloyalty or subversion, unless the investigation of the case had been completed and the results thereof had been determined to warrant removal action. It has been established, however, that on November 14, 1952, Captain Kirkland returned both copies of DD

form 398 to Peress for the signature of a witness other than himself. Peress secured the signature of one Henry Getzoff as witness and on November 18, 1952 returned both copies of the form to Headquarters, First Army. They were received on November 20, 1952.

At this point all forms sent to Captain Peress for completion had been returned to First Army. Captain Kirkland's office examined the forms submitted by Peress for completeness only, no evaluation of the content was made, and normally within 1 or 2 days after receipt, completed Forms 398 and 98 were forwarded to the Intelligence Branch, First Army.

On December 1, 1952, the Intelligence Branch of First Army requested the Reserve Division to obtain from Peress a fingerprint card and three additional copies of DD Form 398. These were requested for use in the investigation of Peress. After receiving these forms, Captain Kirkland in the Procurement Branch, Reserve Division, sent them, together with the DD form 98 to the Intelligence Branch, on January 5, 1953.

After receipt of his orders to active duty, Peress, on December 4, 1952, requested a 15 to 20 day delay in reporting for duty. He desired this time to wind up some personal and professional matters. This request was not favorably considered. Peress was so advised by mail on December 8, 1952 by Capt. F. E. Van Sickle, Jr.

Peress entered on active duty on January 1, 1953 in New York, N. Y., and reported as ordered to his assigned duty station, Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, in San Antonio, Tex., on January 3, 1953. He was to attend an orientation course at the Medical Field Service School from January 7, 1953 to March 7, 1953.

The Office of the Surgeon General in Washington determined that the need for the services of medical and dental officers was greater than the benefits derived from the course, and all such officers, 319 in number, were withdrawn for duty assignments. Department of the Army Special Orders, No. 16, dated January 26, 1953, effected this action by which Peress was ordered from the Texas station on February 7, 1953. He was to report to Fort Lewis, Wash., along with 27 others not later than February 26, 1953, for shipment to, and further assignment by, the United States Armed Forces Far East, Yokohama, Japan.

Meanwhile, back at First Army in New York the Counter Intelligence Division directed an investigation of Peress on February 5, 1953 and, on the same day, notified Captain Van Sickle in the medical section, and Captain Kirkland in the reserve division, that such an investigation was being initiated because of Peress' claim of "Federal constitutional privilege" in executing DD Form 98 and DD Form 398. By letter of February 5, 1953, signed by Capt. C. F. Maxwell for Col. Wendell G. Johnson, the Intelligence Branch, First Army, notified the Intelligence Branch at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., of the institution of and reasons for the investigation. Peress, however, had departed from the Texas station prior to receipt of this information.

Under date of February 12, 1953 the Chief of the Counter Intelligence Division at First Army in New York notified the Intelligence Division, Department of the Army; the Office of the Surgeon General; and Office of The Adjutant General in Washington on the initiation of the investigation. This notice was filed in the Personnel Information Branch of the latter office on February 27, 1953 and in the Surgeon General's Security Branch between February 12 and March 11, 1953.

The official travel time by automobile from Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to Fort Lewis, Wash., is 11 days. This, with the 7 days delay en route, permitted Peress to report to Fort Lewis, Wash., on February 26, 1953. On February 18, 1953, while at his home in New York City, Peress wrote to the Commanding

Officer, Army Personnel Center, Fort Lewis, requesting cancellation of his overseas orders and consideration for reassignment in the United States. He inclosed letters from two psychiatrists, Dr. Edward M. Bernecker and Dr. Max Gruenthal, to substantiate his request and to indicate reasons for granting it. The letter from Dr. Bernecker stated that a daughter of Peress was then being treated for character behavior disorders. The letter from Dr. Gruenthal stated that Mrs. Elaine Peress, the wife, at one time was treated for severe anxiety neurosis, and had suffered a relapse.

On February 24, 1953, 1st Lt. Alfred M. Gade, acting for the commanding officer of the Army Personnel Center, Fort Lewis, Wash., sent a wire message to Peress in New York. This message notified Peress that the personnel center was not authorized to reassign officers and referred him to the Adjutant General in Washington. The message also directed him to comply with his orders and report to Fort Lewis by February 26, 1953.

On February 26, 1953, Peress was at Fort Lewis when a message was received at the headquarters from the New York chapter of the American Red Cross, New York, N. Y., summarizing the "complicated" home situation of Peress and stating that Dr. Gruenthal recommended emergency leave as a temporary alleviation measure. It was stated that this doctor had earlier strongly recommended Peress' permanent assignment to stateside duty; further that the "entire home situation much better when wife constantly near officer." Based upon the communication from the American Red Cross, and in accordance with regulations providing for emergency leave, the commanding officer, Army Personnel Center, Fort Lewis, granted Peress 15 days' emergency leave. Peress was ordered to report at Fort Lewis not later than midnight on March 15, 1953.

On February 27, 1953, Peress addressed a letter to The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, requesting cancellation of his overseas orders and consideration for reassignment in the United States. Inclosed were the same documents previously used to substantiate his request to Fort Lewis and a copy of the Red Cross telegram referred to above. His letter stated that he was leaving for home immediately on emergency leave and that he would be there for the duration of that leave. He further requested that his application be given urgent attention.

On March 9, 1953, Capt. Einar Berge, AGC, Assignment Branch, Office of the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, prepared a memorandum which was subsequently signed by Lt. Col. C. J. Crumm, Office, The Adjutant General, referring this request and accompanying documents, without recommendation, to the Chief, Medical Career Management Division, Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, for consideration. On this same day, the Surgeon General referred the request to a board of officers (Brig. Gen. Egbert W. Cowan, DC, and Col. O. Elliott Ursin, MC), appointed to consider requests of this nature. Based on the statements of the doctors and the telegram from the American Red Cross, both officers recommended approval of the request. The board recommendations were signed by Maj. W. O. Prettyman, Jr., Office of the Surgeon General, acting in his capacity as recorder for the board.

The board handled the application in a routine fashion and was not aware of the derogatory information which was of record elsewhere in the office of the Surgeon General. General Cowan personally determined that Peress should be sent to Camp Kilmer, a station near his home, on the basis of the then current needs. On March 11, 1953, the recommendation that Peress' application for deferment from overseas shipment should be approved and that he should be assigned to Camp Kilmer, N. J., was for-

warded to the Adjutant General, DA, by Maj. Arthur E. Britt, MSC, office of the Surgeon General.

On March 13, 1953, by message authenticated by Capt. Howard Wagner, AGC, Peress was informed that his overseas orders had been revoked and that he had been assigned to Camp Kilmer. Information copies of this message were furnished to the commanding general, First Army; the commanding officer, Camp Kilmer, N. J.; and other headquarters concerned. Inasmuch as there was no indication in Peress' files in Reserve Forces Division, First Army, that he was subject to an investigation, that section failed to notify the Counter Intelligence Division, First Army, of Peress' reassignment to Camp Kilmer within the First Army area. In compliance with the message referred to above, Peress reported to Camp Kilmer March 13, 1953, whereupon he was assigned to duty as a dental officer in the dental clinic at that station. He did not have access to classified information. He remained at Camp Kilmer until separated from the service on February 2, 1954.

The investigation of Peress at First Army was completed on April 15, 1953, and the report filed with the Counter Intelligence Division of First Army on April 21, 1953. That office, under date of April 24, 1953, reported to the Intelligence Division and the Surgeon General's Office, both in Washington, that facts and circumstances disclosed during the investigation provided sufficient evidence of disloyal and subversive tendencies to warrant removal of Peress from the service, pursuant to the applicable security regulation, SR 600-220-1. This report was signed by Capt. Albert Robichaud for Col. Wendell G. Johnson, Intelligence Chief at First Army.

On April 28, 1953, Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas signed a letter for Colonel Johnson, First Army Intelligence Chief, going to the Surgeon General and the Chief of the Intelligence Division in Washington. This letter had inclosed a complete report of the investigation and recommended that action be initiated to remove Peress from the service.

On April 30, 1953, Col. R. G. Prentiss, Jr., executive officer in the office of the Surgeon General, sent the file on the investigation to the Chief of the Intelligence Division from the Office of the Surgeon General. He concurred in the recommendation of Peress' elimination from the service and stated that Peress would not be reassigned from Camp Kilmer prior to final action in the matter.

Since the completed investigation had not been reviewed by the commanding general at Camp Kilmer, it was returned to First Army on May 21, 1953, from the Intelligence Division in Washington, by Maj. James D. Anders, acting for Col. W. A. Perry, Chief Security Division.

Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas, Chief, Counter Intelligence Division, at First Army, sent the file to the Intelligence Branch of Camp Kilmer, N. J., with directions to maintain a copy of the report in Peress' intelligence field file there. This action was dated May 25, 1953.

Lt. Col. C. T. Brown, of the Intelligence Branch at Camp Kilmer, N. J., returned the file to the Intelligence Branch at First Army in New York on June 15, 1953. He reported that Peress was assigned to a nonsensitive position and recommended that he be separated from the service.

On July 7, 1953, from First Army Counter Intelligence Division, Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas sent the file to the Intelligence Division in Washington with an opinion that retention of Peress as an officer in the military service was "not clearly consistent with the interests of national security," and recommended that he be separated from the service.

The pertinent Army regulation in such cases provides for the accomplishment of an interrogatory by a member of the service

who has been investigated prior to final action, when considered appropriate by the Intelligence Division. Such an interrogation was prepared by the Intelligence Division in Washington. It was sent on August 10, 1953, to the Counter Intelligence Division at First Army in New York by Lt. Col. W. P. Meredith for Col. W. A. Perry, Chief, Security Division. Lt. Col. E. E. Winn, Counter Intelligence Division, First Army, forwarded the interrogation to the Intelligence Branch at Camp Kilmer on August 20, 1953.

The interrogation was accomplished by Peress at Camp Kilmer on August 25, 1953. Other than furnishing name, address, date, and place of birth, names of parents and denial of use of any alias, Peress entered "Federal constitutional privilege is claimed" in response to all remaining questions.

The completed interrogation was returned to Intelligence Division, First Army in New York under date of August 26, 1953, by Lieutenant Colonel Brown, Intelligence Branch, Camp Kilmer. He recommended separation of Peress.

The Intelligence Division, First Army, sent the interrogation from New York on September 2, 1953, reiterating the recommendation for removal of Peress from the service. The file passed through the Office of The Surgeon General on September 8, 1953, where Col. R. G. Prentiss, Jr., repeated his recommendation that Peress be removed from the service.

The interrogation, with accompanying recommendations of all echelons through which it passed, was received in the Intelligence Division in Washington September 10, 1953.

On June 29, 1953, Public Law 84, 83d Congress, the amendment to the so-called Doctor Draft Act under which the rank of Peress was later adjusted, was enacted. This law required that persons who had been ordered to active duty under the Doctor Draft Act would be reappointed in the rank commensurate with their professional education and experience.

By letter of September 9, 1953, Peress requested determination of his eligibility for promotion to the grade of major in accordance with provision of the new law referred to above. Col. Ruluff F. Leverich, dental surgeon, Camp Kilmer, on the same date forwarded this request to the commanding general, Camp Kilmer, for necessary action without comment. He also informed the intelligence officer, Camp Kilmer, of this action. On September 10, 1953, at the direction of 1st Lt. William L. Vinette, Personnel Branch, Camp Kilmer, C. W. O. J. T. La Marca, assistant adjutant general, forwarded the request without further comment to First Army for determination.

At First Army, Major Van Sickle and Major Kirkland conferred and prepared a forwarding endorsement to this request, the pertinent portions of which are quoted as follows:

"2. Available information indicates that Dr. Peress possessed the minimum of 11 years of qualifying dental professional experience prescribed for appointment in the grade of major and that his original appointment in the grade of captain was in error.

"5. Recommend action be initiated to reappoint Captain Peress in the grade of major in accordance with eligibility requirements set forth in SR 140-105-6 and SR 140-105-9."

No cognizance was taken by either Major Van Sickle or Major Kirkland of the fact that Peress was under investigation.

This endorsement was signed by Capt. L. Dude, AGC, assistant adjutant general, First Army, and was dispatched to The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, on September 23, 1953. (It has since been established that Peress was entitled to have been appointed initially in the grade of major under the regulations in effect at the time he was commissioned.)

On October 2, 1953, The Adjutant General, Department of the Army, returned the re-

quest to First Army stating that no further examination of the case could be made until the records incident to the initial appointment of Peress were received. The request was again returned to The Adjutant General on October 16, 1953, by First Army with the remark that appointment records of Peress had been forwarded to the Department of the Army on October 10, 1953. The records indicate that no further action was taken on Peress' request for promotion due to the impending review of the records of all Reserve medical personnel for possible automatic adjustment of rank in accordance with Public Law 84, 83d Congress, and appropriate implementing directives.

Accordingly, it becomes necessary to consider the steps taken in connection with the establishment of this procedure.

On May 21, 1953, the Department of Defense established an ad hoc committee to (1) review DOD directives pertinent to the doctor draft and (2) submit a proposed directive to consolidate current policies and procedures. This committee was made up of 2 representatives from each of the 3 military departments. The Department of the Army representatives were Col. Coy L. Curtis, Personnel Division, and Maj. Vernon McKenzie, Office of The Surgeon General. It was necessary for this committee to consider the provisions of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, in preparing its report. The pertinent provision with respect to adjustment of rank reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) or any other provision of law, * * * (An individual) who has been or shall be ordered to active duty * * * as a physician, dentist, or in an allied specialist category * * * shall, under regulations prescribed by the President, be appointed, reappointed, promoted to such grade or rank as may be commensurate with his professional education, experience, or ability."

On August 6, 1953, this ad hoc committee forwarded a draft of a proposed directive to the Director of Personnel Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, which reads as follows concerning adjustment of rank:

"Any physician, dentist, or veterinarian now serving on active duty, whether with or without his consent, who would have been entitled to a higher grade than that in which he is now serving if the applicable provisions of this directive or of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, had been in effect at the time of his current appointment will, at the earliest practicable date, be reappointed or promoted to such higher grade if a board of officers convened by the military department concerned so recommends."

This portion of the proposed directive was concurred in by all members of the ad hoc committee.

On August 26, 1953, the Department of the Army's concurrence in the proposed directive submitted by the ad hoc committee was requested. Concurrence was given by the Department of the Army on September 4, 1953. The proposed directive, concurred in by the Department of the Army, included the words single quoted above which required board action prior to promotion or grade adjustment.

On October 7, 1953, the Department of Defense issued Directive No. 1205.1 in implementation of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, and the recommendations of the ad hoc committee. However, the wording of the directive was not the same as that recommended by the ad hoc committee or concurred in by the three services. The requirement for board action prior to effecting grade readjustment of medical personnel was not included.

This requirement was deleted because such a requirement would be contrary to Public Law 84, 83d Congress. When it was decided by Congress to change the law and make it

mandatory that a person commissioned pursuant to the act must be appointed or reappointed to a rank based upon his professional education, experience, or ability, Congress realized that subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 required, with certain limited exceptions, that appointments to the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander, and up, could only be effected through a board of officers. Therefore, Congress wrote into the Public Law 84, "notwithstanding subsection 217 (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) or any other provision of law." The express purpose of this language was to remove the requirement for a board of officers. Therefore, it was deemed to be contrary to the statute to require such a board of officers. Accordingly the Department of Defense included in the October 7, 1953, Directive No. 1205.1 the following which provides that if the individual is otherwise qualified for appointment it will be done without board action:

"Pursuant to subsection 4 (a), Public Law 779, 81st Congress, as amended, any person who is otherwise qualified for appointment in a grade higher than major or lieutenant commander will be appointed in such grade without referral of his case to a board of officers convened by the Secretary of the service concerned."

Also: "Any physician, dentist, or veterinarian now serving on active duty, whether with or without his consent, who would have been entitled to a higher grade than that in which he is now serving if the applicable provisions of this directive or of Public Law 84, 83d Congress, had been in effect at the time of his current appointment will, at the earliest practicable date, be reappointed or promoted to such higher grade."

Upon receipt of the Department of Defense directive of October 7, 1953, the Department of the Army moved promptly to carry out its provisions. However, the Office of the Surgeon General, as head of the Medical Service of the Army, began screening the qualification records of all officers of the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps for medical professional qualifications only.

On October 8, 1953, Maj. Vernon McKenzie prepared a memorandum for the Chief, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, indicating the changes the Department of Defense directive made in the criteria for grade determination of persons being inducted under the provisions of the Doctor Draft Act and requesting dissemination of this information to all commands. It was signed by Col. R. G. Prentiss. This request was approved and forwarded to The Adjutant General for execution by memorandum prepared by Lt. Col. Emery E. Hyde and signed by Col. Samuel R. Lewis, Personnel Division, for Col. William P. Wansboro.

By a second memorandum, also dated October 8, 1953, prepared by Major McKenzie and signed by Colonel Prentiss, The Surgeon General informed the Chief, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, that his office was reviewing the qualification records of officers already commissioned under the provisions of the Doctor Draft Act, as directed by the Department of Defense and requested that The Adjutant General be directed to reappoint those eligible for reappointment under the changed criteria as determined by The Surgeon General, and to inform all commands of the changes occasioned by Public Law 84, 83d Congress, as implemented by the Department of Defense. This second memorandum pertained to the reappointment of officers already commissioned, whereas the first of the same date pertained only to initial commissioning. However, the same proposed message was enclosed with both. Apparently, assuming that both memorandums concerned the same subject and that the latter was, therefore, unnecessary,

this second memorandum was returned without action to The Surgeon General on October 13, 1953, by memorandum prepared by Lieutenant Colonel Hyde and signed by Colonel Wansboro. However, reappointment action by The Adjutant General, as proposed by this second memorandum, was authorized by Lieutenant Colonel Hyde in conversation with Lt. Col. B. E. Babcock, Office of The Adjutant General, at the time the initial list of persons eligible for reappointment was received from The Surgeon General by The Adjutant General.

From their qualification records, Maj. James F. Dolson, MSC, Special Projects Branch, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, prepared a list of 538 medical officers, 125 dental officers, and 18 veterinary officers considered to be entitled to reappointment under criteria as changed by Public Law 84, 83d Congress, and the Department of Defense directive referred to above. Upon completion of this list, applicable portions were transmitted to the Medical, Dental, and Veterinary Corps career management sections, Office of the Surgeon General, for verification. On October 14, 1953, the reasssembled list was transmitted to The Adjutant General by memorandum prepared by Major McKenzie and signed by Col. H. W. Glattley, Medical Corps, Chief, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, recommending reappointment of the officers listed thereon to the grades indicated. The name of Peress was on that list.

All plans to screen personnel records for material, other than that relating to medical professional qualifications, which is a primary responsibility of a promotion board, and to coordinate lists through security channels were abandoned in the Department of the Army following receipt of the DOD directive which was interpreted by Army officials to preclude consideration of anything other than medical professional qualifications. Neither Major Dolson nor anyone else in the Special Projects Branch, Personnel Division, Office of the Surgeon General, had knowledge of the derogatory information which had been developed on Peress. This information was, however, available in another branch of the Office of the Surgeon General and would undoubtedly have been discovered had normal promotion screening procedures and safeguards been employed in this group readjustment of rank.

Meanwhile, at the Intelligence Branch at Camp Kilmer, Lt. Col. C. T. Brown addressed a memorandum to the commanding general, Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, concerning the case. This memorandum, dated October 21, 1953, related that Peress was denied access to classified material; that the post dental surgeon had been advised; that Peress had requested that a determination be made of his eligibility under Public Law 84, 83d Congress, for promotion to major; that the post adjutant general had been advised of this request; and it included a recommendation that a letter be sent to First Army requesting immediate action to relieve Peress from active duty.

On October 21, 1953, also, General Zwicker sent a letter to the commanding general, First Army, Lt. Gen. W. A. Burress. The letter contained a summary of the derogatory information on Peress, related previous recommendations to relieve Peress, and concluded that his retention was clearly not consistent with the interests of national security. The recommendation for relief was reiterated by General Zwicker.

On October 23, 1953, The Adjutant General issued a letter of appointment in the grade of major to Peress. This letter was addressed through the Commanding General, First Army, to Peress at Camp Kilmer, N. J., and was signed by Maj. James E. Harris for Maj. Gen. William E. Bergin, The Adjutant General. The letter enclosed an oath-of-

office form for execution and return by Peress. First Army forwarded these documents by separate letter on October 29, 1953, to the Commanding Officer, United States Army Hospital, Camp Kilmer, for necessary action.

On October 27, 1953, in the Department of the Army in Washington, the interrogatory completed by Peress on August 25, 1953, was incorporated in the file of Peress in the Disposition Section of the Intelligence Division. Two days later this Section started action leading to preparation of a summary of the Peress file to be used by the Personnel Division of the Army Staff.

Peress executed the oath of office as major on November 2, 1953. The oath was administered by Maj. Herbert F. Bordeaux, MSC, Chief, Personnel Division, Headquarters, United States Army Hospital, Camp Kilmer. This oath of office was returned to First Army through the Commanding General, Camp Kilmer, that same date and forwarded to The Adjutant General by First Army on November 19, 1953. (It should be noted that Peress' reappointment to major was contained in the group readjustment of rank and was completely independent of his letter request of September 9, 1953, for such action.)

On November 3, 1953, General Burress visited Camp Kilmer, where General Zwicker again brought up the matter of Peress and informed him of Peress' reappointment to major on orders from Washington and opposed this action. General Burress immediately telephoned his Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. John B. Murphy, requesting him to look into Peress' reappointment right away.

On the same day General Murphy talked with Col. C. O. Brunner, Chief of Staff, at Camp Kilmer, to discuss the matter. General Murphy stated he would draft a letter to Washington for signature by General Burress.

General Murphy also had Col. D. H. Smith, Personnel Division, First Army, telephone the Personnel Division, Department of the Army, on this matter on November 3, 1953.

Colonel Smith asked the reasons for Peress' reappointment as major in the face of three recommendations for separation, and was advised by Lt. Col. B. E. Babcock, Reserve Branch, Office of The Adjutant General, that the reappointment was authorized by the Department of Defense directive. Colonel Smith was then referred to Major Dolson, Office of the Surgeon General, who informed him that the reappointment was an administrative adjustment of rank based solely on years of professional experience, but that other material on file would have been considered had the Department of Defense permitted a board of officers to pass on the reappointments.

Also, late on November 3, 1953, General Zwicker again wrote General Burress and discussed the Peress case among other things.

A personal letter dated November 6, 1953, was sent by General Burress to the Vice Chief of Staff in Washington, Gen. Charles L. Bolte. An outline of the actions taken in the case in First Army was set forth in the letter. This letter noted that Peress' grade readjustment had been handled in personnel channels and without knowledge of intelligence personnel. The following paragraph taken from that letter expressed the views of General Burress in this matter:

"I have taken the liberty of writing to you personally about this case, believing that you should know about it in view of its obvious implications. It also seems to me that this order for adjustment of grade should be revoked if it is possible to do so, and that Peress should be separated from the Army as soon as this can be accomplished."

On November 10, 1953, General Bolte sent the letter from General Burress to the personnel branch of the Army staff for necessary action in conjunction with the staff intelligence branch.

On November 13, 1953, a special summary of the case, which had been prepared in the Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, was sent to the Personnel Division at request of the latter.

On November 18, 1953, the recommendations of the Intelligence Division for elimination and termination of Peress' commission were sent to the Personnel Division. In the latter branch on the same day the case was sent to The Adjutant General for referral to the Army Personnel Board. The case, as forwarded, had been prepared by Lt. Col. George B. Moore. It was sent over the signature of Col. Gerald G. Epley, Chief, Personnel Actions Branch.

The Army Personnel Board was established as an advisory board on personnel matters within the Office of the Secretary of the Army. The membership is composed of general officers with long experience in the handling of personnel matters. The case was referred to this Board for consideration and recommendation as to whether:

1. Peress should be designated substandard and relieved from active duty with the first increment of the involuntary-release program, or
2. Released with later increments of the involuntary-release program, or
3. Eliminated through proceedings before a board of inquiry, or
4. Retained on active duty.

Attention of the board was invited to the fact that Peress was a possible security risk and that First Army and the Surgeon General had recommended his removal from the service.

On November 20, 1953, the recorder of the board, Lt. Col. Lowell L. Forbes, presented the case to the board. The board members were:

Maj. Gen. Miller B. White, president.
Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler.
Brig. Gen. Frank C. McConnell.

Colonel Forbes suggested the action numbered 1, above, as "best of alternative actions (gets him out soonest)" with his "commission automatically terminated by law." It was his opinion that "in no event should he (Peress) remain on active duty longer than necessary."

The Army Personnel Board concurred with this suggestion. It considered action by a board of inquiry to be time consuming and expensive. The Army Personnel Board recommended relief from active duty under the involuntary-release program with concurrent termination of Peress' Reserve commission without board action. The case was returned to the Personnel Division of the Army staff by Lieutenant Colonel Forbes on November 23, 1953.

On November 25, 1953, Lieutenant Colonel Moore, of the Personnel Division, prepared a memorandum to the Chief of Staff of the Army on the case stating that "determination was made to relieve Peress from active duty after completion of 12 months' service under the involuntary-release program since after that length of service his commission may be revoked as a special registrant, (doctor draft) under section 4, Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended." This memorandum had attached a reply to General Burress' letter of November 6, 1953, for signature of General Bolte. The memorandum was signed by Maj. Gen. Robert N. Young, Chief, Personnel Division, Army General Staff.

On December 4, 1953, the Personnel Division was advised that the Deputy Chief of Staff (Operations and Administration), Lt. Gen. Walter L. Weible desired that the following material be sent to him on the case:

1. File of subject officer and the recommendations of the Army Personnel Board be forwarded with this case.
2. Include with the case copies and Forms 98, 98a, and DD Form 393, and mark the

area that subject officer claimed constitutional privileges.

3. Include present DA policy and DD policy to cover cases of this sort."

On December 12, 1953, a memorandum forwarded the requested material to General Weible. The memorandum repeated the recommendation in the November 25, 1953, memorandum and was prepared by Lieutenant Colonel Moore of the Personnel Division and signed by Brig. Gen. Herbert B. Powell, deputy to Maj. Gen. Robert N. Young. This memorandum was concurred in by Maj. W. R. Buelow, Intelligence Division, Department of the Army.

Upon reviewing the case once more Gen. Weible was of the opinion that in view of the nature of the case he required additional verification of the legality of the proposed course of action as recommended. Accordingly, the file was sent by him to the Office of the Judge Advocate General on December 21, 1953, for examination and return by December 23, 1953.

Under date of December 23, 1953, concurrence for the Judge Advocate General was given by Col. Stanley W. Jones and the file was sent to General Weible for the third time with no changes in the original recommendations of November 25, 1953.

Another review of the case and of the staff recommendations by General Weible at this time caused him to pass the case with his approval of those recommendations. On December 30, 1953, the action recommended was approved by the Vice Chief of Staff, Gen. Charles L. Bolte. On the next day General Bolte addressed a personal letter to Lieutenant General Burress, commanding general, First Army, to inform him that Peress would be relieved from active duty under the Involuntary Release Program as "the most expeditious appropriate means of returning Major Peress to civilian status."

DD Form 390, executed by Peress, was not in the file being reviewed by the officials considering the most appropriate means of effectuating Peress' separation from the service. Having served their initial purpose in connection with his appointment in October 1952, the three copies of the DD Form 390 were distributed by First Army in accordance with applicable regulations—one copy was returned to the Local Draft Board, Forest Hills, L. I., N. Y.; one copy was sent to The Adjutant General for transmittal to the Surgeon General; and one copy was retained in First Army. In accordance with the then established procedures the copy furnished to the Department of the Army was retained in the Office of the Surgeon General and was not returned for inclusion in the official personnel file of Peress, which was maintained by The Adjutant General, until after he was discharged. (On April 2, 1954, the procedures were changed to require that, upon completion of review of the DD Form 390, the Surgeon General would return the form to The Adjutant General for incorporation in the official personnel file of the individual to whom it pertains. The procedures were also subsequently changed on August 9, 1954, to eliminate the referral to the Surgeon General for review. Upon receipt by the Department of the Army the form is now placed immediately in the officer's official personnel file.)

By letter of January 6, 1954, which was signed by Capt. Albert Robichaud for Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas, Counter Intelligence Division, First Army, Brigadier General Zwicker was informed of the content of General Bolte's letter of December 31, 1953, to General Burress.

In a memorandum dated January 11, 1954, which was prepared by Lt. Col. G. B. Moore and signed by Lt. Col. Arthur W. Allen for Col. Gerald G. Eply, of the Personnel Division, The Adjutant General was directed to take the necessary action to:

(1) "Relieve from active duty Maj. Irving Peress, O1893643, DC, upon completion of 12

months' active military service, granting of officer up to 90 days' notice if he so desires."

(2) "Discharge Major Peress from his commission under the provisions of section 4 (b), Public Law 84, 83d Congress, as amended"; and

(3) "Ensure that Major Peress (a) is not permitted to retain his commission at the transfer point at his request and (b) that he is never recommissioned."

These instructions were in accordance with the recommendations of the Army Personnel Board and the December 30, 1953, decision of the Vice Chief of Staff, General Bolte.

The authority for granting Peress up to 90 days notice of his separation is contained in a Department of the Army letter to all major commanders, dated September 11, 1953, subject "Involuntary relief from Active Duty of Non-Regular Officers," which states in part:

"Orders directing separation will provide for relief from active duty 90 days following notification unless the individual concerned requests an earlier release date."

In compliance with the foregoing instruction, The Adjutant General by letter of January 18, 1954, signed by CWO R. C. McDaniel, directed First Army to relieve Peress from active duty and honorably discharge him from the Army at the earliest practicable date. Applicable portions of the letter are quoted as follows:

"1. It is desired that Maj. Irving Peress, O1893643, DC, be relieved from active duty and honorably discharged from the Army at the earliest practicable date depending on officer's desires, but in any event not later than 90 days from date of receipt of this letter. * * *

"4. All commissions held by him will be terminated on effective date of discharge and he will not be tendered a reappointment in the USAR except by authority of the Department of the Army. * * *

"5. Officer will not be separated prior to determination that he is physically qualified for separation by your headquarters. A prompt report will be made to this office in the event action cannot be taken without undue delay."

By letter of January 21, 1954, signed by Lt. Col. J. G. Basbas, First Army directed Camp Kilmer to comply with these instructions.

On January 21 or 22, 1954, Mr. Anastos, an investigator from the McCarthy subcommittee staff called Brigadier General Zwicker and said that he understood that there was a major at Camp Kilmer who was under investigation and that he, Anastos, would like his name. General Zwicker returned the call and contacting Mr. Anastos stated that he believed the name of the person to whom Anastos referred in his call is Major Peress. On January 23, 1954, General Zwicker again called Mr. Anastos and told him that he had just received a Department of the Army order, dated January 18, 1954, directing the separation of Major Peress.

Major Peress signed a statement on January 25, 1954, acknowledging receipt of the notice of his release from active duty and electing to be released on March 31, 1954.

On January 28, 1954, Mr. John Adams, Department Counselor, Department of the Army, received a request from a staff member of the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations that he arrange for the appearance of Peress before that subcommittee in New York on January 30, 1954. Mr. Adams states that he was of the opinion at that time that Peress had already been discharged until he learned that day for the first time of the 90-day election period.

Mr. Adams states that he had been called at his home on January 3, 1954, by Mr. Roy Cohn of the staff of the McCarthy subcommittee; that Mr. Cohn informed Mr. Adams that the subcommittee had some derogatory information on a doctor or dentist who was a major at Camp Kilmer and that the next day Mr. Adams sent a memorandum con-

cerning that call to the Chief of the Intelligence Division, Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau. General Trudeau later that day advised Mr. Adams that the officer undoubtedly was Peress whose discharge had been directed and was about to be processed. Mr. Adams states that he furnished this advice to Mr. Cohn within a few days without revealing Peress' name.

Mr. Adams states that since he had been informed on January 4, that Peress was to be discharged as a possible security risk he felt the Army should have been rid of him as soon as possible. Accordingly, about noon-time on January 28, 1954, he requested G-2 to secure information as to whether Peress had been discharged and, if not, whether he could be discharged by January 29, 1954. Mr. Adams stated that it was his thought to have Peress in civilian status if possible when appearing before the McCarthy subcommittee on January 30, 1954.

Mr. Adams stated that he learned that Peress had not been discharged. He also stated that when he learned that day for the first time of the 90-days election period granted by the September 11, 1953, Department of the Army letter, upon being informed that Peress had selected March 31, 1954, as his discharge date, he dropped his efforts to accomplish Peress' separation prior to Peress' appearance before the subcommittee.

At 4 p. m. on January 28, 1954, Mr. Adams relayed the request for the appearance of Peress to General Zwicker at Camp Kilmer by telephone. General Zwicker notified Peress at 8:15 a. m. on January 29 of the request. Also at that time General Zwicker granted Peress permission to wear civilian clothes and be absent from duty on January 30, 1954.

Peress appeared before the McCarthy subcommittee in New York City on January 30, 1954, in accordance with the request made upon Mr. Adams.

On February 1, 1954, during the morning Peress requested that the date of his election for relief from active duty be changed from March 31, 1954, to provide for an immediate discharge. This was explicitly authorized by regulations.

General Zwicker at approximately 9:30 a. m. on February 1, 1954, telephoned Maj. Gen. John B. Murphy, Chief of Staff, First Army, in New York to inform him of this request. He advised General Murphy that, in consonance with the decision of the Department of the Army to release Peress as soon as possible, he had informed Peress that his discharge would be effected by 2 p. m., February 2, 1954.

Lieutenant Colonel Moore, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, called Col. Donald H. Smith, Chief, Personnel Division, First Army, in the morning of February 1, 1954, to learn the status of Peress' discharge, Brig. Gen. H. B. Powell, Deputy Chief, Personnel Division, Department of the Army, believes that this call was directed by him. While General Powell is not certain it is his impression that this information was furnished to Mr. Adams.

Later that morning Colonel Smith called Lieutenant Colonel Moore in Washington to tell him that he had since learned that Peress had requested an immediate release at Camp Kilmer and was scheduled for release by 2 p. m. the next day, February 2, 1954. Colonel Smith stated that General Zwicker had called General Murphy at 9:30 that morning on the matter. He also told Lieutenant Colonel Moore that Peress' separation had been recommended by First Army long before the grade adjustment of Peress had been effected.

In the afternoon of February 1, 1954, Col. C. O. Bruce, Military Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, received a telephone call from the office of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY. The colonel was informed that a

letter to the Secretary of the Army was being sent to his office by messenger and that the contents of the letter were being released to the press services.

Some time after 4 p. m., Colonel Bruce received the letter. He took it to the office of Mr. Adams, the Department Counselor, between 4:30 and 5:10 p. m.

At or about 5:10 p. m. Mr. Adams took the Senator's letter to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, Lieutenant General Weible. There were extended discussions between General Weible and Mr. Adams in the evening of February 1 during which General Weible learned of the pending discharge date of February 2, 1954, for Peress.

General Weible having handled the matter previously and having directed staff action to insure that the recommended discharge was the proper course, requested information that evening on (1) whether there was any new evidence to be considered; and (2) whether there was any evidence available to support the inferences contained in Senator McCarthy's letter as to possible subversive activities by Peress at Camp Kilmer.

During a conference between General Weible and Mr. Adams a conclusion was reached that the answers to both these inquiries were in the negative. Accordingly, there existed no basis for reconsideration of the case. General Weible, therefore, with Mr. Adams concurring, decided to adhere to the previously approved staff course of action, i. e., get Peress out of the service as expeditiously as possible.

On February 2, 1954, at 2 p. m., Peress was given an honorable discharge and his commission in the Army Reserve was irrevocably terminated. The discharge document given Dr. Peress at Camp Kilmer, N. J., in accordance with Department of the Army instructions of January 18, 1954, was signed by Maj. John J. McManus.

APPENDIX CONTAINING SERVICE HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERSONNEL MENTIONED IN THE CHRONOLOGY

(Histories current as of November 22, 1954)

INDEX

Name	Page and item in appendix	Page(s) in chronology
Adams, John	iv, A	22, 23, 24, 25
Allen, Lt. Col. Arthur W.	iv, B	21
Anders, Maj. James D.	iv, C	9
Babcock, Lt. Col. Bernard E.	iv, D	15, 17
Basbas, Lt. Col. James G.	iv, E	22
Berge, Capt. Einar	v, F	7
Bergin, Maj. Gen. William E.	v, G	16
Bolte, General Charles L.	v, H	18, 19, 20, 21
Bordeau, Maj. Herbert F.	v, I	17
Britt, Maj. Arthur E.	v, J	4, 8
Brown, Lt. Col. Chester T.	v, K	9, 10, 16
Bue, Col. Charles O.	v, L	24
Brunner, Col. Clarence O.	vi, M	24
Buelow, Maj. Wallace R.	vi, N	20
Burress, Lt. Gen. Withers A.	vi, O	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
Cowan, Brig. Gen. Egbert W.	vi, P	8
Crumm, Lt. Col. Clifton J.	vi, Q	7
Curtis, Col. Coy L.	vi, R	12
Dolson, Maj. James F.	vi, S	15, 17
Dude, Capt. Ludwig	vii, T	11
Epley, Col. Gerald G.	vii, U	18, 21
Forbes, Lt. Col. Lowell L.	vii, V	19
Gade, 1st Lt. Alfred M.	vii, W	7
Glattey, Col. Harold W.	vii, X	15
Harris, Maj. James E.	vii, Y	16
Hage, Lt. Col. Gunnar H.	vii, Z	2
Hyde, Lt. Col. Emery E.	viii, AA	14, 15
Johnson, Col. Wendell G.	viii, BB	6, 9
Jones, Col. Stanley W.	viii, CC	20
Kirkland, Capt. Curtis R.	viii, DD	2, 5, 6, 11
LaMarea, CWO Joseph T.	viii, EE	11
Leverich, Col. Rufus F.	viii, FF	10
Lewis, Col. Samuel R.	viii, GG	14
Lyon, Capt. Charles A.	ix, HH	4
McConnell, Brig. Gen. Frank C.	ix, II	19
McDaniel, CWO Robert C.	ix, JJ	22
McKenzie, Maj. Vernon	ix, KK	2, 12, 14, 15
McManus, Maj. John J.	ix, LL	25

INDEX—continued

Name	Page and item in appendix	Page(s) in chronology
Maxwell, Capt. Charles F.	ix, MM	6
Meredith, Lt. Col. William P.	ix, NN	10
Moore, Lt. Col. George B.	x, OO	18, 19, 20, 21, 24
Moreda, Capt. Armand E.	x, PP	4
Murphy, Maj. Gen. John B.	x, QQ	17, 24
Perry, Col. Willis A.	x, RR	9, 10
Powell, Maj. Gen. Herbert B.	x, SS	20, 24
Prentiss, Col. Roger G., Jr.	x, TT	9, 10, 14
Prettyman, Maj. William O., Jr.	xi, UU	8
Robichaud, Capt. Albert	xi, VV	9, 21
Smith, Col. Donald H.	xi, WW	17, 24
Strickler, Maj. Gen. Daniel B.	xi, XX	19
Thomas, Lt. Col. Ronald F.	xi, YY	9, 21
Trudeau, Maj. Gen. Arthur G.	xi, ZZ	23
Ursin, Col. O. Elliot	xii, AAA	8
Van Sickle, Capt. Floyd E., Jr.	xii, BBB	2, 4, 5, 6, 11
Vinette, 1st Lt. William L.	xii, CCC	11
Wagner, Capt. Howard	xii, DDD	8
Wansboro, Col. William P.	xii, EEE	14, 15
Weible, Lt. Gen. Walter L.	xii, FFF	19, 21, 24, 25
White, Maj. Gen. Miller B.	xiii, GGG	19
Winn, Lt. Col. Eric E.	xiii, HHH	10
Young, Maj. Gen. Robert N.	xiii, III	19, 20
Zwicker, Brig. Gen. Ralph W.	xiii, JJJ	16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24

SERVICE HISTORY OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERSONNEL MENTIONED IN THE CHRONOLOGY

A. John Adams: Mr. Adams has completed over 3 years of active military service and 16 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in North Africa, the Mediterranean, and Europe during World War II; was relieved from active duty in January 1946 as a major, and was promoted to the grade of lieutenant colonel USAR in August of 1950; he was chief clerk of the Senate Armed Services Committee during the 80th Congress and acted as deputy general counsel of the Department of Defense prior to assuming his current duties as Department counselor.

B. Lt. Col. Arthur W. Allen: Lieutenant Colonel Allen has completed over 15 years of active military service, is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff School, the Armored Officers' Advanced Course, and the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

C. Maj. James D. Anders: Major Anders has completed over 11 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Advanced Infantry Officers' Course and the Strategic Intelligence School; has been awarded the Silver Star Medal and the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Mediterranean theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

D. Lt. Col. Bernard E. Babcock: Lieutenant Colonel Babcock has completed over 14 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Far East during World War II and the Korean emergency; and has a top secret security clearance.

E. Lt. Col. James G. Basbas: Lieutenant Colonel Basbas has completed over 27 years of active military service; has the educational equivalent to the Adjutant General's School Advanced Course and to the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Middle East and in Europe during World

War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

F. Capt. Einar Berge: Captain Berge has completed over 8 years of active military service; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

G. Maj. Gen. William E. Bergin: Major General Bergin had completed over 36 years of active military service at the time of his retirement on May 31, 1954; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and has the additional equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the China-Burma-India theater during World War II; and had a top secret security clearance at the time of his retirement.

H. Gen. Charles L. Bolte: General Bolte has completed over 37 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the Army War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star for gallantry in action near Bologna, Italy, on April 20, 1945, the Legion of Merit, and the Purple Heart; commanded the 34th Infantry Division in Italy, the unit which cracked the historic Gothic line of the German defense in September 1944; and has a top secret security clearance.

I. Maj. Herbert F. Bordeaux: Major Bordeaux has completed over 15 years of active military service and 10 years of nonactive service; was promoted to the grade of lieutenant colonel on November 16, 1954; served in Europe during World War II and in the Far East during the first year of the Korean conflict; and has a secret security clearance.

J. Maj. Arthur E. Britt: Major Britt has completed over 13 years of active service; is a graduate of the Advanced Officers' Course, Medical Field Service School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; served in the European Theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

K. Lt. Col. Chester T. Brown: Lieutenant Colonel Brown has completed over 16 years of active military service and 14 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in Europe during World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

L. Col. Charles O. Bruce: Colonel Bruce has completed over 18 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Medical Field Service School; has been awarded the Legion of Merit, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Mediterranean and European theaters of operations during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

M. Col. Clarence O. Brunner: Colonel Brunner has completed over 20 years of active military service and 7 years of nonactive service; has been awarded the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in Europe during World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

N. Maj. Wallace R. Buelow: Major Buelow has completed over 12 years of active military service, is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College, has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal, served in Europe during World War II, and has a top secret security clearance.

O. Lt. Gen. Withers A. Burress: Lieutenant General Burress has completed over 37 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the Army War College; was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for service as commanding general of the 100th

Infantry Division in Europe during World War II; the Silver Star for gallantry in action near Neckargartach, Germany, on April 5, 1945, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; and has a top secret security clearance.

P. Brig. Gen. Egbert W. Cowan: Brigadier General Cowan has completed over 36 years of active military service at the time of his retirement in May of 1954; he served in the Mediterranean and North African theaters during World War II; he had a top secret security clearance prior to his retirement.

Q. Lt. Col. Clifton J. Crumm: Lieutenant Colonel Crumm has completed over 27 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; and has a top secret security clearance.

R. Col. Coy L. Curtis: Colonel Curtis has completed over 17 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, Command and General Staff College, and the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Silver Star, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the European theater of operations during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

S. Maj. James F. Dolson: Major Dolson has completed over 7 years of active military service and 4 years of nonactive service; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal, served in the Pacific during World War II and in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

T. Capt. Ludwig Dude: Captain Dude has completed over 14 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Counterintelligence Corps School; and has a top secret security clearance.

U. Col. Gerald G. Epley: Colonel Epley has completed over 22 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Infantry School, the Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal for valor, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Far East following World War II and in Korea during the hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

V. Lt. Col. Lowell L. Forbes: Lieutenant Colonel Forbes had completed over 13 years of active military service and 9 years of nonactive service at the time of his retirement on January 31, 1954; he served in the southwest Pacific during World War II; and he had a top secret security clearance up to the time of his retirement.

W. 1st Lt. Alfred M. Gade: First Lieutenant Gade has completed over 9 years of active military service and 2 years of nonactive service, was promoted to the grade of captain in September 1954, served in the CBI during World War II, and has a secret security clearance.

X. Col. Harold W. Glattley: Colonel Glattley has completed over 28 years of active military service; has the educational equivalent to graduation from the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Silver Star with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; was surgeon of the United States Forces on Bataan, Philippine Islands, at the time of the fall of the Philippines; was a prisoner of war of the Japanese during which time he was a leading United States surgeon in various prisoner of war camps; and has a top secret security clearance.

Y. Maj. James E. Harris: Major Harris had completed over 25 years of military service prior to his retirement on August 31, 1954; he had been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; he served in the European Theater during World War II and in the Far East during the recent hostilities in Korea; and he had a top secret security clearance prior to his retirement.

Z. Lt. Col. Gunnar H. Hage: Lieutenant Colonel Hage has completed over 14 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and of the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

AA. Lt. Col. Emery E. Hyde: Lieutenant Colonel Hyde has over 12 years of active military service and 11 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Armed Forces Staff College; served in the North African and Mediterranean Theater Campaigns during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

BB. Col. Wendell G. Johnson: Colonel Johnson had completed over 31 years of active military service at the time of his retirement on September 30, 1954; he is a graduate of the United States Military Academy and the Command and General Staff School; he had been awarded the Legion of Merit with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served as military attaché in Cuba and in Spain during World War II; and he had up until the time of his retirement a top secret security clearance.

CC. Col. Stanley W. Jones: Colonel Jones has completed over 35 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy; has been awarded the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant with Oak Leaf Cluster; served as Judge Advocate of the Ninth Army in Europe during World War II; was promoted to Brigadier General on October 5, 1954; and has a top secret security clearance.

DD. Maj. Curtis R. Kirkland: Major Kirkland had completed over 16 years of active military service at the time of his separation on April 2, 1954; served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II, had been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster; and had a top secret security clearance during the time of his handling of the Peress case.

EE. CWO Joseph T. LaMarca: Chief Warrant Officer LaMarca has completed over 14 years of military service; served in North Africa and Europe during World War II; was relieved from active duty on August 31, 1954, and reenlisted as a Master Sergeant on September 1, 1954; and has a top secret security clearance.

FF. Col. Ruluff F. Leverich: Colonel Leverich has completed over 13 years of active military service and 11 years of nonactive duty; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Far East during the Korean hostilities; and has a secret security clearance.

GG. Col. Samuel R. Lewis: Colonel Lewis has completed over 24 years of active military service and has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

HH. Capt. Charles A. Lyon: Captain Lyon has completed over 26 years of active military service, was promoted to the grade of major in April 1953, and was released from active duty on February 1, 1954. He is now serving as a master sergeant at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.; and has a secret security clearance.

II. Brig. Gen. Frank C. McConnell: Brigadier General McConnell has completed over 32 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Air Medal; served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II and in the Far East during the Korean emergency; was designated as a principal delegate to the United Nations Command Armistice Delegation in Korea in 1952; and has a top secret security clearance.

JJ. CWO Robert C. McDaniel: Chief Warrant Officer McDaniel has completed over 13 years of active military service; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; and has a top secret security clearance.

KK. Maj. Vernon McKenzie: Major McKenzie has completed over 13 years of active military service; served in the India-Burma theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

LL. Maj. John J. McManus: Major McManus had completed over 11 years of active military service and 14 years of nonactive duty at the time of his release from active duty on November 4, 1954; had been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Far East Command during World War II and in Korea during the recent hostilities there; had a secret clearance up until the time of his relief from active duty.

MM. Capt. Charles F. Maxwell: Captain Maxwell had completed over 12 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Counter Intelligence Corps School and the Provost Marshal General's School; was promoted to the grade of major on April 17, 1953; served in the India-Burma theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

NN. Lt. Col. William P. Meredith: Lieutenant Colonel Meredith has completed over 10 years of active military service and 9 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College and the Strategic Intelligence School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; served in the Far East during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

OO. Lt. Col. George B. Moore: Lieutenant Colonel Moore has completed over 12 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy and the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action in Tunisia during 1943, the Bronze Star Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters for valor and the Purple Heart; and has a top secret security clearance.

PP. Capt. Armand E. Moreda: Captain Moreda has completed over 14 years of active military service; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; and has a top secret security clearance.

QQ. Maj. Gen. John B. Murphy: Major General Murphy has completed over 36 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff School, and has the educational equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action at Bitche, France, on December 16, 1944, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; was promoted to the grade of major general on November 6, 1953; and has a top secret security clearance.

RR. Col. Willis A. Perry: Colonel Perry has completed over 24 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Command and General Staff School, the National War College; and has the educational equivalent to the Armed Forces Staff College; has been awarded the Legion of Merit; and has a top secret security clearance.

SS. Brig. Gen. Herbert B. Powell: Brigadier General Powell has completed over 28 years of active service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, the Air Medal, the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, and the Purple Heart; served as Chief of Staff of one of the Infantry Divisions in the European theater during World War II and commanded the 17th Infantry Regiment in Korea at the time that unit spearheaded the

advance to the Manchurian Border becoming the only United States unit to reach the Yalu River; and has a top secret security clearance. He was promoted to major general on October 1, 1954.

TT. Col. Roger G. Prentiss, Jr.: Colonel Prentiss has completed over 26 years of active military service; has been awarded the Legion of Merit; and has a top secret security clearance.

UU. Maj. William O. Prettyman, Jr.: Major Prettyman has completed over 13 years of active military service; has the educational equivalent to the Medical Field Service School; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

VV. Capt. Albert Robichaud: Captain Robichaud has completed over 12 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Counter Intelligence Corps School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster; served both in Europe and in the China theater during World War II and in the Far East during the Korean hostilities; and has a top secret security clearance.

WW. Col. Donald H. Smith: Colonel Smith has completed over 13 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Purple Heart; served in the Mediterranean theater during World War II and in the Far East during the Korean conflict; and has a top secret security clearance.

XX. Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler: Major General Strickler has completed over 11 years of active military service and 26 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster for valor, and the Purple Heart; served as a battalion and regimental commander in Europe during World War II and later commanded an infantry division in Europe; and has a top secret security clearance.

YY. Lt. Col. Ronald F. Thomas: Lieutenant Colonel Thomas has completed over 14 years of active military service and 12 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and the Counter Intelligence Corps School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal; was a battalion commander in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

ZZ. Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau: Major General Trudeau has completed over 30 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Engineer School, the Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College, and has the educational equivalent of the Command and General Staff College, the Armed Forces Staff College, and the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Silver Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster for gallantry in action on April 12, 1953, and July 8, 1953, near Sokkagae, Korea, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; has served in the Western Pacific during World War II and as commanding general, 7th Infantry Division in Korea during the recent hostilities there; and has a top secret security clearance.

AAA. Col. O. Elliot Ursin: Colonel Ursin has completed over 15 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Southwest Pacific during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

BBB. Capt. Floyd E. Van Sickle, Jr.: Captain Van Sickle has completed over 14 years of active military service, has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, served in the Pacific Ocean area during World War II, was promoted to the grade of

major in May of 1953, and has a top secret security clearance.

CCC. 1st Lt. William L. Vinette: First Lieutenant Vinette has completed over 7 years of active military service and 1 year of nonactive service; is a graduate of The Adjutant General's advanced officers' course; was promoted to the grade of captain on September 16, 1954; and has a secret security clearance.

DDD. Capt. Howard Wagner: Captain Wagner has completed over 15 years of military service; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

EEE. Col. William P. Wansboro: Colonel Wansboro has completed over 16 years of active military service; is a graduate of the United States Military Academy and the Army War College; has been awarded the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, served in Europe during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

FFF. Lt. Gen. Walter L. Weible: Lieutenant General Weible has completed over 36 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Coast Artillery School, the Chemical Warfare School, the Command and General Staff School, the Army War College, the Army Industrial College, and has the educational equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; served in the Pacific during the last few months of World War II and in the Far East during the Korean conflict; and has a top secret security clearance.

GGG. Maj. Gen. Miller B. White: Major General White has completed over 18 years of active military service and 15 years of nonactive service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster and the Purple Heart; served as Director of Personnel, War Department General Staff, and also in the Mediterranean theater during World War II; and has a top secret security clearance.

HHH. Lt. Col. Eric E. Winn: Lieutenant Colonel Winn has completed over 29 years of active military service at the time of his retirement on September 30, 1954; was a graduate of the Counter Intelligence Corps School and the Strategic Intelligence School; served in Europe during World War II and in the Far East during the latter part of the Korean conflict; and had a top secret security clearance at the time of his retirement.

III. Maj. Gen. Robert N. Young: Major General Young has completed over 31 years of active military service; is a graduate of the Command and General Staff School and has the educational equivalent to the National War College; has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, the Silver Star for gallantry in action in France on January 30, 1945, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster, and the Purple Heart; served in Europe during World War II and commanded the 2d Infantry Division in Korea; and has a top secret security clearance.

JJJ. Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker: Brigadier General Zwicker has completed over 27 years of active military service; he is a graduate of the United States Military Academy, the Naval War College, and the National War College; he has been awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action on the coast of Normandy on June 6, 1944, the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant; he commanded an infantry regiment in combat during World War II, and was later made chief of staff of one of the infantry divisions in Europe; and he has a top secret security clearance.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts for finally obtaining from the Army the information he has submitted for the RECORD. It was long overdue.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for joining in the resolution proposed by other Senators and myself to complete the investigations of this case and other cases of this nature which are still pending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his statement.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust that my sense of humor will never forsake me in the new year. I made a resolution to that effect. I trust also that I shall not lack restraint and violate a rule of the Senate, and thus invite censure.

However, according to the morning newspapers, certain Democratic Members of a very distinguished legislative body enjoyed a political feast of reason and flow of wit on Sunday by assailing the Vice President and scoffing at the President's popularity, and flexed their vocal muscles for the front pages in the days to come.

One of them is quoted as saying: "We're not afraid of Eisenhower."

Another is quoted as saying, "I went after Eisenhower and my opponent."

Still another remarked, "This is open season on the Vice President," and then added, "We're not particularly afraid of the Vice President."

It is a little difficult for me to understand whether this is a naive kind of immaturity speaking, whether it is unconscious humor, or whether the cold-war drums are already beating. It sounds as if the happy slogan "I like Ike" is about to be changed to "I fight Ike."

Mr. President, the new theme song seems to be, "Who's Afraid of the Big Bad Wolf?"

The harmony which the President invited is apparently becoming the music of the spears—not spheres.

On the other hand, I remember, from my examinations of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar very long ago, the words: "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings."

It may also be, in the words of that old English poet Pope, that all discord is "harmony not understood."

May it be that way.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLEMENTS. 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. CLEMENTS. 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. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as acting majority leader I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution provides for the amendment of Senate Resolution 14, which was unanimously adopted by the Senate on last Thursday. The resolution deals with the size of committees during the 84th Congress and with the distribution of third-committee assignments.

On last Thursday third-committee assignments for the minority party were left at 3, when they should have been increased to 5. The resolution of amendment simply takes care of the oversight, and provides that, while the distribution between the majority and the minority in the Senate shall be 49 to 47, the majority party shall have 16 third-committee assignments and the minority party 5.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 19) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That during the 84th Congress rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, as amended by Senate Resolution 14, 84th Congress, agreed to January 6, 1955, is further amended by striking out "three", where it first appears in section (4) (a) of such rule, and inserting in lieu thereof "five."

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON PERSONNEL SECURITY—THE CASE OF WOLF LADEJINSKY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it had been my intention to introduce a joint resolution today, which I had prepared, having to do with a joint commission for the purpose of studying our personnel security program. I have prepared a short statement on the subject, which will explain the purpose I had in mind, and also the reason for the delay in the presentation of this particular legislative proposal.

Mr. President, many of us are seriously concerned with the present operations of our Government's security program, as it pertains to Federal personnel.

All of us put foremost the security of our country and want the program to fully serve that purpose, but believe, as the President apparently does, that such security can and must be achieved with fairness and justice to Government employees.

The President has set forth his own personal code of fair play on many oc-

casions, and most recently emphasized his pledge of fairness and respect for individual rights in his message to this Congress. Our task now is to see that such fair treatment of individuals is exemplified by deed rather than word.

The most recent example of inconsistency and injustice under this program is that of Wolf Ladejinsky, a veteran career officer of our Government, with an outstanding record of combating communism which is recognized by leaders of both parties. The full background of this unfortunate case has been publicly aired, and need not now be fully reviewed. Yet the tragic fact remains that even after supposedly full clearance, a cloud hangs over this man, in spite of the fact that he is being asked to undertake a sensitive position in a vital area of the world.

According to the FOA, the decision to clear Mr. Ladejinsky was based on an up-to-date review of all available information, which included a full background investigation by the FBI. Mr. Ladejinsky is being given a very important assignment in one of the crucial and critical areas of the world, Vietnam.

Mr. President, I digress from my prepared statement to say that in that particular area of the world we are in the very important stages of the aftereffects of a negotiated truce and agreement. What develops there may very well indicate to us what will develop in all south-east Asia.

It is in Vietnam, or in Indonesia, where the struggle between freedom and communism is at white heat. Yet our Foreign Operations Administration finds Mr. Ladejinsky qualified in every degree for this very sensitive assignment.

Despite this fact, the Secretary of Agriculture persists in maintaining that Mr. Ladejinsky is a security risk and could not be cleared for employment in the Department of Agriculture as an agricultural attaché.

This is a preposterous, incredible, and almost unbelievable example of cruel and inhuman treatment of a fellow American. It is one thing for responsible officers of this Government to argue privately their respective positions on an important matter or case. It is an entirely different thing, however, to have an officer of the Government of Cabinet rank persist in making charges against a public servant who has given many years of service to his country when other high officials and Government departments have publicly stated that the public servant—in this case Mr. Ladejinsky—was cleared and was suitable for responsible assignment.

The Ladejinsky case has gotten out of hand. Mr. Ladejinsky is being persecuted, he is being abused, and he is being asked to take a very important assignment in a critical area of the world while a Cabinet officer of the Government continues to harass him and question his loyalty and fitness.

To be sure, this makes a mockery of the President's security program. It exposes our Government before the whole world as being one of confusion and contradiction. It truly challenges the leadership of the President as the Chief Executive of this Nation.

Either Mr. Ladejinsky is a good security risk or a poor one; he is either loyal or disloyal; he is either competent or incompetent, and we can no longer tolerate having high officials of the administration publicly making conflicting charges and countercharges on this matter.

Mr. President, I digress to point out that the State Department cleared Mr. Ladejinsky. The Foreign Operations Administration cleared him. Both departments hold him available for assignment on sensitive projects. Does the Department of Agriculture have some information so supersecret that the security clearance of Mr. Ladejinsky in the State Department, under Mr. McLeod, and the security clearance by the Foreign Operations Administration, were not sufficiently good, honorable, and acceptable to the Department of Agriculture?

I think it would be well if our colleagues find out what is the secret which the Department of Agriculture may have.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this moment. I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the real tragedy in this case is what is being done to a fellow human being. Where is the humanity of this administration? Where is the compassion, the decency, and the morality of this administration? Did not the President tell us that the difference between communism and democracy is essentially one of how we treat people? I ask the administration this question: How are you treating Mr. Ladejinsky? When will this man be confronted with the charges against him, charges by a Cabinet officer who has continued to assail his character and his fitness to serve his Government? Where is the rule of fair play in this case?

Frankly, the time has arrived for the President of the United States to put his official house in order. The rule of law is giving way to the rule of stubborn men. High sounding pious phrases are no substitute for straightforward honest talk and explanation.

No person in Government is safe or secure if this kind of capricious action is permitted to continue. The entire civil service of our Government is under attack and being slowly undermined.

Mr. President, I wish to make it crystal clear that I support a security program. I believe in a most careful scrutiny in carrying out such a program. I would say that if all departments of Government had found Mr. Ladejinsky a poor security risk, there would be no argument. But the truth is that only one department has found Mr. Ladejinsky to be a bad risk; two other departments have found him to be a good risk and a good servant of the Government, competent, fit, and available for a sensitive assignment.

The morale of Government workers in key positions can no longer stand this kind of confusion, contradiction, and castigation.

If Mr. Benson really believes that Mr. Ladejinsky is such a bad security risk, then he should take his case to the White House for a decision, because two of his fellow Cabinet members have disagreed with him.

The Ladejinsky case is now a top priority subject of Presidential decision. Apparently, according to the FOA and the press dispatches, Mr. Ladejinsky has been cleared with White House approval. If this be true, then Mr. Benson should either apologize or resign, because he is in open conflict with his own Government.

But the Ladejinsky case is but a symbol of the flaws in our security program that would ever let such a situation develop. It is to the removal of such flaws that we should direct our attention. It is proper for the appropriate committees of the Congress to act without delay toward analyzing, studying, and exposing such flagrant abuses and inconsistencies in our security program.

Mr. President, the security program is important. It must not be played with, and it must not be made to look as if it has no continuity, consistency, or coherence.

But our responsibility goes behind that. Confidence of the public must be restored in both the effectiveness of our security program, and its fairness. It is very important that we emphasize its fairness. To do that, the entire unfortunate situation that has developed around our security program, including attempts to use it as a political weapon, must be lifted above the realm of politics, and above the realm of partisan bias either on the part of the administration or the majority party or the minority party in the Congress.

It has been in a sincere attempt to reach that high level that I have publicly proposed a bipartisan commission on personnel security, composed both of people from within our Government and distinguished citizens from outside the Government in whom the American people can have full confidence.

I appreciate the constructive interest that has been shown by a number of my colleagues in this proposal. I am pleased at the support that has been voiced for it by Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives. I have made it in good faith, and I believe it to be in the best interests of the American people as a whole, regardless of party.

My proposal is to get the entire question on higher ground, because we are talking about the security of our Nation and we are talking about people. We want both security and fairness, and the program does not need to become the plaything of anyone. Instead, it is the solemn, hard duty, and responsibility of all of us. Security is something that cannot be lightly tampered with, nor should the fundamental rights of individuals under our democratic processes.

Although it was my intention to introduce today a joint resolution calling

for the creation of such a Commission, the widespread interest that has been manifested in this proposal has led me to defer such action pending further consultation with leaders of all committees which might be concerned and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle who have expressed interest and concern about this problem. I should like to say we wish to have support and help from Senators on both sides of the aisle.

It is my hope that common accord can be reached on the scope of activities of such a Commission as the one I have in mind in making a bona fide, constructive, long-range approach to providing our country with effective security protection, without jeopardizing fundamental rights of individuals under our Constitution—in other words, to prove that a free society can guard itself against subversion and at the same time can protect the liberties and the rights of its citizenry. In this way we shall prove to ourselves and to the rest of the world that we can exercise careful guard over the liberties of our people and the security of our country. They are not incompatible; in fact, they stand together, and they must be protected together.

Therefore, Mr. President, the joint resolution will be presented to this body as soon as the consultations I have in mind have been completed. I wish to receive the benefit of the counsel and judgment of all who have expressed interest similar to my own.

In concluding these remarks, Mr. President, I say that I welcome whatever help, guidance, and assistance may come from my friends on the Republican side or from my friends on the Democratic side. My hope is that we shall be able to proceed in an orderly way and to conduct ourselves in a fashion which will bring respect to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am merely seeking information. Can the Senator from Minnesota advise the Senate as to when Mr. Ladejinsky was first cleared by the State Department for service in Japan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was cleared twice, let me say, according to the information I have.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from Minnesota give the approximate dates when Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to submit that information in the Record. The detail of the dates is not clear. But I have checked with the State Department. He has been cleared twice. The last time—if I am not mistaken—was in March 1953. But I am not sure of that date.

Mr. AIKEN. When was the first time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was cleared twice by this administration.

Mr. AIKEN. But he was working in Japan before this administration took office, was he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; he was working with General MacArthur; and I

understand that General MacArthur held him in high esteem.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared by the State Department for service in Japan before the present administration took office, was he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand he was cleared before this administration took office, and that he was cleared twice by this administration. He is a career civil servant.

Mr. AIKEN. But the question I asked was whether he was cleared by the State Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; in this administration.

Mr. AIKEN. Was he cleared by the State Department before this administration took office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Both; he was cleared before this administration took office, and he was cleared twice by Mr. McLeod.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota thinks, does he not, that Mr. Ladejinsky was voluntarily cleared by Secretary Acheson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure whether Secretary Acheson cleared him or not. I am sure that Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared twice by the present State Department and present administration.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator from Minnesota agrees, does he not, that Secretary Acheson should have cleared Mr. Ladejinsky before he went to work in Japan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine so, and that undoubtedly he should have been cleared under the loyalty program. But obviously he was cleared by General MacArthur, who had a very good security system.

Mr. AIKEN. But my question is whether Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared by Secretary Acheson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In honest answer to that question, I must say I do not know. But I do know that he was cleared twice by the present State Department officialdom.

I should like to give the Senator from Vermont an answer to his question; I am not evading it. If Mr. Ladejinsky worked for the State Department, the presumption is that he was cleared. But I do not think that is at all the problem presently before us.

Mr. AIKEN. But I think it is very important.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is important, in my opinion, is that he has been cleared by the Foreign Operations Administration; and he has been cleared twice by the State Department since January 1953; and he has been cleared within the past 10 days. Yet one officer of this Government persists in saying that Mr. Ladejinsky is a security risk.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that much of the so-called magnificent work that Mr. Ladejinsky performed in Japan—and I do not say it was not good work; in fact, I understand it was—was done before the present administration took office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Therefore he must have been cleared by Secretary of State Acheson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine he was. The Senator from Vermont wanted a statement of facts. I am giving him what facts I know, and I would be delighted to look into the question he raises and ascertain the facts. I called up the State Department 2 days before Christmas, when I saw that this cruel and inhumane act had occurred, and in some sense of righteous indignation, I spoke to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Brown. The Assistant Secretary of State and the Secretary of State were not available; I could not reach them. So I spoke to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, and I asked the pointed question, "Has Mr. Ladejinsky been cleared by your Department?"

The answer was, "Yes; he has been cleared twice."

I asked, "When?"

The reply was, "Under the administration of Mr. Dulles, since January 1953."

I presume Mr. Ladejinsky was cleared by the Acheson State Department administration. If Mr. Ladejinsky worked overseas, he should have been so cleared. But that is not the point. The point in this matter is that there is one security program, and it is operated under executive order. That security program should operate uniformly. There should be a board of review or a board of appeals, in case there may be conflict between agencies. But there is no such board.

Mr. President, in this instance we see equally responsible high officials disagreeing on the basis of findings and on the basis of investigatory examination by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We see the State Department, which prides itself today on top-level security clearance, being told by officers in the Department of Agriculture, "Your clearance in the State Department is not adequate for clearance in the Department of Agriculture."

I say, first, that that is an insult to the State Department. Or, perhaps, in the light of the charges, the State Department is not sufficiently careful. I happen to believe that it is. I am not in possession of the facts. All I know is that there is an honest disagreement.

In the meantime, not only is our Government embarrassed, not only are Members of Congress embarrassed, but the character of a distinguished public servant, Mr. Wolf Ladejinsky, who has proved for 20 years to be an outstanding opponent of communism and a proponent of effective democracy, has been attacked. I say that is not fair. This man is either good or bad. Either he is a security risk or he is not. I ask that the question be cleared up.

PRICES OF POULTRY AND OTHER FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of all Senators one of the most important letters I have received in a long time. It is from an outstanding lady in the State of North Dakota, a member of a pioneer family. I received the letter this morning. It

comes from Lake Williams, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: For a long time I've been thinking about writing to you but put it off. I have wondered to myself, just why, but think the main reason was that I didn't have any faith in it as to doing any good to write and when one doesn't have faith and hope one doesn't have much, does one?

Several days ago over the news reports I heard that Senator YOUNG from North Dakota was going to try to have all North Dakota declared a disaster area so we would be eligible for loans. Why? We farmers don't want loans. We don't need loans, if we get a fair price for our produce, unless we have a drought, of course.

I sold old hens last fall for 6 cents a pound. A Leghorn hen, and a fair one, too, weighs 3 pounds alive. I got 18 cents for her.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I want every Senator to realize that this woman received 18 cents for a fine Leghorn hen.

Continuing with the letter:

I sold at least 100 spring chickens for 50 cents each. How can one raise and produce for the market at that price? I hope our pal Benson has chicken for dinner once in a while at that price.

I sold pullet eggs for 6 cents a dozen.

I notice that my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is listening quite interestedly. I know that this letter will remind him of the drought area. We were in a terrible situation during the drought. Even at that time, however, the prices of eggs and chickens were no less than they apparently are at the present time.

I sold pullet eggs for 6 cents a dozen. We got that back in the thirties, but then we bought coffee for 25 cents a pound. Today it is \$1.25. To be fair, we should have 35 cents to 40 cents a dozen for eggs, and at least \$1 to \$1.25 for live chickens. We farmers are good spenders if we can make it. We also like nice cars to drive, nice bathrooms and refrigerators, and so forth. Our men like new tractors and modern machinery to lighten the work, but our hog and cattle prices are so far out of line that we just can't buy them after paying our taxes and buy everyday things; and every year we are getting older, too.

Why can't we have things more balanced so we could all make a good living and have a little security?

Well, Senator, I am sorry if I have wasted some of your valuable time, but I have wanted to write this for a long time.

Thank you anyway.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LLOYD RANDALL,
A Farm Wife.

LAKE WILLIAMS, N. DAK.

This outstanding, fair-minded lady is a member of one of the pioneer families of the State of North Dakota. She is not a crank. I think she has a legitimate complaint. I am placing this letter in the RECORD because I have received similar complaints from other sources. Some are not quite so serious as this one. I ask that the letter be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in the hope that some action may be taken which will eliminate the situation with which, apparently, farmers all over the country are faced in connection with chicken and egg prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDRESS BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT ANNUAL WINGS CLUB DINNER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by one of our most outstanding Americans, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. His talk was given at a recent annual dinner of the Wings Club, in New York City.

I believe my colleagues will be particularly interested in that part of the address which embraces a thought-provoking recommendation of this patriotic and experienced citizen, namely, the enlargement of the National Security Council so as to include some outstanding patriotic citizens. Their sole task would be to study and think through, for the Council's benefit, the growing problems in connection with our domestic and foreign policies in their relationship to our national security.

I ask that this interesting address be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD M. BARUCH AT ANNUAL WINGS CLUB DINNER

It is the strange and ironic paradox of our times that the fruits of human genius are so versatile that they may be employed for either the destruction or salvation of mankind. The airplane may shower death upon the earth or bind the peoples and nations of the world together in ties of peaceful commerce. Atomic energy is capable of extinguishing civilization or of raising it to undreamed-of heights of prosperity and progress. If this be the paradox of our time, it is also the challenge. We must so order the world that the power of modern science and technology will be devoted only to the enrichment of life. If we have courage and the wisdom atomic energy may, as Sir Winston Churchill noted, eliminate war itself instead of destroying civilization.

I do not intend to lecture an audience such as this on the problems and potentialities of aviation. But it seems to me that this industry faces the same basic problem and dilemma that confronts us all.

That basic problem is, of course, the cold war. Strange as it may seem, for 40 years we have been either going into or coming out of war. We Americans understand peace and its ways. To a much lesser extent we understand war and its ways. Though we have committed grievous errors in the domestic and economic aspects of war—errors for which we are still paying in the inflation which wracked our economy—in the huge national debt—still, we have managed to pull through. But in these times we are neither at war nor at peace. Some might say that we are both at war and at peace. We have had to adjust ourselves to a situation new to our experience and, indeed, alien to our understanding. The aviation industry, for example, must maintain its military program and devote its research and resources—its best minds—to the unpleasant prospect of war. At the same time it must follow its legitimate peacetime interests. If the industry—and the Nation—have taken on a split personality, it is not surprising. The cold war has generated a good deal of confusion in the land. Unhappily, after 6 years,

I have seen no determined and constructive effort to dispel this confusion.

We simply have not thought through all the problems confronting us, in all their interrelationships. After 6 years of cold war have we, for example, decided what our economic policy should be toward our antagonists, our allies, or the neutralists? Have we devised a global strategy to replace the disjointed and piecemeal responses with which, for so long, we met the Soviet challenge? Have we determined the condition upon which we are willing to reach an agreement with the Soviets? Have we cataloged all the elements of our strength and weakness and have we succeeded in correcting the latter?

These and many other problems are still to be thought through. The course we would pursue in peace will not do now. Nor will the course which war dictates. We need fresh thinking.

I have long advocated the enlargement of the National Security Council to include the most able and experienced men whose sole task would be to study and think through the problems of our times. The present members of the National Security Council are already overburdened with administrative and departmental duties. They simply do not have time for continuous thought. The group I envision, composed of men of the highest caliber, would be nonpartisan not bipartisan. Their examination of a problem and their recommendations would be free from any taint of politics or political controversy which exists between parties and even branches of Government.

I do not advocate that thinking be confined to a select body in Washington. Each of us must do some fresh thinking for himself. Our arsenal of war is mighty. Our instruments for peace are many—but they are all useless unless reason and intelligence direct them. We need a new campaign in America—a campaign to get the facts, not as we would like them to be, but as they are. If the facts are not palatable we are entitled to change them. If we cannot do that, we must adjust to them. But we cannot ignore them or run away from them save at our own peril.

This search for the facts is particularly important now when the Soviet Union seems to be showing an interest tending toward a *modus vivendi*. No one hopes more fervently than I that peace can be made a reality. But it will not come easily and we must not permit ourselves to be deceived. Now, more than ever before, we need clear thinking. Until peace is attained we must be prepared for war. I have urged a standby mobilization program which would permit us, in an instant, to throw all our strength, economic and spiritual as well as military, into any conflict. Such a program is still essential.

We need strength and we need clear thinking. These we can have only if we devote our hearts and our minds to the well-being of our Nation as we do to the success of our personal affairs. We must remember always that our fate is one with the fate of America. We cannot separate our own best interests from the best interest of the country. We must—all of us—think of our own problems, our own needs, our own hopes within the context of the problems, the needs, and the objectives of the country. This land is our proud possession and protector. It is one for all. It must be all for one—America.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, now an Assistant Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Philip Alexander Ray, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Albert Pratt, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Joseph Campbell, of New York, to be Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Lindsay C. Warren, retired.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the recess of the Senate, to the offices indicated:

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

George A. Blowers, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Vance Brand, of Ohio, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

George C. McConaughy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Ben H. Guill, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1957, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30,

1958, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

John A. Hall, of California, to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

John Von Neumann, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1959, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Theophil Carl Kammholz, of Illinois, to be general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 4 years, vice George J. Bott, term expired.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Albert J. Hayes, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 19, 1958, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Robert H. Jackson, deceased.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

William E. Miller, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

M. Frank Reid, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of South Carolina. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

I. FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, TO BE EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior assistant surgeons

Kenneth W. Momery, Jr.
Len H. Andrus

To be assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle
John F. Lee, Jr.

II. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be surgeons

William L. Ross, Jr.
Roger L. Black

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Lawrence C. Gray
Melvin W. Carter
Shinji Soneda

To be scientist

Colvin L. Gibson

To be senior sanitarian

Maurice E. Odoroff

To be veterinarian

Samuel Abramson

To be nurse officer

Marie F. Hansel

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

Adm. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Adm. Ralph J. Arnold, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated:

LINE

John H. Sides	Edwin T. Layton
Victor D. Long	Frederick R. Furth
Henry Crommelin	Robert L. Swart
Redfield Mason	Schuyler N. Pyne
Edward N. Parker	Robert E. Cronin
Edmund B. Taylor	Chester C. Smith
Frederick B. Warder	Harold O. Larson
George C. Wright	Thomas Burrows
David M. Tyree	Donald C. Varian
Lewis S. Parks	Albert E. Jarrell
Willard K. Goodney	William G. Beecher,
Frederick N. Kivette	Jr.
Ira E. Hobbs	Charles H. Lyman III
Harry H. Henderson	Paul D. Stroop
Joseph H. Wellings	Fitzhugh Lee
Joseph M. Carson	Frank O'Beirne
Charles F. Chilling-	Francis D. McCorkle
worth, Jr.	Elton W. Grenfell
John Sylvester	Charles A. Buchanan
John M. Taylor	William G. Cooper
James S. Russell	Clifford H. Duerfeldt
Henry C. Bruton	George C. Weaver
Robert B. Pirie	Albert G. Mumma

MEDICAL CORPS

James R. Fulton
Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Lloyd H. Thomas
Joel D. Parks
William L. Knickerbocker

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William Sihler

DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Taylor

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Air Force

Leggette, Frank Browne, 18072A.
Patty, Homer Emmitt, 18102A.
Hills, Kenneth Bruce, 5680A.
Goodmanson, Murel Matthew, 5681A.
Holden, Paul Cole, 5682A.
Atwell, Lawrence Austin, 5683A.
Cope, William Samuel, 5684A.
X Leverette, William Lawrence, 5685A.

Edwards, Robert Bruce, 5687A.
Conkling, Emmett Virgil, 5688A.
Walsh, Michael Joseph, 5689A.
Taylor, Thomas Edward, 5690A.
Norcia, Benjamin, 5694A.
Pettit, Weldon Monroe, 5695A.
Milliff, John, 19652A.
X Anderson, Arlo Sell, 5696A.
Hohs, Robert Leo, 5697A.
Ray, Robert Homer, 5698A.
Brill, Norris, 5700A.
Hogg, Robert, 5701A.
Scruggs, John Alexander, 5702A.
Carney, John Kilker, 5703A.
Hallem, Louis Carlyle, 5704A.
Hibbits, Francis Leonard, 5705A.
Mellinger, Robert Thomas, 5706A.
Glaenger, Charles F., 5707A.
Wilson, Walter George, 5710A.
Nudell, Fred Wellington, 5711A.
Staskewitz, Benjamin Edward, 5712A.
X Gromak, Anthony Edward, 5713A.
Dean, David Kennedy, 5714A.
Mayberry, Samuel Waller, Jr., 5716A.
Johnston, William Edward, 5717A.
Chilcote, Charles Arthur, 5718A.
Hensley, Joseph Woodrow, 5719A.
Barr, Jennings Monroe, 5720A.
Reeves, Elmo, 5723A.
McCombs, Harold Kelly, 5725A.
Gray, Russell Earl, 5726A.
White, Richard Durwin, 5728A.
Sutton, John Liggett, 5729A.
Bailey, Harry Banks, 5730A.
Norman, William Roy, 5732A.
Griffin, Julius Columbus, 5733A.
Rigney, Charles Edward, 5734A.
Reising, Albert John, 5735A.
Pryor, Charles Donald, 5736A.
Koenig, Perier Arnold, 5738A.
Duty, William Burkett, 5739A.
Slough, Andrew Elmer, 5741A.
Mellor, Alfred Lionel, 5743A.
Ahrens, William Carl, 5744A.
Tigner, Edwin Brown, 5745A.
Myers, Earle Russell, 5746A.
Kappeler, Frank Albert, 5747A.
Stiglich, John Jack, 5748A.
Jenkins, Leaton Elbert, 5749A.
Hunter, Russell Bruce, 5750A.
Holmes, Merrill Dennis, 5751A.
Swanson, Charles Kenneth, 5752A.
Dougal, Robert Elliot, 5754A.
Finley, William H., 5755A.
Hays, John Bennett, 5756A.
Dornbos, Philip Ogden, 5757A.
Decker, Robert Young, 5758A.
Roberts, Gore Frederick, 5759A.
Youngman, Reginald Bunker, 5760A.
Buttmann, Oscar, 5761A.
X Mills, Eugene Spencer, Jr., 5762A.
Smith, Clyde Harrison, 5763A.
X Leavitt, William Job, 5764A.
Lockman, Daniel Barkley, 5765A.
Townsend, Barry Baldwin, 5767A.
Morrison, Harry James, 5767A.
George, John Louis, 5768A.
Sturgis, James Edwin, 5769A.
Eliason, Arnold Clarence, 5770A.
Gordon, William Price, Jr., 5771A.
Parr, Albert Thomas, 5772A.
Babb, Claude Andrew, 5773A.
Acker, Halbert Hammond, 5775A.
Nickels, Loren Smith, 5777A.
Therrien, Patrick Elogius, 5780A.
Barrow, Tom Lee, 5781A.
Ross, John Samuel, 5782A.
Shaw, Donald Adrian, 5783A.
Wansley, Theodore, 5784A.
Verbeek, Harry Peter, 5786A.
Raley, Claude Mason, 5787A.
Carson, William James, 5788A.
Pedersen, Carl Emil, 5789A.
Bowden, William Martin, 5790A.
Toye, Edward Eugene, 5792A.
Jensen, Ralph Soren, 5793A.
Bazan, Edward Theodore, 5794A.
Bradley, Francis Trenholm, 5795A.
Mann, Edward Milton, 5796A.
Miller, Thomas Aldred, 5797A.
Wood, Thomas Donnelly, 5798A.
Kellum, George Glenn, Jr., 5799A.
Goodwin, Vaughn Kirk, 5801A.
Sherborne, Henry Hall, 5803A.
Thompson, Dillard Norman, 5804A.
Spiehl, Robert, 5806A.
Larson, Edwin Cecil, 5808A.
Thiele, Harold Edwin, 5809A.
Riley, Joseph Richmond, 5811A.
Cram, Reginald Maurice, 5812A.
McCracken, Rufus LeRoy, 5813A.
Schweitzer, John Henry, 5814A.
Nyblade, Walter Frederick, 5815A.
Harlow, Paul Norman, 5816A.
Lichter, Carl Jerome, 5817A.
Weaver, Frederick, 5820A.
Westwood, John Raymond, 5821A.
Thomas, Clarence Lamar, 5822A.
Pittman, Bernard Merrill, 5823A.
Foster, Gilbert, 5824A.
Copeland, Lewis Anderson, 5826A.
Horvath, John, 5828A.
Fiss, Robert Wendell, 5829A.
Sullivan, Frederick Edward, 5830A.
Beck, Abe Jack, 5831A.
Minahan, John Carroll, 5832A.
Schudel, Charles Richard, 5833A.
Fowell, Byron Ronald, 5834A.
X Lewis, Samuel Henry, 5835A.
Lyons, Charles Maxwell, 5836A.
Goetzke, Kenneth Herman, 5839A.
Whittle, Frederick James, 5840A.
Pollock, Keith Kermit, 5841A.
Hartbrodt, Frederick Alexander Vincent, 5842A.
Markovich, George Michael, 5843A.
Bottoms, Robert Leland, 5845A.
Walker, Roy Ralph, 5846A.
Purcell, Charles Joseph, 5849A.
Donohue, Elwood Paul, 5852A.
James, Newton Elder, 5854A.
Sawrie, William Ernest, 5855A.
Dinsmore, Dwight Reginald, 5856A.
Vickery, Benjamin Patterson, Jr., 5857A.
Archer, Oneal John Thomas, 5858A.
Behrens, George Herman, 5859A.
Jones, Allen Newton, Jr., 5862A.
Longino, Dick Randolph, Jr., 5864A.
Wilson, Frederick William Hildebrand, 5865A.
Greene, Benjamin Olin, Jr., 5866A.
Query, Jack DeWitt, 5868A.
True, Oscar Harold, 5869A.
Wolf, John Joseph, 5870A.
Perry, Horace Edward, 5871A.
Berger, Kenneth Stephen, 5872A.
X Cowan, Marion Glenn, 5873A.
Urbach, Leonard Henry, 5874A.
Taylor, William Vaughn, 5875A.
Mattison, Robert Martin, 5877A.
Hudson, John Henry, 5878A.
Jordan, Ralph Schaffer, 5879A.
Simmons, Joe Linn, 5880A.
Eichholz, Jerome Charles, 5882A.
Rotkis, Walter Anton, 5883A.
Miller, Walter Frederick, 5885A.
Dalton, Bernard Vincent, 5886A.
Salome, Richard Arlan, 5889A.
Prewitt, Jack Kenneth, 5890A.
Kirkpatrick, Marshall Armine, 5891A.
McCash, Donald Kendall, 5892A.
Stuart, John Montgomery, Jr., 5893A.
Griffin, Harry Norval, 5894A.
Craig, Joe Congdon, 5895A.
Gibson, William Herf, 5896A.
Dalto, John, 5897A.
Voss, Nathaniel Reid, Jr., 5898A.
Summers, Clarence Eugene, Jr., 5899A.
Matthews, Edward Everett, 5901A.
Leet, Jonathan, 5902A.
Youngblood, Curtis Nolan, 5903A.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., 5904A.
Reeves, Ernest Arthur, 5905A.
Manthos, Atlee George, 5906A.
Hennessy, Robert John, 5907A.
Hehrer, Kenneth, 5908A.
Davey, Kenneth William, 5909A.
Brandau, Otto Henry, 5910A.
Hall, Charles Edward, 5911A.
Warren, John Edgar, 5912A.
Carr, Richard Pendleton, 5913A.
Garrett, Skidmore Neale, 5915A.
Mosman, Ormond John, 5916A.
Callaway, Richard Dowdy, 5917A.

Couch, Alexander Pritchard, 5918A.
 Montgomery, Guilford Roland, 5919A.
 McCauley, Clarence Vernon, 5920A.
 Chick, Lewis William, Jr., 5921A.
 Konopacki, Hubert John, 5923A.
 Baker, Ancil David, 5924A.
 Green, Franklyn Thomas, 5925A.
 Pardee, Elliott Thomas, 5926A.
 Olmsted, Charles Thaddeus, 5927A.
 Carmack, John Edgar, 5928A.
 Sturges, Claude C., Jr., 5929A.
 North, Charles Lewis, 5933A.
 Ranck, Nathan Hoover, 5935A.
 Maas, Charles Fundin, 5936A.
 Hollier, Frederick Frank, Jr., 5937A.
 Powell, Joseph Harlee, 5940A.
 Moritz, Gene Phillip, 5941A.
 Thornton, Julian Roy, Jr., 5942A.
 Watts, John Ruben, 5943A.
 Druhe, Hubert Kenneth, 5944A.
 Joseph, Franklin Arthur, 5947A.
 Harrington, George Elliott, 5948A.
 Williams, Leslie Benjamin, 5949A.
 Geanetos, George Stephen, 5950A.
 Moore, John Alton, 5951A.
 Wilson, Charles Smith, 5952A.
 Sansone, Rocco, 5953A.
 Heene, Fred Lewis, 5954A.
 Sulloway, Alexander Mark, 5955A.
 Durham, Benjamin Jasper, Jr., 5957A.
 Stitts, Glenn Theodore, 5958A.
 Helfort, Albert Francis, 5959A.
 Works, Le Eustis, 5960A.
 Payton, Theodore Franklin, 5961A.
 Del Missier, Bruno Carl, 5962A.
 Archuleta, Rubel Vigil, 5963A.
 Taylor, Ben, 5964A.
 Allen, Samuel Lawrence, 5965A.
 Oliver, Robert Russell, 5967A.
 Huston, Sherman Leroy, 5968A.
 Woods, Everett Newton, 5969A.
 Cox, Robert Lewis, 5970A.
 McNally, Joseph Edward, 5971A.
 Hajek, Raymond Rowland, 5973A.
 Gardner, Laurence Ernest, 5974A.
 McGarry, James Michael, Jr., 5976A.
 Smith, Robert Channell, 5978A.
 Tillery, James Hightower, 5979A.
 Gaddis, Albert Crawford, 5980A.
 Edwing, Donald Edwin, 5981A.
 Dice, Evan Adams, 5983A.
 Neely, Russell Wayne, 5984A.
 Bonvicin, Emanuel Frank, 5985A.
 Strom, Charles Walter, 5986A.
 Barrett, John Patrick, 5987A.
 Forrest, Edward Lester, 5988A.
 Allensworth, Hubert Lasater, 5990A.
 Fornal, Joseph John, 5991A.
 Koontz, Thomas Gale, 5992A.
 Rowan, M. C., Jr., 5993A.
 X Hounshell, Claude Eugene, 5994A.
 Smith, Rodney Ellsworth, 5995A.
 Schaffner, William Joseph, 5996A.
 Wilson, John McLain, 5997A.
 Dixon, Brendan, 5998A.
 Beville, Claude, Jr., 5999A.
 Marks, Russell Herbert, 6000A.
 Shepperd, Virgil Earl, 6002A.
 D'Annibale, Vincent James, 6004A.
 Magee, Ernest Maurice, 6006A.
 Langford, Karl Albert, 6007A.
 Darnold, Charles Reese, 6008A.
 Pike, Robert Francis, 6009A.
 Coffey, John Donald, 6010A.
 Tribble, Randolph Louis, 6011A.
 Lind, Harold August, 6012A.
 Shaka, Napoleon Athan, 6013A.
 Tunks, Emerson Ambrose Anthony, 6014A.
 Nichols, Thomas Brooks, 6015A.
 Carney, James Franklin, 18070A.
 Gilmore, John Thomas, 6016A.
 Heran, Paul James, 6018A.
 McGinnis, Paul Benedict, 6019A.
 X Williams, James Willis, 6020A.
 Uhrig, Robert A., 6021A.
 Wildinger, Joseph Valentine, 6022A.
 Watwood, Louis V., 6024A.
 Knowles, Kenyon Leroy, 6025A.
 Grimm, Charles Burton, 6027A.
 Fisher, Philip Fitzgerald, 6028A.

Medical

Hoffman, Archie Arthur, 19222A.
 McDonough, Joseph Francis, 19223A.
 Miller, Hubert Wainright, 19224A.
 Rizzolo, John, 19225A.

Dental

Traynham, Charles Hightower, 18892A.
 Waldmann, Raymond George, 18893A.
 Garrison, Grayson Gwynne, 18894A.

Veterinary

McIntyre, James Clayton, 18893A.

Medical Service

Baer, Reuben Albert, 19428A.
 Miller, Rahe August, 19429A.
 Clark, Robert Emory, 19430.
 Currier, Clyde Charles, 19432A.

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Air Force

Douglas, Robert Emmet, 10572A.
 Shaw, John Blackshire, Jr., 10846A.
 Zick, Marvin Darrell, 10911A.
 X Eddy, Harvey William, 10912A.
 Rudig, James William, 10913A.
 Ashton, Morton Ross, 10914A.
 Benson, August Gerald, 10915A.
 X Latkovich, George, Jr., 10916A.
 X Melendez, Ismael Felix, 10917A.
 Gallogly, William Francis, 10918A.
 Sherman, John Edward, 10921A.
 X Shepperd, William Morris, 10922A.
 Timmons, Durward Earl, 10923A.
 Brady, Bernard John, 10924A.
 Huebner, William Anthony, 10925A.
 X Vance, Zeb, Jr., 10926A.
 Goller, Fred Franquet, 10927A.
 Crawford, John Douglas, Jr., 10928A.
 X Teliczan, Raymond Joseph, 10929A.
 Bearden, Joe, 10930A.
 Bralley, Walter Suvier, 10931A.
 X Gudith, Roy Elmer, 10932A.
 Sells, Orliff Vincent, 10933A.
 Carson, Charles Raymond, 10934A.
 Atkinson, Ivan Charles, 10935A.
 Stow, Kenneth Reeves, 10936A.
 X Smith, Charles Crowe, Jr., 10937A.
 Wisniewski, Stanley Joseph, 10938A.
 Tacker, Lawrence James, 10939A.
 Krier, Rene John, 10940A.
 Dannelly, Frank Porter, 10941A.
 X Thomas, David Bernard, 10942A.
 Werner, Crowell B., 10944A.
 Miller, Emmett Hart, Jr., 10945A.
 Radar, Thomas Owen, 10946A.
 Sowerby, Theo James, 10947A.
 Coakley, Donald Virgil, 10948A.
 X Giddings, Richard Elmer, 10949A.
 X DeGiacomo, Gene Michael, 10950A.
 Dufresne, Roland Joseph, 10951A.
 X VandeBogart, Warren Melendy, 10953A.
 Rollings, Raymond Sydney, 10954A.
 Royce, Ralph Scott, 10955A.
 Lambert, Dwight Arden, 10957A.
 Spears, Byron Polk, 10958A.
 Jensen, Willard Cecililus, 10959A.
 Davis, Paul Allen, 10960A.
 Poe, William Edwin, 10961A.
 Zenty, Edward James, 10962A.
 Friedline, George Jonathan, 10963A.
 Garber, Harold Gregory, 10964A.
 LeGrand, John Joseph, 10965A.
 Donahue, Donald Augustine, 10966A.
 Dent, George Herndon, 10967A.
 X Miller, Clyde George, 10968A.
 Syslo, Benedict Francis, 10970A.
 Matthews, Thurman R., 10971A.
 Harrington, Jasper Jackson, 10972A.
 Mlotkowski, Henry Francis, 10973A.
 X Sullivan, Robert James, 10974A.
 Winham, Lucien Chesley, Jr., 10975A.
 Benoy, Harlan Hults, 10976A.
 X Odom, Felton Harris, 10977A.
 Holden, William John, 10978A.
 Hislop, James Stewart, 10979A.
 X Thomas, Harry Jack, 10980A.
 Lewin, Walter William, 10981A.
 Riddle, Cecil Edward, 10982A.
 Iling, Richard George, 10983A.
 Van Epps, John Siegfus, 10984A.
 Anderson, John Herman, 10986A.

Bradley, Leonidas Cicero, Jr., 10987A.
 Roitsch, Clarence Alfred, 10988A.
 Fleming, David Thomas, 10989A.
 Gawthorp, Paul, 10990A.
 Garrison, Harry Anthony, 10991A.
 Bye, George Ewing, 10992A.
 Ferguson, Roy Eugene, 10993A.
 Secor, Howard J., 10994A.
 X Furbee, Charles Elbert, 10995A.
 X Merritt, Herschel Roscoe, 10998A.
 X Taylor, Daniel James, Jr., 10999A.
 Wilson, Richard Alvin, 11000A.
 Bird, Sidney Albert, Jr., 11001A.
 Roath, William Roderick, 11002A.
 Warden, Ray Sterling, 11003A.
 Yelton, John Fred, 11004A.
 Cavoli, William Joseph, 11005A.
 Cronkhite, John Lyle, 11006A.
 Nichols, John Clark, 11007A.
 Murphy, Thomas Layelle, 11008A.
 Duncan, Cecil Charles, 11009A.
 Simpson, Drewry Narvin, 11011A.
 Caldwell, John James, Jr., 11012A.
 Sheffield, James Russell, 11013A.
 Gladstone, James Tatum, 11014A.
 Smith, Franklin Quick, 11015A.
 Fehrenbacher, Joseph Harold Thomas, 11016A.
 Mann, Linn Embry, 11017A.
 Deakyne, Howard Carl, Jr., 11019A.
 Rees, John Edward, 11021A.
 Britt, Jessie Willard, 11022A.
 Hubbs, Edgar Henry, 11023A.
 Larsen, Marvin Henry, 11024A.
 Turner, Stevens Heyward, 11025A.
 X Johnson, Frank Burtis, 11026A.
 X Schleier, Erich Edwin, Jr., 11027A.
 Hallett, Duane Hartley, 11028A.
 Spencer, William Lewis, 11029A.
 X Moore, Earl Lester, 11030A.
 Oldham, Nile William, Jr., 11031A.
 Briley, Carlus Lindon, 11032A.
 Aitken, John, Jr., 11033A.
 Urban, John Alexander, 11034A.
 Millstefr, Lud James, 11035A.
 Readhimer, Thomas Cecil, 11036A.
 X Kelly, Doran Louis, 11037A.
 Boyer, Max Weldon, 11039A.
 Deitch, Raymond Roland, 11040A.
 Saabye, Herbert John, Jr., 11041A.
 Fields, Lloyd Fondren, 11042A.
 Davis, William Francis, 11043A.
 X Hensley, Harold Storey, Jr., 11044A.
 Abernethy, Robert Joseph, 11045A.
 Brennan, David Thomas, 11046A.
 Plocher, Martin Ernest, 11047A.
 Wockenfuss, Wilbur Eugene, 11048A.
 Arens, Herbert William, 11049A.
 Frost, Foy Benson, 11050A.
 McVicker, Maurice Francis, 11051A.
 Sickels, George Harrington, Jr., 11052A.
 McGill, John Raymond, 11053A.
 Beebout, Vance LeeRoy, 11054A.
 Berman, Harold, 11055A.
 Durston, Glyn, 11056A.
 X Caplan, Aaron Edward, 11057A.
 Lake, Robert Schmidt, 11058A.
 X Hobson, Richard Eugene, 11059A.
 Grant, John Clifford, Jr., 11060A.
 Brandstrom, Alfred Raymond Williams, 11061A.
 Crowder, Noral Farrel, 11062A.
 Hockett, Chester A., 11063A.
 Mack, Ernest Wilmer, 11064A.
 Mapes, Byron Alvin, Jr., 11065A.
 Brazile, Berry Dee, 11067A.
 X Matthews, Allen Randolph, 11068A.
 Oxman, Jaffee Victor, 11069A.
 Correll, Tommy Elbert, 11070A.
 Karhuse, Carl Andrew, 11071A.
 X Plott, Paul Aril, 11072A.
 Scott, Charles Sidney, Jr., 11073A.
 X O'Neil, Donald Edward, 11074A.
 Miller, Joseph Atlee, 11075A.
 Nicholson, Jack, 11076A.
 Cauble, Mark Waverley, Jr., 11077A.
 Marsiglia, Joseph Pasquale, 11078A.
 McMurray, Robert Auburn, 11080A.
 Paap, Donald Herbert, 11081A.
 Cronin, Harold Joseph, 11082A.
 Redman, Frank Owen, 11084A.
 O'Sullivan, Francis Joseph, 11085A.

Byers, Howard Earl, 11086A.
 Crampton, William Cowles, 11087A.
 Pearson, William Paul, 11088A.
 Slade, Alliston, 11089A.
 Dugger, James Ernest, Jr., 11090A.
 × McClendon, Lee, 11091A.
 Reed, Donald Albert, 11092A.
 Lamb, Gordon Douglas, 11093A.
 Speight, John Josh, Jr., 11095A.
 Holmes, Elwin Franklin, 11097A.
 × Bell, Gerald Benjamin, 11098A.
 Stanley, Richard Edward, 11099A.
 Bledsoe, Samuel Black, Jr., 11100A.
 Friedman, Leon Jerome, 11101A.
 Dillon, Francis Joseph, Jr., 11102A.
 Weir, Gordon Thomas, 11105A.
 Stout, Thomas Edward, 11106A.
 × DuBois, William Jay, 11107A.
 Smith, Kenneth A., 11108A.
 McAuley, Walter J., Jr., 11109A.
 Czapski, Edmund, 11110A.
 DeVore, Ralph Nelson, 11111A.
 Ferrari, Joseph Salvatore, 11112A.
 × Hathway, James Ayers, 11113A.
 Hume, Robert Adelbert, 11115A.
 Schwaderer, Willard Eugene, 11116A.
 Cox, Nicholas Henry, 11117A.
 × Manlove, Clifford Thomas, 11118A.
 Whipple, Donald Eugene, 11119A.
 McAuley, Milton Kenneth, 11120A.
 Colchagoff, George Demeter, 11121A.
 Gray, Billy Cooper, 11123A.
 Nelson, Douglas Towle, 11124A.
 × Miller, James Andrew, 11125A.
 Netherton, Clyde Bryant, 11126A.
 Lehman, Hugh Roberts, 11127A.
 Hesterberg, Raymond Chester, 11128A.
 Baker, William Virgil, 11129A.
 Gold, Joe Milton, Jr., 11130A.
 Fross, Horton Lawrence, 11131A.
 Huston, James Leslie, Jr., 11132A.
 Plattner, Milton, 11133A.
 Allison, Eugene, 11135A.
 Cain, James Walter, 11136A.
 Loomer, Perry Douglas, Jr., 11137A.
 × Shimanek, Robert James, 11138A.
 Foss, James Martin, 11139A.
 Gardinier, Russell John, 11140A.
 Mathis, Charles Eugene, 11141A.
 Gisel, Clarence Paul, 11142A.
 Barrett, James Herman, Jr., 11143A.
 Wilson, Billy Baldwin, 11144A.
 Conners, Thomas Aloysius, 11145A.
 Wilemon, Max Walter, 11146A.
 Moffatt, Robert, Jr., 11148A.
 Alba, Michael, 11149A.
 Purdom, Brooks Elbert, 11150A.
 Sealy, Harry Haller, 11151A.
 Millar, Harry Alvin, 11152A.
 Griffin, Ralph Harvey, 11153A.
 Little, Robert Dickinson, 11154A.
 Lynn, Bert Hausmann, Jr., 11155A.
 King, Lester Stanley, 11157A.
 Burwell, John David, 11158A.
 Gunther, Robert William, 11159A.
 Littrell, William Leon, 11160A.
 Remele, Courtney Albert, 11161A.
 × Powell, Clarence Linton, 11162A.
 Libby, William Albert, 11163A.
 Henry, Charles Fogg, 11164A.
 × Smith, William Henry, 11165A.
 × Nixon, Horace Cecil, 11166A.
 Brown, Claude Joseph, 11168A.
 × Wylie, Harold Greever, 11169A.
 × Schultz, Chester Martin, 11170A.
 Donohue, John William, 11171A.
 Simmons, Herbert Walter, 11172A.
 Adams, William Henderson, Jr., 11173A.
 Junker, Jules Xavier, 3d, 11174A.
 Andresen, Malcolm Knapp, 11175A.
 Davis, Robert Emmett, 11177A.
 Mazza, Vincent, 11178A.
 Rich, Robert Stewart, 11179A.
 × Marr, Frederick William, 11180A.
 Sculley, Raymond, 11181A.
 Barker, Glenn Snyder, 11182A.
 × Rea, William Robinson, 11183A.
 Mastropalo, Salvatore, 11184A.
 × Gannon, John Ernest, 11186A.
 Brant, Francis Arthur, 11187A.
 Rainwater, James Allen, 11188A.
 Ostman, Byron Reynold, 11189A.

× Griffin, Ira Lester, 11190A.
 Polio, Nicholas Samuel, 11191A.
 Cox, Luther Christian, 11193A.
 Jones, Garland Maurice, 11194A.
 × Nicholls, Walter Lee, Jr., 11195A.
 North, Charles Anthony, 11196A.
 Skawinski, Theodore Louis, 11197A.
 × Stephens, Sidney Alexander, 11198A.
 Brimberry, Will Olan, 11199A.
 Bilyeu, Hal Errett, 11200A.
 Black, William Howard, 11203A.
 Pennington, Donald Jeffris, 11204A.
 Welti, Conrad Joseph, 11205A.
 Searle, Maurice Ortiz, 11206A.
 Foster, Otis, Jr., 11207A.
 Neal, Robert Jack, 11208A.
 Booth, Clifford Richard, 11209A.
 × Edelen, Carroll Lee, 11210A.
 Hopper, Roy James, 11213A.
 Sullivan, John Willys, 11211A.
 × Jones, Harry Arthur Lawrence, Jr., 11214A.
 Bickerstaff, Curtis Ergil, 11215A.
 Washburn, Jesse Eugene, 11216A.
 Saylor, David Wallie, 11218A.
 Brinegar, Marion Frederick, 11219A.
 Hogan, Floyd Hyer, 11220A.
 Hostler, Gilbert Earl, 11221A.
 Martin, William Albert, 11223A.
 Myrick, Morris Nichols, 11224A.
 Larson, Milo George, 11225A.
 Geck, John James, 11226A.
 Hanlen, Joseph Richard, 11227A.
 Wallace, Arthur Lee, 11228A.
 × Cook, Edwin Jarecki, 11229A.
 Skaggs, Jesse Sparks, Jr., 11230A.
 × Klemme, Meade, 11231A.
 × Campbell, Claude Whitner, 11232A.
 Parkerson, Eugene Campbell, 11233A.
 Beary, Kermit Edwin, 11234A.
 Ryden, Reinhardt August, 11235A.
 Sigler, Kerney Lee, 11236A.
 Bauer, James Earl, 11237A.
 Black, John Lewis, 11238A.
 Staebell, Edward Franklin, 11239A.
 Burgeson, Darell George, 11240A.
 Jarrell, Howard Ray, 11241A.
 Sanford, Raymond Pape, 11242A.
 × Clark, John Max, 11243A.
 Greenwood, Thomas William, Jr., 11244A.
 Hodgson, Charles Willis, 11245A.
 Sieglismund, Robert Wentling, 11246A.
 Binnell, Francis Elwin, 11248A.
 Hancock, Jack Leland, 11249A.
 × Truman, Robert Virgil, 11250A.
 Fowler, John Russell, 11251A.
 Bush, John E., 11253A.
 Davis, James Daniel, 11254A.
 Jones, Jerome Judson, 11255A.
 × Wickman, Robert John, 11256A.
 Ledbetter, Llewellyn Harper, 11257A.
 Crawford, Richard Wallace, 11258A.
 Hollinger, Llewellyn Earl, 11259A.
 Jarvis, Melvin Eugene, 11261A.
 Jones, Fred Guy, 11262A.
 × Berthiaume, Raymond Francis, 11263A.
 Stephens, Glenn Frederick, 11264A.
 × Miller, Samuel Ford, 11265A.
 Smith, William Dulty, Jr., 11266A.
 Brown, Robert Gardiner, 11267A.
 Linebaugh, John Harvey Moore, 11268A.
 Kehoe, Nicholas Bernard, Jr., 11269A.
 Steiner, Irwin Oscar, 11270A.
 Tormos, Jose Ramualdo, 11271A.
 Moore, Floyd William, Jr., 11272A.

Medical

Randel, Hugh Wayne, 19357A.
 Nauert, Nicholas Henry, Jr., 19606A.
 Class, Robert Nelson, 19662A.
 Vivian, Donald Norman, 19988A.
 Condit, Norman Irving, 19956A.
 × Merkle, Robert Woods, 19955A.
 Lutz, Stanley, Jr., 19958A.
 Hammers, Benjamin Nicol, 20006A.

Dental

× Thornberry, Wayne Walter, 18957A.
 Myers, Warren Charles, 18958A.
 Massey, John Thomas, 18959A.
 Herring, Woodward Miley, Jr., 19628A.

Veterinary

Nelson, Robert Kenneth, 19010A.

Medical Service

× Doldge, William Thomas, 19493A.
 Van Horn, Robert Moir, 19494A.
 Rossi, Joseph Patrick, 19498A.
 Hensley, Howard Crawford, Jr., 19495A.
 × Gaines, Robert Lee, 19496A.
 Lord, Douglas Venable, 19497A.
 × Howell, Louis Grady, 19500A.
 × Smith, Stuart Springer, 19502A.
 × Horton, Russell Ervin, 19501A.

Chaplain

× Spellman, Richard Edward, 18801A.
 × Schaefer, Roman Joseph, 18802A.
 × Ressel, Delvin Edgar, 18803A.

Nurse

Hayden, Grace Josephine, 21915W.
 Norred, Annice Elberta, 21928W.
 McKenzie, Margaret Elizabeth, 21933W.
 Berendsen, Dorothy Mildred, 21941W.
 Kriebble, Alice Rosalie, 21956W.
 × Slattery, Lucile Constance, 21965W.
 Jahr, Rhoda U., 20905W.
 × Fintak, Florence Frances, 21983W.
 Montgomery, Alice Lorena, 20980W.
 Young, Eunice Florence, 20929W.
 Smith, Mildred Elizabeth, 20934W.
 Fill, Wanda Irene, 21096W.
 Kelly, Evelyn Aleda, 20950W.
 × Deason, Bernice Y., 20951W.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Air Force

Mahoney, Daniel Crowley, 23006A.
 Marsh, Wesley Chandler, Jr., 23007A.
 Faulkner, Norman Albert, 23008A.
 Bryan, James Thomas, 23009A.
 × Ouder, Melvin Lonny, 23010A.
 × White, Thomas Leonidas, 25607A.
 × Burks, Thomas Wilson, 24266A.
 × Fahrney, John William, 25608A.
 Yoder, Keith Jay, 25609A.
 × Sloop, Everett Eugene, 25610A.
 Forrest, Stephen Mitchell, 26673A.
 Pearson, Carl Russell, 21796A.
 Chew, John Cottle, 25611A.
 Kelly, William Joseph, 23183A.
 Rankin, John Maynard, 21801A.
 × Burton, Charles Rhoades, 23184A.
 × Burckle, Alton George, Jr., 24267A.
 × Crawford, William Arthur, Jr., 21797A.
 × Haggard, Richard Lowell, 17725A.
 × Olivera-Barroso, Manuel, 17744A.
 Rotstan, Robert, 17723A.
 Blount, Buford Charles, 17699A.
 Kane, Richard Weidner, 17711A.
 × Eckmann, Frederick Charles, 17718A.
 × Watkins, Marvin Maurice, 17742A.
 × Moir, James Ferriss, 17712A.
 × Clements, Ben Hill, Jr., 17733A.
 Bleber, Robert Warren, 17739A.
 × Brennan, Joseph Xavier, 17728A.
 Montgomery, Bill Alexander, 17705A.
 Mullan, Alfred William, Jr., 17709A.
 Scroggin, Orville Oliver, 3d, 17738A.
 × Horn, Robert Paul, 17743A.
 × Brumm, Robert Ellsworth, 17717A.
 Titus, Frank Alvin, 17741A.
 × Meredith, Jim Tom, 17706A.
 Springer, Paul Richard, 17715A.
 McCleary, George Carlton, 1775A.
 × Potter, Edward Mac, Jr., 17716A.
 Thompson, George Willard, 17726A.
 Burns, Robert Bernard, 17727A.
 Escue, Walter Harbin, 17702A.
 × Boyle, William Frederick, 17729A.
 × Thomas, Alan Brainerd, 17721A.
 × Rea, Thomas Samuel, 17707A.
 × Allison, Thomas L., 17713A.
 × Son, Herman Franklin, 17734A.
 × Neville, Harry Walter, 17704A.
 × Boone, Warren Wallace, 17708A.
 Trammell, Andrew Jack, 17720A.
 Moore, Winston Eugene, 17722A.
 Ahrens, George Leo, 17732A.
 Boswell, Marion Lillard, 17719A.
 Anderson, Hunter Wilson, 17737A.
 Baker, Wilson Kirby, Jr., 17740A.
 × Schwaller, Charles Dale, 17731A.
 × Riley, Eldon Stanley, 17703A.
 × Schwaner, Charles Fred, 17714A.

- Smith, Clark Bridgland, 17730A.
 X Pettitt, Bert Edward, Jr., 17698A.
 Kent, Joseph Francis, Jr., 17724A.
 Hink, Harry Devere, 17710A.
 X Chapman, John Monroe, Jr., 17700A.
 Winner, Donald Carlton, 17973A.
 Smith, Mart Gary, Jr., 17976A.
 X Phillips, Lowell Gene, 18050A.
 X Hawes, Warren Harding, 18160A.
 Stone, James Samuel, 18247A.
 X Theus, Lucius, 18270A.
 Snyder, George Francis, 18153A.
 X Brisley, Bernard Anthony, 18265A.
 Weeks, Roy Franklyn, Jr., 18189A.
 Schmidt, George Robert, 18202A.
 X Perry, Roland Archibald, 18231A.
 X Lineham, Thomas Uriah, Jr., 18112A.
 Gray, Donald Underwood, Jr., 18223A.
 Kar, Edward George, 18252A.
 X Van Bloom, Jay Clark, 18147A.
 X Violet, Leonard, 18174A.
 Smith, Bennie Cozena, 18141A.
 X Hicks, Malcolm Glenn, 18185A.
 X Wilborn, William Thomas, 18194A.
 X Schuering, Alvin George, 18166A.
 X Malloy, William James, 18197A.
 X Green, Norman Morgan, 18237A.
 Spencer, Loren James, 18255A.
 X Pierce, Russell Kurtz, Jr., 18118A.
 X Talbot, George Edward, 18126A.
 X Sanna, Francis Patsy, 18148A.
 Urquhart, Roland Leslie, Jr., 18162A.
 X Kester, Clifford Daniel, 18163A.
 X Miller, John William, 18198A.
 Lauterbach, Harris Young, 18256A.
 Hinerman, Maurice Elwyn, 18218A.
 X Crowther, Frederick Earl, 18221A.
 Raphun, Leland Richards, 18130A.
 X Hurlburt, Dana Follett, 18119A.
 X Peters, Francis David, Jr., 18137A.
 Humphries, Buford Milton, 18175A.
 Randall, Richard Clary, 18212A.
 X Bostick, Arthur Worth, 18239A.
 Locklear, James Quinton, 18133A.
 X Mandina, Sidney Reginald I., 18125A.
 X Traylor, Horace Cleveland, Jr., 18165A.
 Goppert, Jean Glen, 18167A.
 X Jones, Richard Ernest, 18170A.
 X DuMontier, Louis Devine, 18171A.
 X Hansen, Robert Paul, 18159A.
 Adams, Gordon Sackett, 18186A.
 X Phillips, Thomas Roland, Jr., 18266A.
 Morton, Walter Pinckney, Jr., 18129A.
 X Alexander, Ernest Lee, 18143A.
 X Doe, Irving Chester, 18155A.
 X Gourley, Edwin Parker, 18181A.
 Crowley, John McBride, 18217A.
 Foote, Richard Harold, 18219A.
 X Johanson, Alvin Lars Anton, 18248A.
 Kennedy, Dean Lewis, 18235A.
 Griffard, Robert Marcel, 18264A.
 X Peterson, Harry William, 18275A.
 X Lubert, Vernon Norton, 18127A.
 X Merino, Robert Francis, 18224A.
 X Moehle, Charles Fred, 18131A.
 X Gilpin, Harry Duncan, 18124A.
 X Bray, Leslie William, Jr., 18136A.
 X Shewan, Clifford Wayne, 18150A.
 X Werber, William Alexander, 18178A.
 X Eberhardt, Donald Elwin, 18182A.
 X Byrn, John Stanford, 18196A.
 X Gregory, Willie Preston, 18236A.
 Kirschman, Ivan Paul, 18258A.
 X Moore, Jack Kenneth, 18135A.
 Anderson, George Olaf, 18184A.
 X Houghtby, James Kenneth, 18240A.
 Rutherford, Richard Thomas, 18134A.
 X Mills, Arthur Julius, 18180A.
 X Curry, Ralph Jack, 18245A.
 X Bennett, George Alfred, 18154A.
 X Kenyon, Benjamin Clarence, Jr., 18215A.
 X Hochstetler, George Edward, 18216A.
 X Howes, Lewis Langdon, 18220A.
 Newton, Frederick Carter, 18228A.
 X Hutchinson, Paul Eugene, 18158A.
 Lopez, Donald Sewell, 18164A.
 Schoeffler, Clifford, 18179A.
 Hanigan, Edward James, Jr., 18222A.
 X Pendergraft, Wesley Lael, 18242A.
 X Rementer, William John, 18250A.
 Cook, William, Jr., 18257A.
 Donegan, Charles Edward, 18283A.
 Taylor, Charles Kersey, Jr., 18113A.
 X Light, Herbert Myron, Jr., 18128A.
 X Eubank, Graydon Knox, 18132A.
 X Reuteler, Bruce Ervin, 18168A.
 X Barter, John Wallace, 18208A.
 X Baumann, Robert Price, Jr., 18203A.
 McCully, Robert Humes, 18274A.
 X Wolfe, Charles Spurgeon, 18176A.
 X Rosenberg, Leslie Benjamin, 18210A.
 Brinson, William Leslie, 18117A.
 X Mertely, Frank, 18201A.
 Beno, William George, 18205A.
 X Borders, Charles Wesley, 18149A.
 X Hamilton, Calvin Lee, 18139A.
 Paige, Carl Addison, 18241A.
 X Jones, Donald Alfred, 18157A.
 X Little, David Lee, 18253A.
 X Melton, Carl Mudgett, 18190A.
 X Payant, Peter, 18232A.
 Stephenson, Wayne Louis, 18238A.
 Williams, James Coleman, 18261A.
 X Long, Robert Francis, 18142A.
 X Reeder, William Dean, 18161A.
 Melvin, Robert Elwood, 18193A.
 X Lloyd, Glenn Howard, 18226A.
 Baldwin, Richard Allen, 18262A.
 X Burkhardt, James Murrell, 18230A.
 X Fahrney, Richard Lee, 18191A.
 Ristau, Siegfried Edward, 18169A.
 X Wilson, Elbert, Jr., 18263A.
 Martin, Eugene, Jr., 18233A.
 Beisner, Gerald Jean, 18251A.
 Eagle, Comly Joel, 18115A.
 Nanney, James Thomas, 18177A.
 Davis, Bruce, 18120A.
 Hanton, John Thomas, 18138A.
 X Johnson, Clarence LaVerne, 18213A.
 X Hall, Benny Bob, 18272A.
 X Schmidt, Howard Richard, 18123A.
 X Avise, Herbert Jack, 18114A.
 Bell, Robert Malcolm, 18145A.
 Selbie, Frederic Donald, Jr., 18225A.
 Penick, Everett Smith, Jr., 18234A.
 X Doran, Patrick Leo, 18207A.
 X McNeil, Edwin Evan, 18192A.
 X Cooper, Dewey Glenn, 18260A.
 X Sinnett, Jefferson David, 19269A.
 X Elizey, J. Murray, 18204A.
 X Ayres, Frank Lawrence, 18173A.
 Hurst, Guy, Jr., 18243A.
 Reisner, Horace Jackson, 18271A.
 X Hoffman, Charles Addison, Jr., 18244A.
 Marshall, Sidney Currier, 18206A.
 Preller, Gordon Charles, 18144A.
 X Wilson, Richard Stanley, 18121A.
 X Simpson, Russell Reavely, 19565A.
 X Stevens, Wendelle Castyle, 18195A.
 X Kenyon, Donald Edward, 18268A.
 X Bohannon, James Raymond, Jr., 18146A.
 X Collins, Perry Belmont, 18156A.
 Jones, David Boone, 18183A.
 X Peters, Warren Edmund, 18276A.
 X McMinis, Jonathan Burns, 18249A.
 Moore, Richard Raymond, 19795A.
 Farnsworth, Al W., 18229A.
 X Raley, Theodore Maxwell, 18200A.
 Williams, Lawrence, 18152A.
 X Yeager, Paul Meryald, 18116A.
 X Niemczyk, Julian Martin, 20671A.
 X Baker, Marshall Erbie, 20675A.
 X Adcock, James Kenneth, 20589A.
 X Suttie, James, 20646A.
 X Sandvig, Kenneth Leslie, 20595A.
 X Warner, Walter Eugene, 20610A.
 X McKay, Allen Fraser, 20613A.
 Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.
 X Gruber, Kenneth Willis, 20623A.
 X Ecklund, Eugene, 20600A.
 X Craig, Robert Peter, 20649A.
 X Collington, Frederick, 20663A.
 X Fowler, Oscar Frank, 20583A.
 Brown, Jack Riley, 20599A.
 Dotson, Herbert Forrest, Jr., 20587A.
 Bobbitt, Aubrey Malcolm, 20644A.
 Holt, Garland Edward, 20607A.
 X DeGennaro, Carlo Nicola, 20570A.
 Herrera, Alfred Charles, 20608A.
 Moore, James Conway, Jr., 20664A.
 X Jensen, Lloyd Kenneth, 20624A.
 Henry, Mervin Lester, 20604A.
 Elliott, Donald Ancil, 20636A.
 X Cummings, James Dirickson, Jr., 20618A.
 Singer, Solomon Elias, 20666A.
 X Barry, Russell John, 20656A.
 X McGowan, Samuel Benjamin, 20572A.
 X Glines, Carroll Vane, Jr., 20579A.
 X Jewell, Malcolm Eugene, 20588A.
 X Stroff, Michael John, Jr., 20648A.
 Long, Paul Henry, 20635A.
 X Haynes, Clarence Gilbert, 20653A.
 X Melucas, Paul Joseph, 20640A.
 Perry, James Wallace, 20673A.
 Doiron, Claude Joseph, Jr., 20596A.
 X Rath, Leland John, 20620A.
 X Williams, Wilson Byron, 20668A.
 Barns, William Frederick, 20630A.
 X Spiro, Bernard, 20627A.
 McAnally, Paul Edward, 20581A.
 Jones, William Monroe, 20641A.
 Burnett, Elvin Earl, 20601A.
 X Sharp, Stuart Mayer, 20629A.
 Hall, Harvey Preston, 20674A.
 Busha, George Francis, 20628A.
 Anderson, Charles Keller, 20616A.
 Ernst, William Joseph, 20609A.
 X Clifton, Leecroy, 20650A.
 Hill, Marcus Lee, Jr., 20622A.
 X Myers, Andrew Jackson, Jr., 20769A.
 X Bush, Frederick Eugene, 20643A.
 X Monaco, Anthony William, Jr., 20605A.
 X Vincent, Robert Wilson, 20575A.
 Prager, John William, 20586A.
 X Urquhart, Charles Thomas, Jr., 20584A.
 X Greene, Sidney, 20658A.
 X Woolf, Simpson Molen, 20569A.
 Johnson, George Alvin, 20672A.
 X Vogler, Alfred Fritz, 20670A.
 X Miller, Edgar Cornelius, 20614A.
 X Loman, William Thomas, Jr., 20669A.
 X Sever, James Edward, 20592A.
 X Magill, Francis William, 20652A.
 McGaughey, Donald Keith, 20662A.
 Maher, Thomas Joseph, 20655A.
 Price, Robert Harold, 20571A.
 X Jensen, Sigurd Lars, Jr., 20651A.
 X Slade, William Arthur, 20573A.
 Staples, Johnstone Raleigh, 20578A.
 Canning, Douglas Strickland, 20577A.
 X Welsh, Stephen Jackson, 20634A.
 X Saylor, Warren Daniel, 20637A.
 X Wendt, Willard Arthur, 20625A.
 X Radcliffe, John Bilton, 20667A.
 Montgomery, Joe Shelton, 20633A.
 X Nole, Jack Dean, 20598A.
 X Gaertner, Adolph, Jr., 20603A.
 X Taylor, Joseph Thomas, 20611A.
 Bass, Robert Allan, 20632A.
 X Kohrman, Elwood Netherton, 20602A.
 Lockhart, George Andrew, Jr., 20594A.
 X Lawson, Francis Robert, 20606A.
 X Lunos, Austin Edward, 20645A.
 Stewart, Walter Claiborne, Jr., 20639A.
 X Pedersen, Stanley Cartwright, 20617A.
 X Sturm, Wilmer Ross, 20676A.
 Scarpero, William John, 20677A.
 X Taylor, Jay Johnson, 20580A.
 X Rogers, Dan Terrance, 20665A.
 Orillion, Arthur Joseph, Jr., 20593A.
 Crosby, Samuel Eugene, Jr., 20612A.
 X Brownfield, Paul Wehrle, 20597A.
 X Littlewood, Theodore Peterson, 20642A.
 Farr, John Wesley, 20660A.
 X Shawhan, Zac George, 20576A.
 X Cooney, Jack Bernard, 20657A.
 Newgarden, George Joseph, 3d, 20591A.
 Yusievicz, John Joseph, 20582A.
 White, Boyd Barnard, 20626A.
 X Sheperd, Olen Dean, 20619A.
 Fraser, Paul Victor, 20654A.
 X Smith, J. B., 20638A.
 X King, Edwin Vernon, 20585A.
 X Gallagher, Rial Frederick, 20621A.
 Gentzler, Robert Francis, 20678A.
 X Spencer, Jack, 20661A.
 Blanton, Franklin Dickinson, 21458A.
 X Kelly, James Wyatt, 21462A.
 X Cude, Willis Augustus, Jr., 21463A.
 Aust, Abner Maurice, Jr., 20631A.
 Henry, David Watters, Jr., 20590A.
 X Miller, Sidney Harry, 21459A.

- Tony, Nicholas, 21464A.
 X Shusta, Chester Joseph, 21461A.
 Kemerling, William Earl, 21460A.
 Lewis, Oliver Wendell, 18227A.
 X Frazier, Max Eugene, 21456A.
 Hubbard, George Maurice, 21457A.
 X O'Donnell, William Joseph, 20574A.
 Vollmer, Charles David, 22630A.
 X Pulling, Barton Sebring, 22569A.
 Wood, Thomas Burke, 22686A.
 Solomon, William George, 22627A.
 Clay, Richard Laurence, 22647A.
 Hagemann, Joseph Anthony, 22657A.
 Hopkins, Robert Webster, 22660A.
 X Miller, Orville Eugene, 22629A.
 X Maxwell, Oren Vinson, 22637A.
 X Gailer, Frank Lewis, Jr., 22592A.
 X Kipping, Joseph Harding, 22582A.
 X Doom, Richard Clinton, 22579A.
 Harding, Warren Wilson, 22685A.
 Key, Oran Richard, Jr., 22589A.
 X Gonge, John Foster, 22600A.
 X Mills, Clarence Howard, 22650A.
 X Smoak, Andrew Washington, 22652A.
 X Paul, Charles Timothy Arthur, 22622A.
 X Kalin, Byron Roger, 22626A.
 X Taylor, Jimmie, 22572A.
 X Christensen, Keith La Var, 22639A.
 X Bledsoe, Carroll Harris, 22682A.
 X Parman, Henry Oland, Jr., 22697A.
 X Dill, Glenn Estes, Jr., 22615A.
 Copher, Paul D., 22619A.
 X Feagin, Luther Wesley, 22687A.
 X Phillips, William Charles, 22689A.
 Watkins, Audrey Harold, 22663A.
 Babb, James Walton, 22606A.
 X Deffebach, Harry Wolsey, 22604A.
 X Bush, Russell Lloyd, 22654A.
 X Coletti, Victor Philip, 22609A.
 Gulinson, Joseph Louis, 22671A.
 X Porter, Fletcher Schley, 22672A.
 X Kells, Walter Anthony, 22599A.
 X Edgar, William Robert, 22665A.
 X Cook, Archie Lanier, 22695A.
 X Ames, Douglas Melbourne, 22584A.
 X Warren, Joseph Baker, 22586A.
 Roberson, Harvey B., 22587A.
 Loughnan, Victor James, 22573A.
 X Abraham, Bruce Howard, Jr., 22591A.
 X Myers, George Boyd, 22621A.
 Owens, Charles Durwood, 22610A.
 X Lykins, David William, 22635A.
 X Petkus, Walter Adam, 22613A.
 X Gillespie, Keith Lamar, 22576A.
 X West, Fielding Franklin, 22614A.
 Clark, Kenneth Bemis, 22625A.
 Abendhoff, Gerhard Robert, 22628A.
 Elliott, Frank Worth, Jr., 22664A.
 Wilson, Richard Carroll, 22588A.
 Williamson, Willie George, 22692A.
 Grace, Harold Wayne, Jr., 22694A.
 LaLonde, Robert Frederick, 22703A.
 Van Hoy, Leslie Bryant, 22645A.
 Rolfe, Wilson, 22670A.
 Davies, Joseph Potter, Jr., 22702A.
 X Callahan, John Gregory, 22700A.
 Mitchell, Collins Parks, 22570A.
 Ezell, William Otis, 22649A.
 Johnson, Fon Edwin, 22598A.
 X Stewart, Douglas Donald, 22680A.
 X McDonnell, Robert Henry, 22696A.
 X Bridges, John Lunsford, 22643A.
 X Derrick, Irvin Hendrix, 22605A.
 X Walding, William Harvey, 22611A.
 Neal, Arthur Mehard, 22617A.
 Wood, William Amos, 22595A.
 X Johnson, Robert Colman, 22648A.
 X Cotellesse, Peter, 22699A.
 McDonald, William Tommy, 22673A.
 X Rood, Eric Westburg, 22620A.
 X Hansen, Leroy Blaine, 22578A.
 Burnham, Weibon De Kalb, 22640A.
 X Rodewald, Warren August, 22679A.
 Davidson, B. H., 22575A.
 X Fish, Bruce Baker, 22623A.
 X McDermott, Chauncey Lereign, 22633A.
 X McAllister, Floyd Melvin, 22636A.
 X Vilson, William Walter, 22571A.
 X Jones, Robert Lee, 22693A.
 Smith, Lloyd Dixon, 22585A.
 Daniel, Harlan Frederick, 22580A.
 Lunsford, George Mortimer, 22646A.
 X Page, Waldo Mark, 22602A.
 Johnson, Arthur Hiram, 22684A.
 Steves, Walter Thomas, 22581A.
 Thomchak, Howard Michael, 22601A.
 Penley, Relf Albert, 22608A.
 Hanna, Keith Chance, 22642A.
 X Horey, Raymond Stephen, 22593A.
 X Alden, William Ames, 22658A.
 Bartholomew, Gabriel Peter, 22659A.
 X Morgan, D. P., Jr., 22688A.
 Burriss, Richard Clark, 22641A.
 X Clisham, Winston Harold, 22618A.
 X Marshall, Gerald Roy, 22596A.
 X Herrewig, Alvin Paul, 22634A.
 X McDonnell, James Godfrey, 22705A.
 X Cummins, Harry Timothy, Jr., 22594A.
 X Silliman, James Gordon, 22644A.
 Hubbard, Thomas Parker, 22590A.
 X Kovach, Michael Martin, 22683A.
 X Brunson, Lloyd Earl, 22669A.
 X Saxton, David William, 22674A.
 Davis, Charley Lee, 22701A.
 X McKone, Joseph Francis, 22666A.
 X Kohl, Don Resseguie, 22655A.
 Braeunig, Ewald Christian, 22597A.
 Laferty, William Anderson, Jr., 22667A.
 X Findlay, Ralph Farner, 22631A.
 X Welsh, William Florence, 22676A.
 Lien, Arthur Marvin, 22574A.
 Muldoon, James Edward, Jr., 22651A.
 Burgess, John Raymond, 22698A.
 Murphy, William John, Jr., 22681A.
 X Smith, Richard Willis, 22583A.
 X Grovert, Robert Eugene, 22577A.
 Roberts, Howard Grey, 22603A.
 X Tremblay, Armand Laval, 22624A.
 White, Raymond Eldon, 22661A.
 X Butz, John Louis, 22678A.
 Adams, Charles J., 22656A.
 X Williams, Morris Franklin, 22632A.
 X Eckman, Robert Lee, Jr., 22638A.
 X Kinkead, Joseph Clyde, 22677A.
 X Stewart, James Lenze, 22691A.
 X Gillingham, Rowley Ems, 22616A.
 X Anderson, George Robert, 22653A.
 X Miller, Myron Dale, 22708A.
 Rymer, Frank Pierce, Jr., 22689A.
 Cecil, Thomas, Jr., 22654A.
 Farnum, Mark, Jr., 22667A.
 Blake, Thomas Alfred, 22698A.
 X Vohs, Lester John, 22670A.
 Marshall, Richard William, 22705A.
 Ramsdell, George Raymond, 22661A.
 X Smith, William Harrison, Jr., 22685A.
 Shimonkevitz, William Francis, 22711A.
 Noziglia, Robert Everett, 22675A.
 Murray, John Edward, 22656A.
 X Smith, Edward Frank, 22674A.
 Russell, Charles Clark, 22660A.
 X Dunn, Buel Albert, 22701A.
 Clowry, John Patrick, 22687A.
 Fish, Howard Math, 22704A.
 X McAllister, Warren William, 22672A.
 Statum, Glen Wade, 22668A.
 X Hoban, Richard Matthew, 22658A.
 X Keller, Floyd Eugene, 22712A.
 Wilson, Donald L., 22662A.
 Nestle, Roger William, 22669A.
 X Foust, William Lee, 22690A.
 Sims, William McNaire, Jr., 22680A.
 X Francis, Philip Bruce, 22663A.
 Cahill, Joseph Eugene, 22713A.
 Scherler, Arnold Eduard, Jr., 22697A.
 X Gates, Talbert Mark, 22688A.
 Weyhrich, Melvin Peter, 22700A.
 X Kougias, George Christopher, 22682A.
 X Fromm, Robert Arthur, 22679A.
 X Kuhlmann, Duane Arthur, 22702A.
 Light, Delbert John, 22692A.
 Poladian, Robert, 22695A.
 Minow, James Wallace, 22651A.
 Lyndes, Harry Everett, Jr., 22706A.
 Lincoln, Brian Jerome, 22703A.
 Segura, Wiltz Paul, 22681A.
 X Page, Donald Grey, 22683A.
 Smith, Edgar Harrison, 22684A.
 Boyd, Henry LeRoy, 22652A.
 X Whitley, Albert Grant, 22707A.
 Caylor, William Robert, 22665A.
 X Piercy, Jeff Johnston, 22677A.
 Christie, Robert Lee, 22710A.
 Blake, John Edward, 22671A.
 X Hardcastle, Frank Lockwood, 22693A.
 X Ziegler, John Christopher, 22657A.
 Shelton, William Ernest, 22659A.
 First, David Frederick, 22664A.
 Teel, Wilford Lamar, 22691A.
 Culbertson, Leon Gail, 22696A.
 X Heller, Emerson Earl, 22678A.
 X Wilson, Ernest Riley, 22694A.
 Pohl, Nelson Otto, 22709A.
 Chamberlain, Clarence Newton, Jr., 22686A.
 X Stoneberger, Harold William, 22699A.
 Naylor, Harold Linkey, 22676A.
 X Woody, Rufus, Jr., 22655A.
 X Perry, William Edward, Jr., 22673A.
 Alger, Robert Allaire, 22666A.
 X Macauley, Bill Thomas, 22332A.
 Haigler, Claude Sweringer, 22308A.
 Watson, Albert Thomas, Jr., 22337A.
 Harris, Elsey, Jr., 22309A.
 X Samuelson, Dale Leroy, 22310A.
 X Pine, Forrest Stanley, 22323A.
 Hall, Roland Paige, 22342A.
 Johnson, George Albert, 22341A.
 Peterson, Howard Warren, 22307A.
 X Phillips, Wendell, 22322A.
 X Sullivan, William Joseph, 22334A.
 X Syphers, Victor Kendrick, 22316A.
 Pacharzina, Carl Alvin, Jr., 22311A.
 X Johnson, Wendell Andrew, 22333A.
 Allard, Lionel Charles, Jr., 22331A.
 Morris, Jack Bret, 22326A.
 Wiley, Robert Bernard, 22338A.
 Schmidt, David Julius, 22320A.
 Christopher, Frederick Lenwood, 22315A.
 Krynovich, George, 22313A.
 Edwards, Lloyd Carol, Jr., 22314A.
 X Jenkins, Willard Dolphas, 22344A.
 X Egender, Herbert Franklin, 22317A.
 X Malone, Paul Edward, 22329A.
 Hill, James Arthur, 22324A.
 Stapleton, Leroy Earl, 22343A.
 Booton, Glen Eugene, 22335A.
 X Kuhn, Joseph Anthony, 22321A.
 X Shepard, Van Huber, 22339A.
 X King, Stephen Joseph, 22330A.
 Baisden, Orville Ray, 22336A.
 X Riordan, Daniel Williams, 22327A.
 X O'Hara, David Bailey, 22319A.
 X Cavalli, George August, 22340A.
 Reed, Charles Shelby, 22328A.
 X Becker, Robert Herbert, 22318A.
 Audick, Albert Eugene, 22345A.
 X Hector, Arnold Ernest, 22325A.
 Leech, Richard Gerald, 22312A.
 X Bodinger, Norman Barron, 22315A.
 X Kirby, Elwin Glenn, 22314A.
 Stevens, Jack Duane, 20679A.
 X Gasaway, Nicholas Edwin, 21798A.
 French, Fay Eugene, 22316A.
 X Slover, Julius Elwood, 22012A.
 DuFault, William Francis, 20680A.
 X Botte, David Anthony, 21799A.
 Steele, William Nicholas, 22707A.
 Prager, Arthur, 20681A.
 X Winfree, Douglas Woodson, Jr., 18278A.
 X Salyards, John Albert, Jr., 18279A.
 X Wheeler, James Isaac, 22717A.
 X Vega, John William, 18280A.
 X Clark, Earl Otis, Jr., 20682A.
 Bocken, Richard Charles, 25612A.
 X Torvestad, Robert James, 24268A.
 X Fishel, Martin David, 24698A.
 White, Lee Wayne, 24696A.
 Mulvey, Gordon Ernest, 24697A.
 Albright, John Scott, 24703A.
 X Bennett, Henry Wayne, 24695A.
 X Goynes, Carroll Heard, Jr., 24728A.
 Keutman, Charles Henry, 24699A.
 X Johnson, Robert Manon, 24706A.
 Farrar, Aubrey O'Neal, 24702A.
 Mason, Wendell Leon, 24708A.
 Brush, Donald John, 24700A.
 X Post, Gerald Joseph, 24707A.
 Crisman, Marcus Blair, Jr., 24704A.
 X Shannon, William Earl, 21802A.
 X Pace, Robert Eugene, 22710A.
 X Gleaves, Donald Heavner, 18282A.
 X Thorn, James Read, 25613A.
 Matte, Joseph Zannet, 20615A.

× Jackson, Charles Wilbur, 18284A.
 Williams, Donald Alan, 26674A.
 × Gardner, Edith Rose, 26675W.
 Rigsby, Cecil Harding, 18285A.
 Smith, Norman Stanley, 24346A.
 Bernard, Duane Richard, 25615A.
 × Moberley, Ralph Herbert, Jr., 25614A.
 × Consta, Arthur Leo, 23718A.
 Hament, Carrol, 20045A.
 League, Miles Richard, 18286A.
 × Tanner, Theodore John, 18287A.
 × Schleuss, Louis Frederick, 23719A.
 Gross, Kenneth Eugene, 18289A.
 × Pulley, John Hubert, Jr., 18288A.
 Edwards, Robert Frederick, 22711A.
 × Werbeck, Donald Louis, 18290A.
 Terrell, Harry Evans, Jr., 18291A.
 × Snyder, Orrin William, 3d, 22712A.
 × Pattillo, Charles Curtis, 23720A.
 × Buchanan, Robert Sylvester, 18292A.
 × Sharp, David Martin, 18293A.
 × Shiver, Morris Eugene, 18294A.
 × Smith, Gayle LeRoy, 20683A.
 Jashinski, Victor Harry, 24709A.
 × Ferrato, Theodore Peter, 22713A.
 Thompson, Lawrence A., Jr., 18295A.
 × Peters, Earl William, 20684A.
 Rothery, William James, Jr., 23721A.
 × Walter, Harvey Peter, 18296A.
 Bialock, Woodrow Wilson, 18297A.
 Toothman, Byron Rimbey, 20686A.
 × McQuown, John Ragan, 23722A.
 Jordan, Vincent Anthony, 26676A.
 Lockridge, Clarence Reynolds, 18298A.
 Sexton, Roy Denver, 26677A.
 × Hilton, Garland Bruce, Jr., 23723A.
 × Kasten, Nelson, 22714A.
 Stevens, Robert Merrill, 23724A.
 Thorne, John Francis, Jr., 24347A.
 × Reichart, Stuart Richard, 24269A.
 Galpin, Harry Tower, 24348A.
 × Trommershauser, John, 18300A.
 × Jenks, Harford Perry, 18299A.
 May, Edward Stanley, 18301A.
 × Pattillo, Cuthbert Augustus, 22715A.
 × Braddock, James Edward, 24349A.
 Snyder, John Thomas, 18302A.
 × Reid, Addison Taylor, 18303A.
 Tannenbaum, Leon Marvin, 20687A.
 × Schwab, Jack Clifford, 22716A.
 Palmer, William Joseph, 18304A.
 × Gehri, Donald Harry, 22717A.
 × Lewis, William Henry, 23725A.

Medical

× Snedden, Hal Edward, 23123A.
 Koehn, Robert Cecil, Jr., 25732A.

Dental

Turner, James Allen, 26321A.
 × Hagen, Sidney Allen, 23178A.

Veterinary

Grau, William Henry, Jr., 23073A.
 Greer, Russell Flagg, 21867A.
 Davis, Harold Clayton, 23075A.
 Bilderback, William Riley, 23216A.
 Douglas, Jack Donnalee, 25331A.
 Garner, Howard Scott, 25669A.
 Harris, Milford Douglas, Jr., 25670A.
 × Ringley, Donald William, 24225A.
 × Griffin, Thomas Ponton, 23217A.
 × Barnes, Charles Miller, 23218A.
 Benson, Richard Earl, 24226A.
 × Reeves, Johnnie Lee, 23220A.
 Clayton, Frederick Ware, 23219A.
 × Moe, Douglas Ford, 26645A.
 Barron, Charlie Nelms, 25671A.
 × Young, Robert Joiner, 24227A.
 × Nold, Max Marcell, 23597A.
 × McGown, Murlin Lee, 23598A.
 Howells, William Veatch, 25672A.
 × Crandell, Robert Allen, 24229A.
 × Bailey, Robert William, 24231A.
 × Houk, Donald Clement, 24228A.
 × Phelps, Gene Collins, 24230A.
 × Terry, John Leary, Jr., 24232A.

Medical Service

× Herrin, Daniel Monroe, Jr., 21620A.
 × Little, Herman Ivy, 21616A.

× Holihan, Francis Leonard, 21607A.
 Ruffing, Donald Joseph, 21621A.
 × Schult, Harold George, 21617A.
 Johnson, John Alfred, 21611A.
 Beck, William Stanislaus, 21612A.
 × Cook, Raymond John, 21610A.
 Nicely, Harry Benson, Jr., 21622A.
 × Zellers, Billy Bob, 21614A.
 × Marolf, Kenneth Lloyd, 21613A.
 Winkelblech, Donald Ray, 21624A.
 × Woolf, Henry McCune, 21615A.
 Garner, Walter Frank, 21609A.
 × Allinson, John Nils, 21626A.
 × Whitt, Orbin Russell, 21625A.
 × Weller, William Edgar, 21618A.
 Rofitis, Robert Jesse, 21623A.
 × Smyth, Kenneth Eugene, 21619A.
 Werderman, Charles John, 21872A.
 Connolly, Owen Francis, 21668A.
 × Foley, Frank Robertson, 21870A.
 × Saul, Lee Irvin, 21871A.
 × Kimball, Lorenzo Kent, 21869A.
 × Tayloe, Leon Thomas, 23076A.
 × Swimmer, Adolph Harold, 24233A.
 × Lubrant, Anthony John, 21627A.

Chaplain

Graeber, Joseph Marlin, 23210A.
 Denehy, John Francis, 24683A.
 × Ketter, Leander Joseph, 23211A.
 Boardman, William Armistead, 25631A.
 × Verbeke, Robert Henry, 24684A.
 × King, William Joseph, 24685A.
 × Kullowatz, Vernon Frederick, 24686A.

Women's Medical Specialist

× Deming, Elsie L., 20901A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Air Force

Walters, Marvin Lee, 23116A.
 Bronner, Edmond James, 23115A.
 Johnson, Samuel Robert, Jr., 25936A.
 O'Malley, Gene Jolliffe, 25937A.
 × Bennett, John Harley, 23139A.
 Gray, David Lawrence, 23142A.
 × Gustafson, George Alan, 23140A.
 × Yanecek, Earl Eugene, 23144A.
 × VanGorder, Francis Cleve, 23145A.
 Mayo, Jack Bernard, 25938A.
 Humphrey, Eugene Channing, 25939A.
 × Welch, Billy Jack, 23146A.
 × Smith, Arthur Clair, Jr., 24605A.
 Lawson, Richard LaVerne, 25940A.
 × Donohue, William John, Jr., 24173A.
 × Buckland, Alwyn Charles, 23153A.
 × Rozsa, Allen Claire, 24606A.
 × Davila Aponte, Luis Angel, 23147A.
 × Astrella, Ralph John, 24609A.
 × Christenson, Arnold Petri, 24610A.
 Bond, Jack David, 25683A.
 × Stoltenberg, Richard Edward, 24612A.
 × Brown, William Earl, Jr., 23193A.
 Brown, Stuart LeRoy, Jr., 23192A.
 × Larue, James Eugene, Jr., 23191A.
 × Low, James Frederick, 23194A.
 Berger, Warren George, 23198A.
 Miller, Alfred Marion, Jr., 23195A.
 Ingram, Benjamin Franklin, Jr., 23210A.
 × Parks, Roland William, 23197A.
 × Moore, Thomas Lee, 23196A.
 Hunt, Billie Bob, 23200A.
 × Hayford, Robert Louis, 25942A.
 Kauttu, Paul Alfred, 25941A.
 O'Connell, Donald Roger, 26586A.
 Tracy, Fred Lewis, 26587A.
 × Pate, William Bernard, 26584A.
 × Pratt, Carl Ely, Jr., 26585A.
 Chapman, Henry Alan, 26588A.
 Millstead, Robert Evans, 24613A.
 × Mitchell, Robert Jean, 24614A.
 × Wood, Richard Jack, 24615A.
 Winston, Marjory Eva, 25943W.
 Tarver, William R., 26590A.
 × Brown, Norma Elaine, 26589W.
 Dellaripa, James Michael, 26591A.
 × Swing, Herbert Raiston, Jr., 23149A.
 Paul, William Sidney, 23151A.
 Green, Elmer Harold, Jr., 23150A.
 Herrick, Ronald Charles, 26592A.
 James, Francis Edward, Jr., 26593A.

Miller, Charles B., 26595A.
 Ashe, Mary Ellen, 26596W.
 King, Gilberta, 25944W.
 × Kramer, Edward Francis, Jr., 23154A.
 × Cooper, Byrum Wilson, 24867A.
 Koetting, Donald Joseph, 23629A.
 Thomas, John Powers, 23624A.
 × Doak, Malcolm Robert, 23628A.
 × Gillory, Byron Morris, 23621A.
 × Athanas, George Lyke, 23619A.
 × Bounds, Jesse Clemson, Jr., 23620A.
 × Saville, David Barnhardt, 23623A.
 × Disch, Thomas Harold, Jr., 23627A.
 Forsman, Billy Baker, 23626A.
 Toma, Joseph Shaker, 25946A.
 Bakken, Robert Wayne, 25945A.
 Collins, Kenneth Stanley, 26597A.
 Spencer, James Hoyte, Jr., 26598A.
 × Warner, William Ayres, 23158A.
 × Light, Wilbur Smith, 23156A.
 × Bauman, Wendall Carter, 23159A.
 × Quinn, James Lester, 23155A.
 Browning, George Moore, Jr., 23157A.
 × Hoffman, Charles Raymond, Jr., 23160A.
 Doerty, Walter Lafayette, Jr., 22777A.
 × Bridgman, Oscar Cleon, Jr., 25947A.
 Whitaker, Benjamin Merrill, 24688A.
 Folline, William Benjamin, 25599A.
 × Valentine, Garrison Norton, 24617A.
 Myers, Richard Lee, 24616A.
 × Walker, Ian Gordon, 24618A.
 Puryear, Edgar Francis, Jr., 23252A.
 × Foster, Murphy James, Jr., 23253A.
 × Akers, George Storms, 24967A.
 × Jones, Aldred Wilson, 24970A.
 × Vanderheide, Norma Gail, 24971W.
 × Anding, Thomas Earl, 24968A.
 Foster, Harl Randal, 26600A.
 Gaylord, Bradley, Jr., 23635A.
 × Fisher, John Levi, 23641A.
 × Shearon, James Thomas, 23644A.
 Somers, Eugene Kinkad, 23649A.
 Rose, Charles Kenneth, 3d, 23647A.
 × Lee, John Thomas, Jr., 23642A.
 × Jancauskas, Alldore Anthony, 23638A.
 × Sanet, Edward, 23648A.
 × deClairmont, Ralph Gregg, 23636A.
 × Romack, Joseph Conrad, 23646A.
 × Roesener, Arlie Keith, 23640A.
 × Smith, Edwin Luther, 23645A.
 × Randerson, John Tremper, 23643A.
 × Kline, Cozier Snider, 23632A.
 × Neuner, Louis George, Jr., 23633A.
 × Cameron, Lyle Willis, 23634A.
 × Kohlmeier, Edward John, 26604A.
 × Kelly, Henry Miles, 26601A.
 Seufert, William Sherman, 206603A.
 Donnelly, Charles Lawthers, Jr., 26605A.
 Weissgarber, Martin, Jr., 26606A.
 Gray, Fred William, 26602A.
 × Ford, Claude Junior, 24619A.
 × Partridge, Robert Wilson, 26607A.

Medical Service

× Little, Robert Lorenzo, 24256A.
 × March, James Edward, 25346A.
 Moyer, James Earl, 25683A.
 × Cortner, Robert Harold, 25347A.
 × Dowell, Frank Herbert, 25348A.
 Mengel, Robert Arthur, 25742A.
 × Mixson, Marion Hagood, Jr., 25349A.
 × Brenner, Theodore Engelbert, 25684A.
 × Hirsch, Jerome Albert, 25350A.
 × Buckeridge, Francis Arthur, 25351A.
 Archibald, Erwin Roger, 25685A.
 Clayton, Eugenia, 25686W.
 × Huggins, Henry Alexander, Jr., 25687A.
 × McLain, George Hobson, Jr., 25352A.
 Hadley, Neil Blaine, 26669A.

Nurse

× Sands, Mary Louise Ryder, 23246W.
 × Wells, Helen, 23247W.
 × Maisey, Alberta Frances, 23243W.
 × King, Wanda Mae, 23244W.

Women's Medical Specialist

× Potter, Olive Justine, 23248W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Dr. Frank F. Warren, president of Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God our Father, in the spirit of reverence we would come into Thy presence this day. Thou hast told us that we ought to pray and not to faint. We look at our world and at the tasks which are ours, and too often we grow faint in the realization of our personal shortcomings. Help us to realize anew the divine strength which is ours for the asking, the wisdom which is ours for the seeking, and the understanding of Thy divine will for ourselves, our Nation, and the world.

We ask this day for Thy divine blessing upon the Congress of the United States. The problems that confront us as a nation are multitudinous and the decisions made this day may be momentous. May each Member of the House realize anew the wisdom that comes from above, and may hearts and minds be open to Thy leadership. Help us to be great enough to put behind us the trivia of life and may we unite on all that is essential. Forgive us for all that Thou dost see in our conduct and conversation unworthy of us and cleanse our hearts through the indwelling of Thy Spirit through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1955, was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

THE HONORABLE EDMUND P. RADWAN

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 7, 1955.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to House Resolution 11, 84th Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect EDMUND P. RADWAN, of the 41st District of New York, I have the honor to report that on the 7th day of January 1955, at Buffalo, Erie County, State of New York, I administered the

oath of office to Mr. RADWAN, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. RADWAN subscribed.

I have the honor to be,
Yours respectfully,
EDWARD A. RATH,
County Clerk, Erie County, N. Y.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 71) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas EDMUND P. RADWAN, a Representative from the State of New York, from the 41st District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed to the oath of office before Mr. Edward A. Rath, Erie County clerk, Buffalo, N. Y., authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said EDMUND P. RADWAN as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. PASSMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 72) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Ben J. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania; Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Michigan; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; T. Millet Hand 2d, New Jersey; Harold C. Ostertag, New York; Frank T. Bow, Ohio.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; Albert P. Morano, Connecticut; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Joseph L. Carrigg, Pennsylvania; Robert D. Harrison, Nebraska; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Patrick J. Hillings, California; Oliver P. Bolton, Ohio; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California.

Committee on Ways and Means: Daniel A. Reed, New York; Thomas A. Jenkins, Ohio; Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kean, New Jersey; Noah M. Mason, Illinois; Hal Holmes, Washington; John W. Byrnes, Wisconsin; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Howard H. Baker, Tennessee; Thomas B. Curtis, Missouri.

The resolution was agreed to.

SELECTION OF MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement. Those Members who served in the 83d and past Congresses know that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PRIEST, has been the Democratic whip.

Mr. PRIEST now assumes the very responsible position of chairman of the very important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has himself made the decision that the duties of that chairmanship are such that he feels constrained to confine his activities to that position.

As a result of that it became necessary to select a majority whip. I am very pleased to announce to my colleagues today that the Speaker and I, in conference, have designated and selected the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, to be the majority whip during this Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1955.
The Honorable JOHN McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: In replying to your urgent request that I continue as the Democratic whip, let me say first of all that I am deeply grateful to you for extending to me the opportunity to serve again in that position.

I shall always cherish among my finest memories the very close and fine relationships with you and Speaker RAYBURN during the time I served as the Democratic whip.

I wish very much that I could feel that it would be possible for me to continue as the whip and at the same time assume the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have served on that committee for 12 years and I know something about the load that the chairman of the committee must carry. This has been a difficult decision for me to make, but I feel that I cannot do both jobs as I think they should be done and I shall give to the position of chairman the best I have in energy, effort, and thought.

Let me assure you again that this is a decision that has not been easily reached and further assure you that I shall always be grateful for your friendship and your cooperation during the time I served as the Democratic whip and to pledge to you and to whoever may be appointed to this position my very closest cooperation at all times.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. PERCY PRIEST.

JANUARY 7, 1955.

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PERCY: I am in receipt of your letter of January 3 and I want you to know I regretted very much the decision you made that you did not feel you could continue as Democratic whip, that the arduous duties of your chairmanship of the all-important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce constituted your first attention and required your constant attention. You performed your duties throughout the years you were Democratic whip in an outstanding and most effective manner. I always valued the close relationship that existed between you and Speaker RAYBURN and myself, and your loyalty and devotion to both the Speaker and myself.

As chairman of the very important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce you will make an outstanding record for

yourself and make marked contributions to the progress of our country and the benefit of our people. It is needless for me to tell you that in any way I can cooperate with you, either personally or officially, it will always be a pleasure for me to do so.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours.

SELECTION OF MINORITY WHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce on the part of the Republican Members that we have reappointed our very efficient whip, Mr. LES ARENDS, of Illinois.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 63)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For the consideration of the Congress, I submit my recommendations for further developing the foreign economic policy of the United States. Although largely based upon my special message to the Congress of March 30, 1954, these proposals are the product of fresh review.

The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets. Our own self-interest requires such a program because (1) economic strength among our allies is essential to our security; (2) economic growth in underdeveloped areas is necessary to lessen international instability growing out of the vulnerability of such areas to Communist penetration and subversion; and (3) an increasing volume of world production and trade will help assure our own economic growth and a rising standard of living among our own people.

In the worldwide struggle between the forces of freedom and those of communism, we have wisely recognized that the security of each nation in the free world is dependent upon the security of all other nations in the free world. The measure of that security in turn is dependent upon the economic strength of all free nations, for without economic strength they cannot support the military establishments that are necessary to deter Communist armed aggression. Economic strength is indispensable, as well, in securing themselves against internal Communist subversion.

For every country in the free world economic strength is dependent upon high levels of economic activity internally and high levels of international trade. No nation can be economically self-sufficient. Nations must buy from other nations, and in order to pay for what they buy they must sell. It is essential for the security of the United

States and the rest of the free world that the United States take the leadership in promoting the achievement of those high levels of trade that will bring to all the economic strength upon which the freedom and security of all depends. Those high levels of trade can be promoted by the specific measures with respect to trade barriers recommended in this message, by the greater flow of capital among nations of the free world, by convertibility of currencies, by an expanded interchange of technical counsel, and by an increase in international travel.

From the military standpoint, our national strength has been augmented by the overall military alliance of the nations constituting the free world. This free world alliance will be most firmly cemented when its association is based on flourishing mutual trade as well as common ideals, interests, and aspirations. Mutually advantageous trade relationships are not only profitable but they are also more binding and more enduring than costly grants and other forms of aid.

Today numerous uneconomic, man-made barriers to mutually advantageous trade and the flow of investment are preventing the nations of the free world from achieving their full economic potential. International trade and investment are not making their full contribution to production, employment, and income. Over a large area of the world currencies are not yet convertible.

We and our friends abroad must together undertake the lowering of the unjustifiable barriers to trade and investment, and we must do it on a mutual basis so that the benefits may be shared by all.

Such action will add strength to our own domestic economy and help assure a rising standard of living among our people by opening new markets for our farms and factories and mines.

The program that I am here recommending is moderate, gradual, and reciprocal. Radical or sudden tariff reductions would not be to the interest of the United States and would not accomplish the goal we seek. A moderate program, however, can add immeasurably to the security and well-being of the United States and the rest of the free world.

TRADE AGREEMENT AUTHORITY

I request a 3-year extension of Presidential authority to negotiate tariff reductions with other nations on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis. This authority would permit negotiations for reductions in those barriers that now limit the markets for our goods throughout the world. I shall ask all nations with whom we trade to take similar steps in their relations with each other.

The 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act should authorize, subject to the present peril and escape clause provisions:

1. Reduction, through multilateral and reciprocal negotiations, of tariff rates on selected commodities by not more than 5 percent per year for 3 years;

2. Reduction, through multilateral and reciprocal negotiations, of any tariff

rates in excess of 50 percent to that level over a 3-year period; and

3. Reduction, by not more than one-half over a 3-year period, of tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1945, on articles which are not now being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities.

THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

For approximately 7 years the United States has cooperated with all the major trading nations of the free world in an effort to reduce trade barriers. The instrument of cooperation is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Through this agreement the United States has sought to carry out the provisions and purposes of the Trade Agreements Act.

The United States and 33 other trading countries are now reviewing the provisions of the agreement for the purpose of making it a simpler and more effective instrument for the development of a sound system of world trade. When the current negotiations on the revision of the organizational provisions of the General Agreement are satisfactorily completed, the results will be submitted to the Congress for its approval.

CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURE

Considerable progress has been made in freeing imports from unnecessary customs administrative burdens. Still more, however, needs to be done in the three areas I mentioned in my message last year: (1) the simplification of commodity definitions, classification and rate structures; (2) improvement in standards for the valuation of imports; and (3) further improvement of procedures for customs administration.

An important step toward simplification of the tariff structure was taken by the Congress last year with the passage of the Customs Simplification Act which directs the Tariff Commission to study the difficulties of commodity classification of imports. The interim report of the Tariff Commission to be made by next March 15 should help enable the Congress to determine whether further legislative steps should then be taken or should await submission of the final report.

The uncertainties and confusion arising from the complex system of valuation on imported articles cause unwarranted delays in the determination of customs duties. I urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to legislation for remedying this situation.

The improvement of customs administration requires continuous effort, as the Congress recognized by enacting the Customs Simplification Acts of 1953 and 1954. The Treasury Department in its annual report to the Congress will review the remaining reasons for delay or difficulty in processing imported articles through customs and will propose still further technical amendments to simplify customs procedures.

UNITED STATES INVESTMENT ABROAD

The whole free world needs capital; America is its largest source. In that light, the flow of capital abroad from our country must be stimulated and in such

a manner that it results in investment largely by individuals or private enterprises rather than by Government.

An increased flow of United States private investment funds abroad, especially to the underdeveloped areas, could contribute much to the expansion of two-way international trade. The underdeveloped countries would thus be enabled more easily to acquire the capital equipment so badly needed by them to achieve sound economic growth and higher living standards. This would do much to offset the false but alluring promises of the Communists.

To facilitate the investment of capital abroad I recommend enactment of legislation providing for taxation of business income from foreign subsidiaries or branches at a rate 14 percentage points lower than the corporate rate on domestic income, and a deferral of tax on income of foreign branches until it is removed from the country where it is earned.

I propose also to explore the further use of tax treaties with the possible recognition of tax concessions made to foreign capital by other countries. Under proper safeguards, credit could be given for foreign income taxes which are waived for an initial limited period, as we now grant credit for taxes which are imposed. This would give maximum effectiveness to foreign tax laws designed to encourage new enterprises.

As a further step to stimulate investment abroad, I recommend approval by the Congress at the appropriate time of membership in the proposed International Finance Corporation, which will be affiliated with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This Corporation will be designed to increase private investment in less developed countries by making loans without Government guaranties. Although the Corporation will not purchase stock, it will provide venture capital through investing in debentures and similar obligations. Its operation will cover a field not dealt with by an existing institution.

The executive branch will continue through our diplomatic representatives abroad to encourage a climate favorable to the private enterprise concept in investment.

We shall continue to seek other new ways to enlarge the outward flow of capital.

It must be recognized, however, that when American private capital moves abroad it properly expects to bring home its fair reward. This can only be accomplished in the last analysis by our willingness to purchase more goods and services from abroad in order to provide the dollars for these growing remittances. This fact is a further compelling reason for a fair and forward-looking trade policy on our part.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The United States has a vast store of practical and scientific know-how that is needed in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The United States has a responsibility to make it available. Its flow for peaceful purposes must remain unfettered.

United States participation in technical cooperation programs should be carried forward. These programs should be concerned with know-how rather than large funds. In my budget message next week, I shall recommend that the Congress make available the funds required to support the multilateral technical cooperation programs of the United Nations. The bilateral programs of the United States should be pressed vigorously.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

The United States remains committed to the objective of freedom of travel throughout the world. Encouragement given to travel abroad is extremely important both for its cultural and social importance in the free world, and for its economic benefits. Travel abroad by Americans provides an important source of dollars for many countries. The executive branch shall continue to look for ways of facilitating international travel and shall continue to cooperate with private travel agencies.

One legislative action that would be beneficial in this field is the increase of the present duty-free allowances for tourists from \$500 to \$1,000 exercisable every 6 months. I recommend the passage of such legislation.

TRADE FAIRS

International trade fairs have been of major importance to foreign countries for many years, and most of the trading nations have strengthened the promotional aspects of their industrial displays in many fairs with a central exhibit designed to emphasize the industrial progress and achievement of the nation.

Soviet and satellite exhibits, for example, have been costly, well planned, and housed in expensive structures designed to convey the impression that the U. S. S. R. is producing on a large scale for peace and is creating a paradise for workers.

The United States, which has a larger volume of international trade than any other nation, until recently has been conspicuous by its absence at these trade fairs. American visitors and participants have pointed out the failure of their Government to tell adequately the story of our free-enterprise system and to provide effective international trade promotion cooperation.

As a result, I have undertaken an international trade fair program under the direction of the Department of Commerce. Since the inauguration of this program in August, participation has been authorized in 11 fairs to be held before June 30. Sixteen additional fairs are being considered for exhibition purposes in the latter part of the year. The first fair in which the United States presented a central exhibit is that at Bangkok, which opened December 7, 1954. At our exhibit was awarded first prize. Over 100 American companies supplied items for inclusion in it.

I shall ask the Congress for funds to continue this program.

CONVERTIBILITY

Convertibility of currencies is required for the development of a steadily rising

volume of world trade and investment. The achievement of convertibility has not been possible in the postwar period due to dislocations caused by the war, inflation, and other domestic economic difficulties in many countries, which have contributed to an imbalance in international trade and payments. However, steady progress, particularly by Western European countries, is being made toward our mutual objective of restoring currency convertibility. The foreign economic program proposed here will make an important contribution to the achievement of convertibility.

AGRICULTURE

No single group within America has a greater stake in a healthy and expanding foreign trade than the farmers. One-fourth to one-third of some major crops, such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco, must find markets abroad in order to maintain farm income at high levels.

If they are to be successful, programs designated to promote the prosperity of agriculture should be consistent with our foreign economic program. We must take due account of the effect of any agricultural program on our foreign economic relations to assure that it contributes to the development of healthy, expanding foreign markets over the years.

CONCLUSION

The series of recommendations I have just made are all components of an integrated program, pointing in a single direction. Each contributes to the whole. Each advances our national security by bringing added strength and self-sufficiency to our allies. Each contributes to our economic growth and a rising standard of living among our people.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1955.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL ON THURSDAY

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have leave on Thursday next to report and take up for consideration an emergency appropriation bill.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that funds appropriated by this bill will be needed before the close of the week, and for that reason, if I have the approval of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I ask that the committee be permitted to bring it up on the day reported, the 3-day rule to the contrary notwithstanding. The bill is otherwise privileged for immediate consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I can see nothing for us to do except to pass some bill along the line of the budget estimate that will be presented. Therefore, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

**REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER
PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 62)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith my first semi-annual report on the activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as required by that law.

Public Law 480 is an expression by Congress of its determination to deal with the abundance of our agricultural production in a constructive way. Despite the problems created by this abundance, we may be thankful we live in a land which is able to produce plentifully rather than one which suffers the affliction of food shortages.

The enclosed report includes the dollar value of the foreign currency for which commodities exported pursuant to section 102 (a) of the act have been sold, as well as the estimated order of magnitude of the total country programs which have been generally agreed on but not fully negotiated, together with the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation of such sales. The report also contains a summary of the policies and operating techniques involved for the administration of the act during the first 6 months of its existence.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1955.

POSITIONS OF CLERK FOR THE MAJORITY WHIP AND MESSENGER IN THE MAJORITY CAUCUS ROOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution, (H. Res. 73).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 6, 1955, the positions of clerk for the majority whip and messenger in the majority caucus room at the basic salary rates of \$3,000 and \$1,740 per annum, respectively, shall be vacated, and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for office personnel for the majority whip to be appointed by him at rates of compensation totaling not more than \$5,000 basic per annum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this does not change the amount?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. It permits the majority whip to allocate the amount as he desires. I may say that I obtained that permission 2 years ago as minority whip. This now applies to the majority.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSITIONS OF SECRETARY, LEGISLATIVE CLERK, CLERK, ADDITIONAL CLERK, ASSISTANT CLERK, AND STENOGRAPHER IN THE MAJORITY LEADER'S OFFICE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 74).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 6, 1955, the positions of secretary, legislative clerk, clerk, additional clerk, assistant clerk, and stenographer, in the majority leader's office shall be vacated and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for office personnel for the majority leader to be appointed by him at rates of compensation totaling not more than \$18,340 basic per annum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the same situation applies here. There is no increase in the total amount, but it does give the majority leader freedom as to the allocation of the amount rather than being frozen to a certain amount for certain positions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO THE CHIEF JANITOR AND ASSISTANT CHIEF JANITOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 75).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 6, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the chief janitor and the assistant chief janitor (minority), Doorkeeper's department at the basic salary rate of \$1,100 and \$300 per annum respectively.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this represents a \$300 increase in the base salaries for two employees, one majority and the other minority, whose positions are mentioned in the resolution I have just offered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this is agreeable to us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE
BALANCE OF THE WEEK**

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]

obtained unanimous consent in relation to bringing up certain emergency appropriation items on Thursday next. That resolution, including those items, will come up at that time with my understanding that they are noncontroversial, so there will be no rollcall. Those items would not come out of committee unless they were unanimous, and I am making this statement so that the Members might be aware of the fact that those are emergency appropriation items. One relating to the FHA involves windfalls and additional employees. The second involves foreign claim settlements and an appropriation in connection with that. The third involves the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with group team work for which funds are lacking, and fourth, an item or items in connection with the legislative aspects of the appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us at this time what the House might expect this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of anything else.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the purpose to adjourn from Tuesday to Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Tomorrow, as I understand, a message will come up on the postal-civil-service pay Government group health.

Mr. MARTIN. A message from the President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and there is a message on Thursday on the Armed Forces reserve plan and military pay. And, it is the intention to go over from Tuesday to Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The legislation Thursday will not include any funds to pay those 11 characters who were suspended from the United Nations?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. My understanding, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa, is that it is a unanimous report from the 40 members as of now. Of course, there are 20 on the Democratic side and 20 on the Republican side with 10 vacancies still to be filled on our side. One appropriation relates to FHA and the other one is a foreign claims settlement. What it is, I am unable to answer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to be sure that no funds appropriated by this Congress will pay those 11 persons, the fifth-amendment Communists, of the United Nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. There is nothing in here except some ordinary routine items, administrative costs for the Foreign Settlement Commission, and for FHA, and I understand there is one item on agriculture. It will not give anybody any trouble.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was sure that was so but I could not definitely answer the gentleman's question and I never want to make a statement unless I can back it up. I am glad the gentleman from Texas furnished the information that I could not give.

THE LATE JOHN G. COOPER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I arise to call the attention of the House to the fact that on last Friday a very distinguished former Member of this House passed away. I refer to the Honorable John G. Cooper, who served with distinction in this House for 22 successive years.

Mr. Cooper was born in 1872 and spent most of his life in Youngstown, Ohio. He had by reason of his industry and good character been elevated to a position of responsibility with one of the railroads in his section of the State. His first political service was that rendered as a member of the State Legislature for the State of Ohio. After serving one term in the State legislature, he was elected to membership in the United States House of Representatives. His service in the House of Representatives began on March 3, 1915. He served 11 successive terms, for a total service of 22 years in Congress.

Mr. Cooper was a man of high character and great natural ability. These, with his fine qualifications, brought to him the esteem and respect of all his colleagues, with the result that he had a great deal of influence in Congress. Soon after he left Congress, he was given the position of chairman of the board of claims of the Ohio Industrial Commission. He served in this capacity with distinction until 1945.

Mr. Cooper died last Friday at the home of his son in Hagerstown, Md. His body was taken to Youngstown where he was buried at the side of his wife.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that Mr. Cooper was a fine citizen, a very capable Congressman, and a true American in every way. We who knew him will miss him.

May he rest in peace.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with everything my distinguished Ohio colleague [Mr. JENKINS] has said, and to add my word of respect and admiration for the man who, after a long life of service slipped away 2 or 3 days ago. John Cooper was a man one could not but admire, respect, and love. Yes, he was a locomotive engineer who rose, as men can and do in this free land of ours, to sit in this great body. And how he loved his country and how well he represented the heart and soul of America, every moment that he was here, indeed every moment since he left us. Those of us who knew him are better off for his living.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to know John Cooper very well and to serve with him upon a special committee a little over 25 years ago, which laid out a program for the construction of the present Federal prison system. Mr. Cooper was the chairman of that committee and made a fine record. I am very sorry to hear of his passing.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in paying my respects to John Cooper. He represented for 22 years the district which I now represent.

John Cooper was a gentleman, one of the finest characters who ever came to this House; so well loved that he was known all over the district he represented as John G. He represented the district well, had a fine family, truly a good American. As I say, he was loved and respected.

I repeat that I join my colleague from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in paying my respects to John G., and may God have mercy upon him.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress our beloved late colleague, John Cooper, was one of the outstanding Members of Congress and one of its finest Members; a mental giant, a man who served his people, his State and country and the Congress of the United States with great distinction, making marked contributions to the progress of sound, constructive legislation through the Congress.

I was grieved when I read of his death. I join the Ohio delegation in their expressions of sympathy on this occasion.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in these words of regret at the passing of former Congressman John Cooper, with whom I was privileged to serve. He was a man of outstanding ability and a great legislator. Always kind and courteous he was beloved by all. His death is a great loss to the State of Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Ohio in the expressions to which he has given voice with respect to the character and life of the late John G. Cooper, of Ohio.

When I came here in 1927, John G. Cooper was one of the ablest and most distinguished Members of this body. I soon learned to appreciate his high qualities of heart and mind and it was not surprising to find the high regard in which he was held by the membership of the House. It was with very great regret and sorrow that I learned of his death.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point, on the life and achievements of the late John G. Cooper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in an expression of respect and regret at the passing of the Honorable John Gordon Cooper, who served in this body with honor and distinction for nearly a quarter of a century. He had been a member of this body for 14 years when my father began his first term here. As dean of the Ohio delegation, John Cooper was looked up to by the younger members for his fairness, fatherly counsel, and kindness. He represented his district for a total of 22 years until 1936, yet there are many, many of my constituents in the counties of Ashtabula and Trumbull who still have close personal remembrances of him, their last Republican representative for 16 years. I extend to his family my sympathy for their loss, but they can be proud, I know, of the mark he made in his four score years of devoted service to his country in these halls.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and a feeling of personal loss that I announce to the House the death of the Honorable Clyde Williams, former Member, who died November 12, 1954. Congressman Williams, for many years represented the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, the district I now have the honor of representing.

Congressman Williams is an excellent example of the typical American success story. From an humble beginning as a farm boy in Jefferson County, Mo., to the Halls of Congress; a gulf that could only be bridged in a free country, that is the story of Clyde Williams.

The people of the Eighth District knew they had a great statesman in Clyde Williams. They consistently sent him back term after term to represent them in the Congress of the United States. Mr. Williams was first elected to Congress in 1926. During this session he served capably on the House Naval Affairs Committee. From 1931 to 1943 Mr. Williams was one of the most influential Members on the Banking and Currency Committee. It was while serving on this very important Committee that Mr. Williams coauthored major amendments to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation laws that enabled our domestic industry to successfully meet the demands of World War II.

Clyde Williams was born on a farm near Grubville, Jefferson County, Mo., on October 13, 1873. He attended country

schools, De Soto High School, and the State Normal School at Cape Girardeau, Mo. He was graduated from the law department of the University of Missouri in 1901.

He was admitted to the bar the same year and commenced practice in De Soto, Mo. Mr. Williams was elected prosecuting attorney of Jefferson County in 1902 and served in that capacity until 1908. He also held the honored post of Democratic State Chairman in 1938.

After leaving Congress, Mr. Williams engaged in legal work for the RFC in Washington from 1943 until 1945. At that date he retired from public and political activity and lived in retirement at his home in Hillsboro, Mo.

I am sure many of you remember Clyde Williams. The recollection of his warm smile, his ready wit, his marvelous mastery of the spoken word and his unquestioned honesty, will live on in the hearts of his many friends in the Congress and in his beloved State and district. And with the passing of time the great legislative accomplishments of Clyde Williams will effectually blend into their well-earned place in history.

I join his many friends in sending to his family deepest sympathy in their great loss.

THE LATE MARTIN F. SMITH

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to announce to the House the death in this city on October 25, 1954, of the Honorable Martin F. Smith who for 10 years, from 1933 to 1943, was a Member of the House of Representatives from the Third District of Washington, which I now represent.

Martin Smith was born in Chicago. He was educated in the schools of that city and studied law at Northwestern University. When 20 years of age he decided to go West. He settled in the little lumbering, seaport town of Hoquiam, Wash. In Hoquiam he did accounting while pursuing his studies of the law. In 1912, when only 21 years of age, Martin Smith was admitted to the Washington State bar.

He served as a private in World War I.

Always interested in politics, Martin Smith served his city as municipal judge, as councilman and later as its mayor, winning the office by the largest majority ever obtained by any mayoralty candidate. Later, in 1932, he was nominated on the Democratic ticket for Congress from the Third District and in November 1932 became the first Democratic candidate in the then 22-year history of the district ever to carry it. He won reelection to Congress 4 times, serving a total of 10 years.

The Third District of Washington is in fact a peninsula. It is bounded for its full length on the west by the Pacific Ocean, on the south by the navigable waters of the great Columbia River, and on the north by the navigable waters of Puget Sound. The Third District of Washington has more ports than any congressional district in the Nation.

Martin Smith, therefore, naturally sought and secured a place on the river and harbor committee, where he became an influential member. He obtained several waterway projects of interest to his district.

He was much interested in public power and was among those who worked to bring about the first power dam developments on the Columbia. His interest in behalf of Spanish-American War Veterans caused that organization to elect him to honorary membership.

But tides in politics change. In 1942 after he had been in office 10 years, the political tide ran out for Martin Smith and he was defeated by a Republican.

Soon thereafter Mr. Smith was appointed to the Board of Immigration Appeals from which he resigned 2 years later to run unsuccessfully in 1944 for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator. A month later he was appointed as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States which position Martin Smith was holding at the time of his death.

Martin Smith never lost interest in Congress and the friends and associates he made there and several times each year he would come on to the Hill to sit through an afternoon session of the House and to visit with old timers who knew him when he was a Member.

We extend to his widow and the two daughters and their families, who survive him, our sincerest sympathy.

FIELD PRICES OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the membership of the House to the special order granted this afternoon to my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] to speak on the subject of the authority of the Federal Power Commission to set field prices on natural gas. Mr. IKARD's speech will deal with the decision rendered by the Supreme Court in the so-called Phillips case in June of last year.

If you are from oil- and gas-producing areas, you are, of course, intensely interested in this decision and will be interested in hearing my colleague's discussion. If you represent areas where natural gas is consumed, you will be interested in what he has to say from that standpoint. This should include many Members of the House of Representatives, but if it does not include all, then I call your attention to the fact that a fundamental philosophy is involved. It has to do with whether we allow government by bureaucracy and a further control of a vital industry by the Federal Government.

If you are from an oil- and gas-producing area, you will be interested in Mr. IKARD's discussion of how this decision and the orders of the Federal Power Commission will affect this most important industry. If you are from those

areas where natural gas is consumed, I think you may be convinced by Mr. IKARD's discussion that your consumers will not receive cheaper gas by reason of prices at the production and gathering point being controlled by the Federal Government. All, of course, are interested in our national defense, and this factor will be developed. I hope before many weeks we will have legislation on the floor of this House to clarify the authority of the Federal Power Commission in the control of price on natural gas. In my opinion, it was never the intent of Congress that the Federal Power Commission should have such control, and, as will be pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], the Federal Power Commission itself, after long and careful consideration, came to that conclusion. The Supreme Court in the so-called Phillips case decided otherwise, and now the Commission, unless Congress acts, has the responsibility of such control and will proceed to impose its regulations.

I hope you will be on the floor to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], a man eminently qualified to speak on this subject.

TARIFFS ON TEXTILES

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with the extension of my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including a statement made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on behalf of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute by R. Houston Jewell, vice president of the Crystal Springs Bleachery, of Chickamauga, Ga., and Mr. Robert Jackson the executive vice president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

This statement is a most illuminating and really an alarming one and I hope it will be read by every Member of this House in whose district cotton textiles are produced.

In the name of protecting Japan it looks like the bright-eyed boys in the State Department and the do-gooders are willing to destroy the American cotton textile industry. Japan was formerly our enemy and it was due to the impressive record of the cotton industry that we were able to clothe our soldiers and give them tents under which to sleep and be protected from the elements thus aiding us to defeat Japan and the other members of the Axis. Shall we now destroy our cotton textile industry just to prevent Japan from trading with other nations? The question answers itself. I am sure that we are not going to stand by and see this happen to one of the great industries of our country.

I have today introduced a bill which would prevent the President from entering into any trade agreements with any country that would further reduce the tariffs on textiles. Already they have

been drastically reduced and to reduce them further would be a peril threatening the very life of the industry. I will have more to say about this threat as the year goes on if any attempt is made to lower these tariffs.

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS ON AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURES AND RELATED ITEMS IN FORTHCOMING AGREEMENTS WITH JAPAN AND OTHER COUNTRIES

(Statement before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, December 21, 1954, of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute presented by R. Houston Jewell, vice president, Crystal Springs Bleachery, and Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.)

(Other associations expressly endorsing this statement: Association of Cotton Textile Merchants, the Narrow Fabrics Association, National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, Southern Garment Manufacturers Association, the Thread Institute, Tufted Textile Fabrics Association, the Underwear Institute, the Yarn Distributors Association)

The cotton manufactures to be considered for tariff concessions in forthcoming trade agreements comprise almost the entire cloth production of the American cotton textile industry. It includes all countable cotton cloth, that is, cloth which can be basically described by the number of threads per inch and by yarn numbers and by weight. In addition, the list covers the products of the industry's chief customers. This coverage includes most apparel items made either of woven or knitted fabrics, with the single exception of cotton hose.

The published list does not necessarily imply that concessions will actually be granted on every item. It does imply, however, that every item is the subject of a potential concession. The comprehensive nature of the list leaves us with the conclusion that the entire cotton textile industry of the United States is regarded as potentially expendable.

This conclusion is reinforced by reference to schedule XIII, Manufactures of Rayon or Other Synthetic Textile. Here are listed synthetic yarns and filaments of rayon or other synthetic textile, of cut fiber or staple fiber or any other type. This is a listing of the most extraordinary significance to the cotton industry of the United States. Tariff concessions on cotton goods are a threat to domestic cotton consumption and therefore a threat to the American cotton farmer.

Tariff concessions on synthetic yarns are another danger. Such an action taken when the price of cotton is being upheld by the agricultural program can have no other result than a wide disparity between the price of rayon yarns and the price of raw cotton. The competitive effect would be to compel the cotton mills of the United States to switch from cotton to rayon. No better device could be contrived to sound the doom of the American cotton farmer along with the American cotton-manufacturing industry.

We feel that it is highly relevant to point out that no other major industry is to any important degree exposed to the potential sacrifice considered for the cotton industry. The American people feel that the great mass-production industries of the United States are so much more efficient than foreign industries as to be immune to the dangers of unlimited foreign competition.

Hence we expect that the articles selected for tariff reduction would include the products of these great super-efficient mass-production industries. They are either not on the list at all, or are relatively minor items.

With respect to the other great industries of the mass-production type, we can say

from the list of negotiable items that they are most tenderly treated.

Stating our proposition in positive terms, the list supports strongly the conviction that the tariff program of the United States, as currently set up, strikes at the little fellows, especially those who most need protection. It is a program which threatens to undermine the small business of America. It is a program that admits that a number of industries will be hurt and that Government aids and subsidies will have to be relied on to put the bread of charity into the mouths of their workers. We now know what industries and activities are in danger. Cotton agriculture, threatened by tariff reductions on synthetic yarns, is a great segment of our economy. But, it is made up of little fellows.

The cotton-manufacturing industry of the United States, taken as a whole, is a giant industry with an invested capital of more than \$6 billion and an army of workers exceeding a million and a quarter. But its component parts are mostly little fellows. Seventy-five percent of the industry is made up of small independent units, no one of which has as much as 1 percent of the total business.

The great iron and steel industry, whose giant proportions tax the imagination, comes under Schedule III, Metals and Manufacturers of. There is listed there thumbtacks, needles, nail files, surgical and dental instruments, shotguns and pistols. As an example of complete mopping up on a little fellow is the inclusion of bicycle bells, which is about all that is left of the bicycle industry. And so it goes throughout the entire list, whether we look at chinaware and glassware, or agricultural products where the direct targets are the poultrymen, the fishermen, the dairymen, the berry pickers, and the growers of lily bulbs and mushrooms.

The authors of the negotiable list have a long and varied assemblage of articles in Schedule XV, Sundries. From a host of small industries, they list rubber balls, beads, hats and bonnets, toothbrushes, handbags, laces, dog leashes, candies, hair combs, tobacco pouches, umbrella handles, and frog legs. We consider the formulation of this list of expendable industries as a proper subject of congressional investigation. We shall request such investigation.

The Small Business Administration, which is one of the leading bipartisan constructive efforts on Capitol Hill, will be sorely put to it to find applicants in the future for their loans and other aids to small business.

In the case of the cotton textile industry, at least 75 percent of which is small business, previous trade agreements have already imposed tariff reductions on about 91 percent of the industry's production. The cuts have averaged about 37 percent. For many individual items they have amounted to as much as 50 percent, and on a limited number the cuts have already reached the permissible maximum of 75 percent.

All of the important concessions granted have gone to the major textile exporting countries of Western Europe—the United Kingdom, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany, France, Belgium, and Austria. As a result of these concessions, the average ad valorem equivalent on imported cotton goods as computed by the Tariff Commission as of January 1, 1952, is 22.4 percent. Were this computation brought down to date, it would probably show an appreciably lower average duty because of the increased proportion of higher quality finished imports which carry a lower ad valorem rate.

Of the concessions granted to the United States, most have been nullified, some have been revoked, and in only one instance, namely the concession granted by Canada, has there been continuous and complete fulfillment.

The import restrictions of Western Europe have amounted to a virtually complete em-

bargo against textiles from the United States and incidentally from Japan. The same import restrictions have also been typical of most of the underdeveloped countries of the world and have been strengthened by a continued uptrend of textile tariff rates in most countries.

Despite all these developments, the United States has not only kept faith in its concessions, but has generalized them to all the free countries. As a consequence Japan has become the chief beneficiary. Her exports to the United States exceed those of all other countries combined and currently our imports from Japan are sharply rising. Continuance of this trend will make American tariff rates a matter of little importance to the United Kingdom and the countries of Western Europe. Whatever our rates may be, Western Europe will be unable to compete with Japan in the American market except on limited ranges of specialty goods.

The truth is that the United Kingdom and all of the textile-manufacturing countries of Europe fear Japanese competition quite as much as does the American industry, even though their manufacturing costs are lower than those of the United States.

For a long period proponents of lower tariffs have declared that lower wages in foreign countries were offset by correspondingly lower efficiencies. Textile managers know that this is not so. Japan now has a cotton-manufacturing industry whose efficiency is equal to or above the industries of Europe and which compares favorably with the average efficiency of the American industry.

The Japanese industry is new. At the end of World War II, its residue of spindles from the losses of war was less than 1½ million. Since that time the spindleage has grown to about 8½ million, the growth representing completely new and modern equipment. In fact a considerable number of Japanese cotton mills now stand at the world's top level of textile efficiency. Yet their average wages are in the neighborhood of 13 cents an hour, which is one-tenth of the average cotton textile wage in the United States. Raw material costs are essentially the same in Japan, the United States, and Western Europe. Of the remaining costs about one-half consist of wages. With a wage cost, therefore, which is roughly one-third of that prevailing in Western Europe and one-tenth of that in the United States, Japan has a competitive advantage over the entire Western World which reaches its maximum in comparison with the United States.

The wage picture for the major cotton textile-manufacturing countries is as follows, on an average hourly straight-time basis:

United States.....	\$1.30
Switzerland.....	.43
United Kingdom.....	.40
France.....	.38
Italy (estimated).....	.30
India.....	.095
Germany.....	.317
Japan.....	.136

It is the position of the American industry that present tariff rates constitute no barrier to expanding imports of Japanese goods. In fact the volume of imports from that country could have been vastly greater during the past 2 or 3 years had the Japanese chosen to invade the American market. They did not so choose for the following reasons: (1) The volume of Japanese exports was expanding at a reasonably satisfactory rate without necessity of large exports to the United States. Japan is once more the world's leading exporter of cotton goods and this year the total volume is expected to reach 1.2 billion yards; (2) the

Japanese industry knows that the United States industry is also an overcapacity industry, dependent on its export trade to avoid heavy surpluses and domestic market depression. In this view, the Japanese have been very realistic. They have not joined with the United Kingdom and the countries of Western Europe in the clamor for American tariff reductions on textiles; (3) the Japanese dollar position has been kept very comfortable by the enormous expenditures of the United States in that country. For the past 2 years, in fact, dollars have been far more abundant in Japan than the soft currencies. Japan has had to draw heavily upon her dollar account to buy goods from the sterling area, from Latin America, and from a number of the European countries. On several occasions she has been forced to use dollars for the purchase of sterling because of the virtual sterling area embargo against Japanese goods.

These things being so, the question may be asked why the inflow of Japanese cotton goods has doubled and possibly quadrupled during September, October, and November of the current year, as indicated by cargo manifests at the port of New York and by cable reports of shipments from Tokyo but not yet reported by the Bureau of the Census. During these 3 months Japanese textile imports on an annual basis would be the equivalent of 150 million yards or more, thus reaching the peak levels of 1936 and 1937. The explanation may be the statements from the United States Government regarding the liberalization of Japanese imports into the United States. The Japanese have been made to feel that they now have an open invitation to invade the American market.

During the past several years the American industry has come to have respect for the Japanese, both as textile manufacturers and as sound appraisers of the economic and political difficulties which beset the world textile trade. In a number of textile conferences we have joined them in a study of international textile trade difficulties and the means of their solution. We have not been in disagreement on any major point.

At Buxton, England, in September 1952 the Japanese stated their analysis of cotton textile problems as did the American delegation. The Japanese report is published in the proceedings of that conference. We recommend this analysis to the attention of the committee and submit herewith a copy as part of the record.

Representative excerpts are, and I quote: "The postwar trade recession is due, we believe, to a decline in consumption in the agricultural countries. . . . Consumption in the countries of Asia and Africa fell from 7.8 yards before the war to 5.6 yards after the war, showing a 30-percent decrease, which comes to as low as one-fifth of the consumption level in the major cotton manufacturing countries. . . . Consequently it is not too much to say that the trend of world cotton textile trade is affected more by the level of consumption in the underdeveloped areas than by any other factors. . . . To increase consumption in the underdeveloped countries is the most effective way to expand trade. The road therefore to expanded trade is to elevate the income level of those underdeveloped countries."

The great paradox of world textiles is the enormous production over capacity of the major manufacturing countries in contrast to the distressing undersupply and scarcities of underdeveloped countries which are the natural importing areas.

The Japanese textile export problem is not different from that of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Western Europe. They share an overall problem which cannot be solved by these manufacturing countries selling their surpluses to each other. What has happened to Japanese trade has hap-

pened to our trade and the British trade and is exactly measured in the following table:

Principal markets for Japanese cotton cloth exports

(Millions of square yards)

Country	Annual average, 1934-39	January-August 1954
Aden.....	53.2	11.5
Argentina.....	76.0
Australia.....	63.6	36.4
British East Africa.....	104.0	1.1
British West Africa.....	7.6	29.9
Burma.....	24.4	38.2
Canada.....625
Ceylon.....	18.4	13.0
Cuba.....13
India.....	425.6	.71
Pakistan.....	76.1
Indonesia.....	336.4	231.8
Iran.....	35.6	32.0
Iraq.....	64.4	13.2
Malaya.....	36.0	25.1
Manchuria.....	120.0
China.....	3.7
Philippines.....	41.2	13.1
Thailand.....	80.0	70.3
Sudan.....	72.0
South Africa.....	33.2	14.3
United Kingdom.....	16.0	25.9
United States of America.....	70.4	19.6
Total.....	2,423.2	833.2

The comparisons show that almost all of the Japanese trade losses have occurred in Asia, Argentina, and in sterling areas outside Asia. The British takings of Japanese goods since the war, were wholly for reexport. British consumption of Japanese goods is debarred.

The relatively high United States imports in the prewar period were due to the concentrated invasion of Japanese goods from the autumn of 1936 to the spring of 1938, which was the major factor in bringing about in 1938 the deepest depression the American industry has known. That peak level has been regained in the months since August.

In other words the American industry is now being laid open again to the disastrous consequences which past experience all but guarantees.

In former years our Government could see no grounds for a reciprocal trade agreement with Japan. After a survey by the Tariff Commission an increase was recommended in the customs duties on Japanese cloth. This recommendation was promptly put into effect.

Since that time the Japanese industry has become vastly more efficient, the range and quality of their production have increased, and our tariff duties have been lowered.

We now reproduce for the committee a consolidation of 9 weeks of cargo manifests showing the imports at New York of Japanese piece goods and articles of apparel.

Manifests from other ports are not available for this recent period, September 15 to November 17. For the 9-week period, imports of piece goods are indicated as being in excess of 20 million yards, and imports of apparel items and specialty articles are estimated to approximate 5 million more. Converted to an annual equivalent the total figure would approach 150 million yards.

PARTIAL LIST OF IMPORTS OF TEXTILE CARGOES FROM JAPAN COMING INTO THE PORT OF NEW YORK SEPTEMBER 15 TO NOVEMBER 17, 9 WEEKS

Gray broadcloth, 2,358 bales.
Gray printcloth, 1,811 bales.
Gray shirting, 2,220 bales.
Gray poplin, 1,033 bales.
Gray sheeting, 30 bales.
Piece goods and textiles (not described), 2,287 bales and 871 cases.
Needlepoint, cotton, 41 cases.
Colored piece goods, 150 bales.
White piece goods, 187 bales and 5 cases.
Printed piece goods, 60 cases.

Indian prints, 71 cases.
Handkerchief cloth, 159 bales and 18 cases.
Gingham, 312 bales and 108 cases.
Combed gingham, 366 bales.
Rayon gingham, 48 bales and 79 cases.
Seersucker, 8 bales.
Rayon piece goods, 226 bales and 253 cases.
Cotton and rayon ticking, 53 bales.
Velveteens, 23 bales and 1,102 cases.
Tablecloth, damask, and manufactures thereof, 215 bales and 3,197 cases.

Handkerchiefs (cotton, rayon, and mixed), 137 bales and 245 cases.
Kitchen and dish towels, 911 bales and 20 cases.

Cotton and rayon bedspreads, 64 bales.
Pillowcases, 45 bales and 69 cases.
Cotton gloves, 31 cases.
Rayon robes, 5 cases.

Ladies' blouses, 150 bales and 941 cases and 194 cartons.

Men's and boys' shirts (chiefly of flannel, corduroy, or gingham), 1,214 cases and 1,272 cartons.

In the doctrine of lower tariffs, one of the central planks is that industrial adjustments forced by international competition are the same as those caused by internal competition.

That can best be answered by some specific illustrations. When horses and buggies were superseded by automobiles, the automobiles didn't come in from Europe, they were made in the United States of America. When the old-fashioned water wheels on a thousand rivers were superseded by turbines and dynamos, the turbines and dynamos were built in the United States, not abroad. When the iron and steel industry and much of the boot and shoe industry left New England years ago, they landed in the Middle West, not in Czechoslovakia. When New England later lost most of her spindles, they found haven in the South, not in Japan. When the bulk of cotton agriculture left the Southeast, it didn't go to Brazil. It went to Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Arkansas, and California.

To these could be added a thousand more illustrations to show that adjustments from internal forces produce a net gain which remains in our own national economy instead of taking flight to foreign countries.

Could anyone suppose that the United States would be better off if its boot and shoe industry had gone to Czechoslovakia, its automobile industry to Great Britain, its dynamo manufacturing to Switzerland, its textile industry to Japan, its chemistry to Germany, and its cotton culture to Latin America?

Another dangerous doctrine is the assumption that trade should be balanced on a country-by-country basis, particularly where the United States is concerned.

A particular country can economically balance its trade only in relationship to the entire world of trading nations. If a country's trade policy represents normal economic intelligence, its imports are supplementary to its own production and will be procured from the most advantageous sources. Thus a country's most advantageous areas of supply may be entirely different from the most advantageous areas of export. This simple natural principle is the basis of all multilateral trade.

Prior to the war Japan's balance of trade with the United States was one of academic interest. She had the essential overall balance in her total world trade. She sold the bulk of her products to the underdeveloped areas of the world—mainly Asia and Oceania—and from the proceeds bought her foodstuffs, cotton, and other raw materials from the United States and elsewhere. That was the normal natural pattern of Japanese trade.

It is now protested that Japan can no longer do this. Why? Inconvertible currencies, trade restrictions, political embar-

goes. If these are the answers, these constitute the problem.

Thus viewing its component parts, we see that the problem is not within but without the borders of the United States. There the solution must be found.

It is not found by setting up the United States tariff system as a substitute problem. This recourse not only postpones attack on the real problem; it does no favor in the meantime to Japan or the world trade. An unnatural trade pattern cannot long stand.

There is no more reason to permit unrestricted access of Japanese cotton goods into the United States than to permit the unrestricted import of raw cotton from Brazil, or of dairy products from Denmark and Holland, or wheat and wheat flour from Canada, or of certain nuts and fruits from southern Europe. In each instance, equally, there would be, in effect, the same type of attack on American employment, incomes, investment, and standards of life.

Such outcomes cannot be tolerated for agriculture. Neither should they be tolerated for the manufacturing industries whose raw-material consumption and whose payrolls are indispensable to the progress and prosperity of agriculture.

We, therefore, hope that our foreign economic policy may find its guidance in world realities and carry through to those solutions which are basic and enduring.

With such a program and code of faith, there would be little concern that for a short time continued aid might be advisable for Japan. That is of slight significance when measured against the restoration of normal and natural markets for Japan and the maintenance of economic health in the United States.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express some views with regard to my interest in the minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour as provided for in the bill I have introduced today.

According to press reports and his state of the Union message President Eisenhower will recommend to the 84th Congress an increase to 90 cents per hour in the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. His recommendation is far from adequate and demonstrates an unrealistic consideration of the current economic situation.

Thirty-six dollars a week for a 40-hour week does not provide a family with the minimum budget required in any part of the country under present prices according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Millions of workers in this country are working for substandard wages in seasonal industries and living under depressed conditions. This threatens to undercut the wage levels of all workers. In fact these conditions have destroyed the wage level and working standards of thousands of workers. Many have been forced out of jobs entirely through plant liquidations and relocations to areas where manufacturers have an unfair competitive advantage because they exploit their employees by paying submarginal rates. This practice makes it increasingly difficult for us to bring new

industry into the areas of the coal fields where the acute and chronic unemployment is a national disgrace.

The national minimum of \$1.25 an hour is thoroughly justified and is certainly not excessive in view of rising living standards and living costs. A minimum wage based upon increases in the cost of living and worker productivity since the establishment of the 1938 and 1939 minimum would be in excess of \$1 an hour. Moreover, since the minimum of 40 cents an hour was provided for by Congress, average gross hourly wages of manufacturing production workers have risen 182 percent and per capita disposal income has risen 189.5 percent. An increase in the minimum wage corresponding to these increases would require a minimum of \$1.25 an hour.

A realistic floor beneath wages would be important factors in preventing undesirable industrial dislocation and unfair competition as well as exploitation of low-wage employees; would boost purchasing power, living standards, and productivity; create more jobs; and would be important economic stabilizing factors.

THE LATE HONORABLE HUGH GIBSON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the great loss suffered by the United States by the death of Hugh Gibson, the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Mr. Gibson served the United States on numerous occasions in many capacities, and his service reflected great credit on him and on the Republic he loved so well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made regarding the Honorable Hugh Gibson. He served his country well and will long be remembered for the very magnificent job he did with this committee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Gibson devised various methods of taking surplus populations from Europe that ultimately would have relieved a great deal of pressure. It is the hope and prayer of those of us interested in this problem that someone can be selected to succeed him who to some degree at least can carry on this fine work. Personally I have lost a dear friend of many years. His guidance and enthusiasm gave me an insight of a great problem I otherwise would not have had.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that I have known no finer diplomat or more patriotic gentleman than Hugh Gibson. I

knew him well; my husband knew him well. We worked with him throughout the time he was in the diplomatic field. We also knew of the great work he did before he entered the diplomatic service. His passing leaves me with a very full heart, full of deep gratitude.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I include the following newspaper editorials regarding Mr. Gibson and his great work:

[From the New York Times of December 13, 1954]

HUGH S. GIBSON DIES AT GENEVA—LONG A DIPLOMAT AND RELIEF AIDE—FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER 30 YEARS, HEAD OF COMMITTEE FOR MIGRATION, WAS 71

GENEVA, December 12. Hugh S. Gibson, retired United States diplomat and Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, died this morning at the age of 71.

The veteran diplomat, who had served the United States at many posts throughout the world and had represented his country at dozens of international conferences, succumbed to a heart attack at about 9 o'clock at his home outside Geneva.

Mr. Gibson's son, Michael, who was on a visit to Paris, returned to Geneva.

Although suffering from a broken bone in his foot and able to move about only in a wheelchair, Mr. Gibson had presided at the principal sessions of his committee's semi-annual meeting 10 days ago. He told the opening session of the 24-nation group that European political and economic stability for the next 10 years could be assured only through the emigration of 5,000,000 Europeans.

During 46 years in international affairs, 30 of them as a Foreign Service officer, Mr. Gibson represented the United States on many important and dramatic occasions.

His name first became known when, as Legation secretary in Brussels, Belgium, he took part with Brand Whitlock, United States Minister, and others, in vain efforts to save Miss Edith Cavell, a 50-year-old British nurse, from being shot by the Germans for acts allegedly inimical to their invading army early in World War I.

From this time until his death, Mr. Gibson held many and varied posts in the United States diplomatic service and with organizations having a semiofficial governmental standing. In World War I and later, he was associated with Herbert Hoover in international relief work, and many of his State Department assignments were made to areas in which this training could be useful.

Hugh Simons Gibson was born in Los Angeles on August 16, 1883. He was a son of Frank Gibson and Mary Simons Gibson. His father was a Scottish-born bank cashier.

Mr. Gibson received his preliminary education from private tutors and completed courses in the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques in Paris in 1907. His first post in the Foreign Service was that of secretary at the legation in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, in 1908.

From 1911 to 1913 he was secretary at the legation in Havana.

After service in Belgium and at other posts, during World War I, Mr. Gibson became first secretary to the United States Embassy in Paris toward the close of the war. He left this post in 1918 when Congress appropriated \$100 million to establish the American Relief Administration to provide food for certain European countries. He served as director general of this organization, of which Mr. Hoover was chairman. In the 8 months between the end of the fighting and the signing of the final treaty of peace, Mr. Gibson and Mr. Hoover had distributed nearly 5 million tons of foodstuffs.

In addition to his duties with Mr. Hoover, Mr. Gibson served on an interallied commission that made the first post-World War I

report on the condition of the war-ravaged Balkans.

In 1919 Mr. Gibson was appointed Minister to Poland, a post that called for more relief administration work than diplomacy during the formative years of the new republic.

From 1924 to 1927 Mr. Gibson was Minister to Switzerland, then a key post because of the presence in Geneva of the headquarters of the League of Nations.

In this and other similar duties, Mr. Gibson took a lead in movements to reduce armaments, but these efforts for the most part were not entirely successful. In that same year he was chairman of the United States delegation to the Conference for Limitation of Naval Rearmament, which had wider, if more controversial, results.

He returned to Belgium as Ambassador in 1927. He held this position until 1933 and was returned to it by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1937. He retired from the post the next year.

In the period between his two terms as envoy to Belgium, Mr. Gibson was Ambassador to Brazil. While in this post, he served as the United States representative on a mediation group that ended the 7-year-old Chaco war between Bolivia and Paraguay.

Mr. Gibson retired from the Foreign Service in 1938. His long experience in relief work later resulted in his appointment to the migration committee.

In 1921 Mr. Gibson married Mlle. Ynés Reyntiens, a daughter of Maj. Nicholas Reyntiens, of the Belgian Army. She was a maternal granddaughter of the seventh Earl of Abingdon of England. Mrs. Gibson died on March 19, 1950.

HOOVER LAUDS GIBSON—PRAISES HIM AS A "GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT"—DULLES IN TRIBUTE

Former President Herbert Hoover yesterday termed Hugh S. Gibson "one of America's great public servants."

"He was a man of complete integrity and devotion to our country," Mr. Hoover said. "He was trusted all over the world. His election to his present position as director of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration by the representatives of a score of nations is but an indication of that trust."

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY

WASHINGTON, December 12.—John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, said he was deeply grieved by the news of Mr. Gibson's death, saying Mr. Gibson had been a close personal friend for many years.

"Mr. Gibson was a man of unusual personal charm and wit and endeared himself to a wide circle of friends," Mr. Dulles said.

"The American people will, I know, regret the passing of this great American who served his country under the most difficult conditions with distinction and honor."

LANE HAILS FORMER CHIEF

Arthur Bliss Lane, who was United States Ambassador to Poland, 1944-47, and who previously had served under Mr. Gibson when the latter was Minister to Poland, said:

"The regrettable passing of Hugh S. Gibson creates a grievous chasm in human achievement. He had a wit and brilliant intelligence which were outstanding. He had also the adventurous quest of goals to conquer."

HUGH GIBSON

Hugh Gibson, who died yesterday in Geneva, Switzerland, at the age of 71, was not only a distinguished career diplomat, he might also be called a career humanitarian. Whether the enterprise at hand was the vain one of trying to save Edith Cavell from a German firing squad in the First World War, or ending the war in the Chaco, or administering vast war or postwar relief projects; whether it was working for disarmament or considering, as in one book he

did, "The Problems of Lasting Peace"; whether it was representing his own Government with effectiveness and dignity or directing a committee for finding new homes for refugees and migrants—the work on which he was engaged when he died—Hugh Gibson gave to the task a brilliant mind, a deep understanding of other persons and nations and a profound sympathy.

Never advertising his own virtues or achievements, always giving himself unselfishly and single mindedly, he was not in his later years much in the public eye. He took his joy in the useful work he was able to do, and it was his good fortune to go on doing it to the very day of his death.

[From the New York Times of December 14, 1954]

rites for Gibson Tomorrow

GENEVA, December 13.—Western diplomats assembled in the Chateau de Genthod today to pay their last respects to Hugh S. Gibson, former American diplomat. Mr. Gibson died yesterday in his Geneva lakeside home of a heart attack at the age of 71. A funeral service will be held in the Roman Catholic Church of Notre Dame in Geneva at 11 a. m. Wednesday. Mr. Gibson will be buried in Geneva.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of December 13, 1954]

HUGH GIBSON

Hugh Gibson, who has just died in Geneva at the age of 71, was one of the most devoted, energetic, and resourceful emissaries America ever sent forth into the world of diplomacy. He once referred to himself as a diplomat who did "not wear spats." He might have said with equal accuracy that he was a diplomat who was not afraid to roll up his sleeves, and a human being whose concern was for people as well as for nations. When to these traits were added his capacity to make friendships, his abilities as an organizer and his talents as a writer, a picture of Mr. Gibson's unusual attainments began to emerge.

From 1914 to 1938 hardly a great event in international affairs took place in which Mr. Gibson did not play some part. As secretary of the American Legation in Brussels in 1914 he did what he could to mitigate the effects of warfare upon the populace, and his strenuous efforts on behalf of Edith Cavell, the English nurse executed by the Germans, brought him wide notice. Later on he represented America in many countries, holding the ambassadorships to Switzerland, Belgium, and Brazil. A close friend of President Hoover, he continued in the diplomatic service under President Roosevelt, retiring in 1938.

Although he left the diplomatic service years ago, Mr. Gibson never ceased his efforts to bring help and hope to the international scene. Since 1951 he had been director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, organized by 20 nations. He was in the midst of work on its behalf when he collapsed, dying as he had lived, in the service of his fellowmen.

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 14, 1954]

HUGH S. GIBSON

When news of the death of Hugh S. Gibson came to Washington on Sunday, there must have been many whose minds flashed back to 39 years ago and one of the great stories of all time—the execution of Nurse Edith Cavell by the Germans in Brussels, October 12, 1915. He was among the Americans who strove in vain to save her. The memory abided with him all the rest of his days, and it influenced him toward noble humanitarian achievement.

Mr. Gibson was already a career Foreign Service officer when World War I started. He

was Herbert Hoover's principal lieutenant in the Belgian relief work. Later he was United States Minister successively to Poland, Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg, Brazil, and again Belgium and Luxembourg. He represented his country also at the London Naval Conference, the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and the Buenos Aires Mediators Conference which settled the Chaco War. The last task of his life was that of directing the enterprises of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, finding new homes outside Europe for thousands of displaced individuals and families.

A small, frail, gray man, Mr. Gibson always was immersed in his job. His sympathies were boundless, and he never was too heavily burdened to accept additional responsibilities. The clarity and efficiency of his mind were demonstrated in his books on foreign affairs, in some of which he had Mr. Hoover as his collaborator. But his outstanding quality was his consecrated spirit. He was selfless in his devotion to humanity, and for that especially he is entitled to grateful remembrance.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE HUGH S. GIBSON BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE ICEM AFTER HIS RELECTION AS DIRECTOR ON NOVEMBER 30, 1954

Honorable members of the council, I thank you most sincerely for the honor you have bestowed upon me by electing me to continue as Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration under its constitution.

It is an honor which I highly appreciate. The Committee has become part of my life, and is my chief and constant personal concern.

I have an unbounded faith in its value to mankind and in its vast potentialities.

Long and varied experience of international bodies has made me realize that this is the most constructive organization for close and fruitful collaboration between governments of free sovereign states on an expanding scale of membership and activities.

It is bound to succeed in the accomplishment of its task, being firmly based on the community of interests of all its members—that most sound but so rare foundation of mutual understanding and coordination of efforts.

The coming into force of the constitution marks the beginning of a new era in the Committee's history. It provides the hitherto missing element of stability, indispensable to future development by means of expanded services and of more definite long-range planning. It comes at a time when past experience allows the member governments more competently to appraise the Committee's effectiveness and more confidently to plan its future.

A new chapter of the Committee's history is about to open.

The final draft of the constitution was adopted on October 19, 1953, by the sixth session of the Committee in Venice. Considering the wide variety of legislative procedures of the 16 governments who have now ratified it and made possible its coming into force, and the vast volume of legislation on problems of urgent importance which their respective parliaments have been faced with, it is gratifying to note that this constitution should have been officially accepted by so many governments in so short a time. It shows their interest in the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, in its stabilization and its future development. I am particularly happy that Chairman CHAUNCEY W. REED, who so ably presided over the adoption of the constitution in Venice, and steered it through the legislative procedures of the United States Congress to its final enactment by the United States Government, is present here

today. I am sure that we all regard the eminent chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary in a sense as the father of this document which is so important to the Committee. I express the fervent hope that the acceptance of the constitution by the remaining member governments will soon follow and that, fortified by the increased stability provided by its constitution, the Committee will attract the governments of other interested countries to join its membership, thereby expanding the scope of its effective international collaboration.

THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a concurrent resolution declaring that it be the sense of the Congress that the United States Mission to the United Nations should take all possible steps expeditiously to bring about a consideration by the United Nations of the applicability of the principle of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, on the agenda of the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, there appeared as item 62 for consideration by the General Assembly:

Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus.

On December 17 of last year, the General Assembly, by a vote of 50 to 0, with 8 abstentions, approved the following resolution:

The General Assembly, considering that, for the time being, it does not appear appropriate to adopt a resolution on the question of Cyprus, decides not to consider further the item entitled "Application, under the auspices of the United Nations, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus."

I have constantly supported the United Nations and United States participation in that organization. I feel, however, that this decision to take no action now when it is so crucially needed strikes a blow at justice and the principle of self-determination. This is all the more so when we consider that over 80 percent of the population of this island in the Mediterranean are Greek. It has always been inhabited by Greeks. In 1878, the British administration, under the nominal sovereignty of the Sultan, succeeded the Ottoman domination. In November 1914 Cyprus was annexed to the British Empire, and in 1925 the Government of the United Kingdom made the island a crown colony.

Today, in Cyprus—

As stated in the letter of the President of the Council of Ministers of Greece to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, under date of August 16, 1954—one of the most ancient cradles of western civilization, the colonial status still survives,

imposed on a people whose destiny has been linked with the cause of freedom.

The failure on the part of the United Nations to assume its moral responsibility to act on an issue which is being watched by the entire world is particularly difficult to comprehend when it is recalled that one of the cardinal principles of the United Nations is "to develop friendly relations among nations based on the respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

One of the encouraging results of our foreign-aid program has been the revival of Greece into a strong member of the free world alliance and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Greeks have done a magnificent job in restoring their country to a position of strength in a vital area of the world. In this area and elsewhere the Communists are steadily at work, through constant attempts at subversion and through their insidious propaganda. To deny Cyprus its self-determination gives aid and comfort to the Communists in their propaganda drive.

Cyprus is relatively small. Its population is only 520,000, but the issue is a large and important one. It is the issue of colonialism versus self-determination. Have we learned nothing from Indochina? Are we learning nothing from North Africa? The strong feeling aroused by United Nations failure to act has resulted in civil disorder and riots in Cyprus and Greece.

On August 14, 1941, there was issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom a Declaration of Principles, known as the Atlantic Charter. The third principle of the Atlantic Charter contains a declaration of respect for "the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live." The British victory in the United Nations over the small island of Cyprus is a denial and mockery of a principle to which she has pledged herself in the Atlantic Charter.

The vote in the General Assembly has been described by the British representative to the United Nations, Anthony Nutting, "as a great and important victory for commonsense." Mr. Speaker, this is not my concept of commonsense, common decency, or common justice, and I know it is not the American concept. I hope, therefore, that as expressed by the Greek representative to the United Nations, "Very soon the United States Government will be back to its traditional policy for the principle of self-determination" and that our delegation to the United Nations will press this matter at every possible opportunity.

Cyprus is not a local colonial squabble; it is an international matter of the highest importance involving, in the final analysis, the security of the United States.

AMENDING THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard President Eisenhower's special message to the 84th Congress outlining his foreign-trade policy.

The cornerstone of the President's foreign-trade program, in my opinion, will be the section to amend the Trade Agreements Act. Briefly, this legislation will give the President the power to negotiate to reduce annually those tariffs which he believes should be reduced in the country's best interest by 5 percent each year for the next 3 years, and it will provide for a 3-year extension of the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements.

I concur wholeheartedly with the administration's philosophy in its foreign-trade program.

I feel that the 84th Congress should let the world know what our future trade policy is to be, that the economic policy of the United States—where we stand and in what direction we are going—must be known soon by our friends of the free world so that they can plan their economic future and enact legislation to implement the policies they must adopt.

I feel that unless the 84th Congress enacts the President's Trade Agreements Act the United States will be seriously handicapped in its role as leader of the free world.

Failure to act would be to play directly into the hands of the Kremlin and would effectively undermine our efforts to halt the flow of strategic material to the Soviet bloc.

In the Republican 83d Congress I was glad to introduce the bill to carry out the President's program. This Congress is controlled by the Democrats. Fortunately, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is in agreement with the President on foreign-trade legislation. He has also introduced a bill to implement the program. By introducing my bill again, I am pleased to give my endorsement to the President's program. I believe that a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives will also endorse this worthwhile legislation when they are called to vote on it on the floor of the House of Representatives.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENT ESCAPE CLAUSES (PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 6 (b) OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1951)—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 64)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was

read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 72, 73), I hereby submit to the Congress a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing trade agreements.

This report was prepared for me by the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1955.

(Enclosure: Report on Trade Agreement Escape Clauses.)

THE ROSE SHOULD BE OUR NATIONAL FLOWER

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution to designate the rose as the national flower of the United States. An identical resolution is being introduced in the Senate by the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

The United States is the only major country in the world without a national flower, and I feel we should add this symbol to the national identification of the United States. The rose has long represented courage, loyalty, love and devotion, and has become an international symbol of peace.

I am told that recent opinion polls show roses to be the overwhelming favorite of the American people. This year it is estimated that more than 75 million roses will be sold in the United States to persons who will wear them—as I am doing today—or give them to others, or use them to beautify their homes. Some 30 million American gardeners and housewives grow roses each year, and public parks in virtually every major city in the country cultivate rose gardens for the benefit and enjoyment of the public.

THE PRESIDENT'S SECURITY PROGRAM HITS PAY DIRT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it always seems to be more newsworthy to attack a program or a person than to defend. A case in point is the new security program instituted by this administration which has been attacked by the extremists on both sides.

A man by the name of Joseph Petersen, a former code expert in the National

Security Agency, has just been sentenced to 7 years in prison for espionage. It has now been revealed that the way he was caught was by means of a routine check under the new security program instituted by President Eisenhower.

Here was a very serious security risk who had been working for the Government for years and who would still be on the payroll today, undetected and unapprehended, had this administration not acted promptly and vigorously.

There are bound to be mistakes made in the administration of any such program, but let us remember this Petersen case before indulging in too violent criticism.

One of Washington's most alert and able journalists, Jack Steele, of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, is the enterprising reporter who has dug into the facts and disclosed the manner in which Petersen was caught. Under leave granted, there follows his column as it appeared in the Washington Daily News:

A ROUTINE CHECK

(By Jack Steele)

Joseph Sidney Petersen, Jr., the former National Security Agency code expert sentenced to 7 years in prison for espionage, was caught as a direct result of the Eisenhower administration's security program.

The fact that Petersen was apprehended through the operations of the security program—which is now under heavy Democratic fire—was not disclosed when he was indicted or sentenced.

He pleaded guilty to passing code secrets to a foreign power.

A Defense Department spokesman confirmed today that the first leads in the case came from a routine reinvestigation of Petersen.

Military intelligence agents making this security check came across the first evidence of Petersen's activities.

Since the leads pointed to possible espionage, the Defense Department called in J. Edgar Hoover and turned the case over to the FBI.

The FBI then made the full investigation which led to Petersen's arrest and indictment.

Under the security program, the Defense Department has jurisdiction over the National Security Agency. The Agency's super-secret code and communications work is mainly for the military services.

The Department spokesman said military intelligence agents were convinced Petersen was a "lone wolf" and was not linked with any espionage ring.

Federal Judge Albert Byran, in sentencing Petersen yesterday, said the former code expert had "deliberately violated the trust and confidence placed in him by our country."

Judge Bryan was permitted to examine in private some of the information Petersen admitted having turned over to a Dutch military attaché.

He said passing two of the documents "could have led to very, very serious consequences for the security of the United States."

Petersen insisted he had pleaded guilty to safeguard "the security of the Nation," noting that a trial might have led to public disclosure of the secret documents.

Petersen's attorney also contended that two documents stamped "top secret" were grossly overclassified.

Judge Bryan conceded that Petersen's confession and his cooperation with the FBI and intelligence officers after his arrest were extenuating circumstances.

But he said that did not soften Petersen's deliberate leak of secret information which

might have had terrific consequences to United States security.

The 40-year-old clerk faced a possible maximum sentence of 10 years in prison and a \$10,000 fine. The Government withdrew two other espionage counts in return for his guilty plea.

Disclosure that the Petersen case was uncovered through the security program came as this program was under heavy criticism for the Agriculture Department's firing of Wolf Ladejinsky, the Department's attaché in Tokyo.

LOWERING OF TARIFFS ON TEXTILES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] in strongly protesting to the President any reduction or any lowering of tariffs on textiles.

I appeared before the Tariff Commission a few weeks ago when the cotton manufacturers had a hearing and also appeared on the same day before the Committee on Reciprocity protesting the lowering of the tariffs on cotton and woolen textiles.

May I remind the Members of the House that we had the same battle some years ago prior to the war with Japan against that country's tremendous increase in the volume of cotton textiles being brought into the country. The great volume of importations did not elevate the low standard of living in Japan or change its general economic condition. These importations did however come very close to breaking the back of the American textile industry. It did threaten ruination to many of our communities. The allowing of these textiles to come into our country did not prevent war and it would be well for us to keep this fact very firmly in mind.

A day or so ago one of our excellent newspaper reporters informed me the Pentagon is now authorizing the purchase of and is actually buying woolen and cotton underwear from Japan for our servicemen in the armed services. I am checking on this report to discover if this is actually the fact. It would be a rather horrible situation if we permitted the unemployment of people of our own country in order to help other countries reduce and avoid unemployment. We have sacrificed billions of our substance to rehabilitate other nations some of whom were enemies in World War II. Must we now sacrifice our skilled labor here at home and sacrifice our standard of living? We have generously provided the capital for these countries to purchase new, modern, up-to-date textile machinery for their new plants which we also built. Must we now give them our domestic market and force our own industries into oblivion? Is this sound economics for our country? Certainly it is the contrary. It is unsound economics and un-

sound thinking. Based upon sound economic thinking this proposal to reduce the tariffs on textile importations cannot be supported. I am completely opposed to any reduction. Our textile industry needs protection and adequate protection if it is to survive in world competition without a reduction in the American standard of living. I have been a Member of Congress for quite a number of years and I do not intend to stand by and see the great American textile industry ruined and used as a pawn for temporary political favor on the international chessboard of politics. Instead I intend to fight.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today and 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 4 to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 143), is amended, effective December 31, 1954, by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, but who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission. If such person returns to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), he shall, from and after such change of status, receive the same compensation as a person originally appointed to the Commission from private life."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have cleared this with the minority leader. The prime purpose of this resolution, which has passed the Senate, is to enable the former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson, who has been a member of the Commission, to continue as a member. Of course, it is a wise thing, if any others are affected, to have it apply to them, because they have been on the Commission for months, and we will have the benefit of their studies and their experiences rather than to put a new man on. So, that is the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not insist on the passage of this resolution now. I would like to say something about it when it comes up. I

am opposed to it not because of the gentleman from Michigan because I like Senator Ferguson very much and my objections do not concern Senator Ferguson personally. But, it is a matter of principle that is involved. I do not like the resolution in so far as it sets a new precedent and I would like to say something against it when it comes up regularly.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that there is no partisanship connected with it. If Mr. Ferguson was not permitted to continue on the Commission, another Republican would be named. That being the case, why is it not good judgment to permit one to continue who has had experience, for several months longer?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman would like me to go into it more fully, I will be very glad to do so. It dates back to the time when Mr. Truman was President. The idea was sold to him that there should be a bipartisan commission, and Mr. Truman sponsored it. He was for it. He asked that the Commission be appointed, that a bill be passed by the Congress creating it, and then Mr. Hoover was made Chairman of the Commission on the theory that it would be bipartisan; that a Democratic President would select an outstanding Republican Chairman of the Commission, and then they had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans on the Commission so as to show it was bipartisan. Well, later on under this administration it was recreated, but instead of the President selecting an outstanding Democrat, a member of the opposite party to be the head of it like President Truman did, Mr. Hoover was reappointed, and instead of having an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, I think you will find that there is a larger number of Republicans. Now, questions like that are questions I want to look into and have something to say about it when it comes up. In fact, the Legislative Branch of the Government should not delegate its power, anyway. I am opposed to that part of it. We should not farm out our legislative duties. We are in reach of the people. They can reach us through their votes as intended under our Constitution and laws.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is opposed to the Commission, is that it?

Mr. PATMAN. They cannot reach the Hoover Commission.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman, as I understand, is opposed to the Commission.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to find out about the status of the membership and personnel to make sure it is bipartisan as intended and I want to give further consideration to this proposed new policy of permitting a Member of Congress to continue his legislative powers after he is no longer a Member of Congress.

The Hoover Commission has unusual legislative powers. It can even present bills for Congress to consider.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman indicates that he might object?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 1815, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. DURHAM; the gentleman from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PRICE; the gentleman from Texas, Mr. KILDAY; the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. DEMPSEY; the gentleman from New York, Mr. COLE; the gentleman from California, Mr. HINSHAW; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN ZANDT; and the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. PATTERSON.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND GATHERING OF NATURAL GAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, the production and gathering of natural gas within the gas-producing States has recently been subjected to centralized Federal regulation for the first time in history.

This resulted from a decision of the United States Supreme Court. The case is known as the Phillips Petroleum case, and is reported as Phillips Petroleum Co. against Wisconsin in 347th United States reports, page 672. Prior to this decision, the independent companies engaged in the production and gathering of natural gas had planned and conducted their business under the careful regulation of State conservation commissions without interference from Washington. However, the Phillips decision interprets the Natural Gas Act of 1938 so as to give the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the sale of natural gas by independents, to interstate carriers. The Federal Power Commission itself had previously decided that it possessed no such jurisdiction. The Commission's decision had been made after the taking of 10,000 pages of testimony, and was reflected in a well-thought-out decision with only one Commissioner dissenting.

Natural gas comes both from wells which produce only natural gas and from oil wells as the gas adjoining or dissolved in the oil deposit is released as the oil comes up out of the well. In both cases, the natural gas instead of being stored near the well as is sometimes the case with oil, is piped directly away unless there is no market for the particular well, in which case gas is flared off by being burned. When gas is sold, it passes through a meter by which it is measured and goes then to the pipelines of a concern which gathers and resells it to an interstate pipeline company. The

gathering company may also produce its own gas and gather it for similar resale.

The Phillips Petroleum Co., although a large oil company, also produces, gathers, processes, and sells natural gas. It sells its own natural gas and also natural gas produced by others. The gas which it buys is approximately 50 percent of the gas sold by Phillips Petroleum Co. The Supreme Court case did not concern itself with the oil operations of the company, but only with its natural-gas operations.

Phillips is known as an "independent" natural-gas producer in that it does not engage in the interstate transmission of gas from the producing fields to consumer markets and is not affiliated with any interstate natural-gas pipeline company. (*Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 674-675).)

Phillips sells gas to five interstate pipeline transmission companies. These interstate carriers transport the gas to consumer markets in which they resell it to consumers and to local distributing companies located in 14 different States. The Phillips gas flows from the wells "through a network of converging pipelines of progressively larger sizes to 1 of 12 processing plants, where extractable products and impurities are removed." Two of these systems are located in two States. Each of the remaining 5 is located in only 1 State.

After processing is completed, the gas flows from the processing plant (which is owned by Phillips) through an outlet pipe, of varying lengths up to a few hundred feet, to a delivery point where the gas is sold and delivered to an interstate-pipeline company. The gas then continued its flow through the interstate-pipeline system until delivered in other States.

The Natural Gas Act, as enacted in 1938, provided in section 1 (b) as follows:

The provisions of this act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption for domestic, commercial, industrial, or any other use, and to natural-gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale, but shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making a very fine statement concerning an act which has been important to the gas industry and to decisions of the Supreme Court. Does it not boil itself down to this, that under the Phillips Petroleum Co. case, contrary to anything that had ever been anticipated, the Federal Government is controlling the natural gas production right at the wellhead? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. IKARD. The distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma is exactly right. As I will attempt to develop here, that is something that was not in any way intended by the Congress at the time of the enactment of the Natural Gas Act, and it is beyond the farthest dreams of those people that considered it.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine statement he has made.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it fair to say that there are but 2 bases on which we might justify control, 1 being the interstate character of the movement from the gathering plants, from the point where Phillips sells his gas to some distant consumer in some other State? That is the basis on which the Federal Gas Act was passed and justified, was it not?

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. Then, as I understand it, there is the theory that public utilities or a monopoly should be regulated by government, but we have generally agreed that if there were not an interstate movement there the regulation should be by the States. Does the gentleman agree that that is generally sound?

Mr. IKARD. I do.

Mr. POAGE. In this case there is not even any natural monopoly or public utility feature involved, is there?

Mr. IKARD. That is right. One other thing is that most public utilities are thought of as operating in an area where speculation has been removed.

Mr. POAGE. And where there is a guaranteed return.

Mr. IKARD. Certainly, as the gentleman well knows, there is probably no more speculative business in the country today than the search for and development of natural gas.

Mr. POAGE. I cannot think of a more hazardous undertaking than going out and trying to find the gas and produce the gas. Once the gas is produced and is moved in commerce, after it gets into interstate commerce, it ceases to be a speculative undertaking, because there is a return at the end and that is known, and the amount of gas coming in and the amount coming out and the prices are all known. But these people producing gas have no knowledge of whether they are going to get gas or not when they drill. They have no monopoly in the production because if you have land that is suspected of being productive of gas you can sell it to the highest bidder.

Mr. IKARD. Yes. They not only have no assurance they are going to get gas, but the odds are something like 6 to 10 against them that they will not get it.

Mr. POAGE. So there is neither the interstate character nor the utility character present that would justify any Government regulation of the business of producing gas. Is that right?

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. It might also be said, and I am sure the gentleman will agree, that about 85 percent of all the drilling for oil and gas is done by what might be termed the small-business man in the oil and gas business. In other words, the small, independent operator goes out to search for oil and gas, and

6 times out of 10 he misses. He must find an area where oil and gas can be produced. Then what happens? The major companies move in and develop it. Is that not the history of the oil and gas industry?

Mr. IKARD. I think it is important here to understand we are not talking about tremendous companies and combines, but we are talking about small, independent businessmen like the corner merchant, or somebody like that, people who are relatively small and who are in a business that has a high mortality rate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At the present time do the public utilities commissions, as for instance in the State of Michigan, have anything to do with or have any jurisdiction over the sale of gas in the State of Michigan which comes in from Texas?

Mr. IKARD. I am not sure I understand the gentleman's question, but did I understand him to ask if this had anything to do with the gas which goes into Michigan from Texas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. IKARD. We are not talking here about the authority of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the movement of natural gas in interstate commerce which would affect the thing that the gentleman is talking about. What we are talking about here is the right of the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of gas from the initial producer at the well head, which is entirely different. We are talking about something here which represents about 10 percent of the cost of your gas in Michigan. So you see, I really think, if you did away with the producer entirely, in other words, if the people in Michigan got their gas free, it would not affect the price that they pay a great deal, because about 90 percent of the cost of the gas is laid down up in this part of the country which goes into transmission, distribution, gathering, and that sort of thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to compliment the gentleman on the statement that he is making. I have the honor to represent a large oil- and gas-producing district. There is no issue which confronts our industry at the present time which is more important than the one to which the gentleman is addressing himself. I hope the gentleman will acquaint the whole country with the vital issues involved.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman very much.

Section 4 of the Natural Gas Act authorizes the Federal Power Commission to regulate the "rates and charges made, demanded, or received by any natural-gas company for or in connection with the transportation or sale of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Com-

mission." And a natural-gas company is defined as "a person engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or the sale in interstate commerce of such gas for resale"—section 2 (6).

The Phillips Petroleum case involved one question which concerned the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and involved a dispute as to whether "the rates charged by a natural-gas producer and gatherer in the sale in interstate commerce of such gas for resale" are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

Phillips admitted that it had engaged in "the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale." Although that admission would bring it within a phrase in the first part of the Commission's jurisdictional charter, it did not bring it within the definitive last part of the section. The admission was properly made in view of earlier decisions of the United States Supreme Court—*Interstate Natural Gas Co. v. Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682, 687-689; and *Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. v. Calvert* (347 U. S. 157, 166-168).

However, Phillips contended that it was exempted from the jurisdiction of the Commission by the latter part of section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act which provided that the provisions of the act "shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the facilities used for such distribution or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

The petitioner particularly emphasized its contention that its sales are part of the "production or gathering of natural gas" to which the Commission's jurisdiction does not extend, according to the express language of the last part of section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act.

The producers and gatherers of natural gas had since 1938 conducted their business on the justified assumption that the independent production and gathering of natural gas were not subject to Federal regulation, even though the gas was sold to interstate pipeline transmission companies whose operations were subject to the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction.

As is pointed out by the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas, the hearing and debates in Congress on the bills which evolved into the Natural Gas Act were concerned with interstate pipelines, not with independent producers of gas.

These hearings gave little or no consideration to any need for regulating the sales by independent producers to the pipelines. The case of *Columbian Fuel Corp.*, second FPC, pages 200, 207—exempted from regulation an independent producer of gas which Mr. Justice Douglas said was in all material respects comparable to Phillips Petroleum Co. As he pointed out, that decision was made by officials intimately familiar with the background and history of the Natural Gas Act. There was only one dissent even at that time. The Supreme Court Justice continued by saying:

That construction of the act by the Commission has persisted from that time (see

Billings Gas Co. (2 F. P. C. 288); the *Fin-Ker Oil and Gas Production Co.* (6 F. P. C. 92); *Tennessee Gas & Transmission Co.* (6 F. P. C. 98) down to its decision in the present case (10 F. P. C. 246).

That construction by the Commission, especially since it was contemporaneous (*United States v. American Trucking Assns.* (310 U. S. 534, 539)) and long continued (*Federal Power Commission v. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.* (337 U. S. 498, 513)), is entitled to great weight (347 U. S. at 689).

Regulation by the Federal Government of the price at which an independent producer sells his natural gas will bring all of his operations under Federal control because it is necessary as part of the machinery of regulation, to establish a rate base in the light of the expenses of all the operations of the company. As Mr. Justice Douglas concludes:

The effect is certain to be profound. The price at which the independent producer can sell his gas determines the price he is able or willing to pay for it (if he buys from other wells). The sales price determines his profits. And his profits and the profits of all the other gatherers, whose gas moves into the interstate pipelines, have profound effects on the rate of production, the methods of production, the old wells that are continued in production, the new ones explored, etc. Regulating the price at which the independent producer can sell his gas regulates his business in the most vital way any business can be regulated. That regulation largely nullifies the exemption granted by Congress (347 U. S. at 690).

Mr. Justice Clark also wrote a dissenting opinion with which Mr. Justice Burton concurred.

Clark took the position that the regulatory gap which the Natural Gas Act was intended to fill with Federal regulation was at the end of the interstate pipeline transmission between the pipeline company and the local distribution system; that it was not at the beginning of the interstate journey. He pointed out that the general language in the opinion which referred to the situation at the end might also seem to cover the situation at the commencement of the pipeline, but that it was not intended to do so and should not be construed to have done so. He emphasized that the majority brings every gas operator, from the smallest producer to the largest pipeline, under Federal regulatory control, contrary to the intention of the Congress, the understanding of the States, and that of the Federal Power Commission itself."

He adds:

By today's decision, the Court restricts the phrase "production and gathering" to "the physical activities, facilities, and properties" used in production and gathering. Such a gloss strips the words of their substance. If the Congress so intended, then it left for State regulation only a mass of empty pipe, vacant processing plants, and thousands of hollow wells with scarecrow derricks, monuments to this new extension of Federal power. It was not so understood. The States have been for over 35 years and are now enforcing regulatory laws covering production and gathering, including pricing, proration of gas, ratable taking, unitization of fields, processing of casinghead gas including priority over other gases, well spacing, repressuring, abandonment of wells, marginal area development, and other devices. Everyone is

fully aware of the direct relationship of price and conservation.

He points out that Phillips Petroleum Co. "performs no such middleman or transmission functions" as Interstate Natural Gas Co. had done—347th United States Reports, page 697—and concludes at 347th United States Reports, page 698:

In the words of Mr. Justice Jackson, we believe "that observance of good faith with the States requires that we interpret this act as it was represented at the time they urged its enactment, as its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it, viz, to supplement but not to supplant State regulation. (*Federal Power Commission v. East Ohio Gas Co.*, *supra*, at 490.)

The majority opinion was written by Mr. Justice Minton with whom Mr. Justice Frankfurter concurred in a separate opinion. The majority concluded that the finding of the Federal Power Commission that the sale was within the production or gathering of natural gas exemption was without adequate basis in law. This, in effect, nullified the expert deliberation which had gone into the collection and analysis of the 10,000 pages of testimony in the case before the Federal Power Commission. The majority of the Supreme Court held that production and gathering, in the sense that those terms are used in section 1 (b), end before the sales by Phillips occur. The majority opinion attempts to distinguish the *Columbian Fuel Corp.* case and to indicate that the subsequent decisions of the Federal Power Commission have not all been consistent.

In the Phillips case the Court relies heavily upon its earlier decision in *Interstate Natural Gas Co. v. Federal Power Commission* (331 U. S. 682). That company produced or purchased natural gas which it sold within the same State to three interstate pipeline companies. In that case, the Supreme Court said:

We have held that these sales are in interstate commerce. It cannot be doubted that their regulation is predominantly a matter of national, as contrasted to local concern. * * *. Unreasonable charges enacted at this stage of the interstate movement (of gas) become perpetuated in large part in fixed items of costs which must be covered by rates charged subsequent purchasers of the gas, including the ultimate consumer.

The earlier opinion noted that exceptions to the primary grant of jurisdiction in section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act are to be strictly construed.

The majority opinion in the Phillips case points out that petitioner attempts to distinguish the *Interstate Gas* case on the grounds "that the interstate company transported the gas in its pipelines after completion of gathering and was affiliated with an interstate pipeline company and therefore subject to Commission jurisdiction in any event." However, Mr. Justice Minton concluded that the Court has based its decision in the *Interstate* case "on the broader ground that sales in interstate commerce for resale by producers to interstate pipeline companies do not come within the 'production or gathering' exemption."

In answer to the petitioner's contention that Congress intended to regulate

only the interstate pipeline companies, the Court said that the act gave the Commission jurisdiction over either the transportation or over the sale for resale in interstate commerce of natural gas. It pointed out that this grant of power was in the disjunctive and added that the transportation and the sale could have been connected by the conjunctive word "and," and would thereby have required both the transportation and the sale by a company as the basis for the Commission's jurisdiction over the company and its transactions. The Court felt that the Congress had intended to give the Federal Power Commission control over "all wholesales of natural gas in interstate commerce."

The Court's opinion concluded—at 347th United States Reports, page 685:

Regulation of the sales in interstate commerce for resale made by a so-called independent natural-gas producer is not essentially different from regulation of such sales when made by an affiliate of an interstate pipeline company. In both cases, the rates charged may have a direct and substantial effect on the price paid by the ultimate consumers. Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of natural-gas companies was the primary aim of the Natural Gas Act. *Federal Power Commission v. Hope Natural Gas Co.*, supra at 610. Attempts to weaken this protection by amendatory legislation exempting independent natural-gas producers from Federal regulation have repeatedly failed, and we refuse to achieve the same result by a strained interpretation of the existing statutory language.

In a footnote to this statement it was said that:

Among the bills introduced in recent Congresses to restrict the existing jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over natural-gas producers are: H. R. 4051, 80th Congress, 1st session; H. R. 4099, 80th Congress, 1st session; H. R. 1758, 81st Congress, 1st session; and S. 1498, 81st Congress, 1st session.

In concurring with the majority, Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote a separate opinion emphasizing his view that the Court's construction of 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act was supported by what he called an authoritative gloss coming from the history of the act. It was his contention that the Natural Gas Act was intended to give the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over that part of the natural gas industry which the States were prohibited from regulating by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Mis-souri v. Kansas Gas Co.* (265 U. S. 298) and *Public Utilities Commission v. Attleboro Steam and Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83). He concluded that Congress "wrote the doctrine of the Attleboro case in the Natural Gas Act and said in effect that an Attleboro situation was to be taken over by Federal regulation and was not to be left to the fluctuation of adjudications under the commerce clause."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us if it is physically or economically possible for anybody to engage in the gathering of natural gas and to furnish the money necessary to gather the gas if he is not going to be allowed to sell it.

Mr. IKARD. They just are not going to do it.

Mr. POAGE. He cannot eat it, he cannot store it; consequently he has got to sell it.

Mr. IKARD. He cannot store it.

Mr. POAGE. And he has got to sell it to somebody who is going to move it; consequently it is perfectly clear that the decision of the Supreme Court completely nullifies any exemption for anybody gathering natural gas.

Mr. IKARD. Absolutely.

Mr. POAGE. He simply will have to sell it.

Mr. IKARD. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. There will be corrective legislation proposed before the present Congress and possibly by the gentleman from Arkansas who occupies the chair, who has studied this question very extensively. I am hopeful that corrective legislation will be enacted during this session.

Mr. IKARD. The gentleman from Arkansas who now occupies the chair is one of the best-informed men in the country on this question. I know there will be several bills introduced. I intend at some later date to introduce one myself and I know there are many others that will be introduced for consideration.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The history of this situation is that the Federal Power Commission originally refused to take jurisdiction of these people the gentleman is talking about. Then the Supreme Court came along and actually violated the substantial evidence rule in overruling the Federal Power Commission, did it not?

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. In other words, they have upheld these various bureaucratic ideas about bringing people under Federal control, but the first time one of the bureaus said it did not have control of somebody the Supreme Court reversed itself and took them in.

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is the situation we are facing and that is the reason we must have legislation on the subject to define it completely.

Mr. IKARD. The gentleman has touched upon a rather unique part of this. It is probably one of the few cases in history where a Federal commission or bureau has said, "We do not have jurisdiction," but the courts have made them assume it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would the passage of legislation such as the gentleman suggests be construed in any way as advising the Supreme Court that it should confine itself to the interpretation of laws that we enact rather than to itself legislate?

Mr. IKARD. I am afraid it does not have that purpose. It does, though, amend the act so that it may be subject

to just one interpretation and I think that would be that the Federal Power Commission did not have jurisdiction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then it would be in the way of an explanation to the Court as to what the Congress meant?

Mr. IKARD. Yes. Some people are sometimes fuzzy as to what the Congress intends.

In the light of the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case, the Federal Power Commission on July 16, 1954, issued an order with respect to the independent producers and gatherers of natural gas covered by the Court's decision. It was estimated that more than 4,000 of them would be included in this category. The new rules were made retroactive to June 7, the date of the Court's decision. They required sales contracts which were in effect on that date to be filed with the Commission by October 1, 1954. They also prohibited an increase in rates without their first being filed with the Commission so that any proposed increase could be suspended pending hearings and decision.

In addition, applications for certificates authorizing transportation and sale in interstate commerce were required to be filed by October 1. This was order No. 174. One of the Commissioners dissented from the issuance of this order on the grounds that it was ex parte, retroactive, and that it denied persons subject to it rights guaranteed them by the Natural Gas Act and by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us what the numerical division of the Court was in this decision?

Mr. IKARD. Five to three.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us how the Chief Justice voted on this matter, the present Chief Justice?

Mr. IKARD. He voted for the measure.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Bringing all these people under Federal control?

Mr. IKARD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Now, had he voted against that, we would not have this situation, would we?

Mr. IKARD. Well, that is true, yes.

On October 6, 1954, the Commission issued order 174-A which revised and superseded its order 174. Upon petition the Commission on September 8 scheduled oral argument on the revised order for September 22, in its offices in Washington, D. C. On September 24, the Commission modified its order 174-A by extending its deadline from October 1 to December 1, 1954, and by making certain clarifying amendments. Two companies subject to the order obtained stays from Judge Wayne G. Borah of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans, La., in cases brought by them for review of the Federal Power Commission's Order 174-A. These companies were Magnolia Petroleum Co. and the Ohio Oil Co. The stays were issued on November 15 and 16, respectively.

The General Counsel of the Federal Power Commission on November 23, 1954, published an opinion that those stays were effective only with respect to the two companies involved in those two suits, and that the Commission was therefore, under no restraint to refrain from further consideration of order 174-A as applied to other companies. Other companies are not seeking similar stays. The companies which obtained the stays are said to believe that the stay orders permit them to cancel their contracts with pipeline transmission companies under a clause authorizing cancellation in the event that the Federal Power Commission assumes jurisdiction of the company's sale of natural gas to the pipeline.

Proceeding under the Administrative Procedure Act, the Union Producing Co. obtained a temporary stay in the United States District Court, District of Columbia. On December 20, 1954, Judge Holtzoff refused the FPC's motion to dismiss, and, therefore, this case will go to trial on its merits, namely, that the plaintiff, as a producer of natural gas, is not subject to the Natural Gas Act, and on the further ground that the orders—174 and 174-A—are said to have been illegally issued.

On November 24 the Federal Power Commission announced that it expected to modify its order 174-A in order to afford such companies an opportunity to seek Court review of the order. The Commission nevertheless said that it anticipated substantial compliance with the order. The same Commissioner who dissented from the original order renewed his dissent in an opinion accompanying order 174-A.

On December 17, 1954, order 174-B was issued, which again amended 174-A. Although this new amendment made a few technical changes that eliminated some of the paper work required of the independent producer, it was of no benefit to him as far as basic regulation by the FPC is concerned. In fact, it provided for more regulation in that certain escalator clauses in sales contracts would not be recognized by the FPC after May 1, 1955.

The latest development in the series of actions the FPC has undertaken since June 7, 1954, is to set a hearing for January 11, 1955, in which the FPC will hear from producers, consumers, State regulatory bodies, and so forth, on the subject of Fixing of Rates To Be Charged by Independent Producers for Natural Gas Sold in Interstate Commerce for Resale—Consideration of Principles and Methods To Be Applied. In this connection, it is to be noted that while many independent producers will appear, still others will not appear because they take the position that in this instance the FPC is exceeding its jurisdiction as set out in the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case.

The Commission is following the policy of promptly enforcing the power given it by the Supreme Court in an across-the-board freeze of natural-gas prices, and of later giving consideration to the problems and views of the industry.

The Chairman of the Commission has said that the Commission was not con-

fined to any inflexible method of determining natural-gas prices, and would soon ask industry members, State commissioners, and representatives of consumer interests to submit suggestions. Although it is somewhat heartening to learn that the Commission is intent on listening to the views of those affected by its natural-gas price regulations, nevertheless, his statement emphasizes the powerful discretion lodged in the Commission to use its own judgment as to how the price of natural gas should be determined and what, in the final analysis, that price will be. No regulation has a more persuasive effect than price regulation, as those who were subject to OPA—as who was not—will well remember.

The Chairman of the Commission went on to say, in effect, that the necessity for financial rewards commensurate with the risks of exploring and developing natural-gas reserves will be recognized by the Federal Power Commission. "We intend to recognize this indisputable fact, in our ratemaking," he said. However cooperative this expression of goodwill may appear, it is not to be forgotten that price for risk taking, in our free-enterprise economy is determined in the market place. Only when risk becomes stabilized and there is little or no competition can one identify the enterprise as a public utility to be subjected to Government regulation.

The FPC order suddenly freezes prices and contractual terms retroactively as they were last June 7. An industry, particularly such a speculative one as the production of natural gas, is constantly in a state of flux. To freeze it suddenly brings its myriad units and its dynamic growth to a jarring halt.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Has the gentleman observed that there is considerable propaganda around over the country to the effect that if the Federal Government controls the price of natural gas at the gathering point or in the field, that they will receive cheaper rates for gas? Contrarily, is it not very reasonable to assume that if the small producers and gatherers of natural gas are controlled by the Federal Power Commission, it is going to have the effect of contracting the natural gas business to the point that a few corporations in the country will have control of the gathering and the distribution of natural gas and also that the lack of exploration, of discovering new reserves for natural gas, will be contracted and therefore, in the long run, mean that the consumer is bound inevitably to pay a higher price for his gas?

Mr. IKARD. That is exactly right. The effect of the order eventually will be to force out of business the small-business men who are the independent producers of natural gas and to concentrate these great natural reserves in the hands of a few tremendous companies, the result of which will be increased prices to the consumer. There is no question about that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say that I am listening with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks. At a later date I want to get some time of my own to speak on this subject extensively. In the meantime I want to say that in my judgment—and I have studied this question—the road we are following now, if it is unchecked, is going to lead to the nationalization of oil and gas and perhaps coal and perhaps other industries. So, I think we are making a serious mistake if we do not do something in the Congress to check the march that we are making down that road toward nationalization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I should like to remind the distinguished gentleman that there is another special order to follow.

Mr. IKARD. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the next special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman has 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I should be very glad to yield to the gentleman, because I should like to hear the finish of his discussion, if he is allowed to proceed without too many interruptions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman, that he be permitted to speak for an additional 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is making a very excellent presentation, and I do not want to interrupt except to say that I think he is performing a service to the House and to the country by presenting this issue early in the Congress. I hope, with him, that during the session favorable action may be taken to remedy this situation.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This question was asked by one of our colleagues from Texas a little while ago. It had to do with members of the Supreme Court and on which side they were. As I recall it, the gentleman asked about the Chief Justice. To get away from any partisan feeling or any implications of that kind, so that the gentleman can continue, I should like to suggest this. Is it not true that the Chief Justice is what is commonly known as a moderate progressive or a progressive moderate?

Mr. IKARD. I will say to the gentleman that my purpose here is not to indulge in shades of political definitions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not think it was.

Mr. IKARD. Gas producers, including such companies as Humble Oil & Refining Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Texas Co., Magnolia Petroleum Co., and Stanolind Oil & Gas Co. are refusing to contract more gas to interstate pipelines. One official of a major company is quoted as saying:

We are not offering any gas for sale in interstate commerce at this time.

This attitude on the part of producers is not a capricious one and warrants an explanation. It is not that the producers are going on a sit-down strike or that they are demanding higher prices for their gas. The answer lies in the simple, economic and practical fact that a producer cannot continue to sell, or contract to sell for long periods of time, his product when he cannot tell what price the FPC will allow him. All he wants is his contract price which in all instances is the fair field price or the prevailing market price at the time he sold. Very few producers completely finance themselves, and it is their bankers who must demand some certainty as to price. Therefore, the producing industry cannot continue to grow if the FPC regulates the producer in the manner as they now contemplate doing.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. If the Federal Power Commission may regulate the price of gas at the wells, what is to stop them from issuing an order to regulate the price of oil? That would be the next phase of the situation. I wonder if the gentleman would care to discuss that.

Mr. IKARD. I should like to say to the gentleman that I intend to discuss that in a very few moments. I think the gentleman's point is well taken, and I intend to say more about it in a few moments.

The effect of the Commission's order freezing gas prices at the wellhead has been practically to stop cold the industry's national expansion. The seven States in the South and Southwest which produce gas have been exporting to other parts of the country almost as much as they consume themselves. There were ambitious plans to supply other areas. These have been put on the shelf because of the order. Consequently, some communities which would soon have been supplied with natural gas will go without it. If this and other heating fuels are subjected to the kind of regulation enforced by this order, competition will stagnate, and lack of competition is the best way to exploit consumers. Contrast this result with what Mr. Justice Minton wrote in the Supreme Court's majority opinion:

Protection of consumers against exploitation at the hands of the natural gas companies was the primary purpose of the Natural Gas Act.

Much gas produced along with oil will be wasted by venting—or burning—if the State regulatory commissions, in the interest of conservation, do not prevent it. The State commission sometime shut

down oil wells to prevent wastage of gas. And, consequently, often the oil companies are willing to go to the expense of building gas pipelines to gather the gas, in order to be allowed to open their oil wells. This absorption of gas transportation cost by the profits of oil operations results in gas at low prices to consumers. If the gas operation were separated, as Federal regulation may force it to become, gas cost and so prices would have to rise; and Federal regulation might cause an increased gas price to consumers.

A conflict between State conservation policy and Federal price policy seems to be arising in Oklahoma where a minimum price for which gas can be produced has been set by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission in order to justify pipeline construction. The price was set at 9.8262 cents per thousand cubic feet and upheld by a United States circuit court of appeals on the ground that the State could set prices for conservation purposes. If there is conflict of views between State and Federal commissions as to what price is necessary to protect a natural resource and what price is necessary to satisfy demands of those who urge Federal regulation, how can the issue be resolved?

The States right to regulate the price charged by natural gas producers is involved in another case now on appeal in the United States Supreme Court by the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America. Two other pipeline companies, Panhandle Eastern and Michigan-Wisconsin, joined in the request for review of the order of the Oklahoma court upholding an Oklahoma Corporation Commission order fixing minimum prices for natural gas sold to interstate pipelines. If the idea of Federal domination and absolute control of this vital industry is carried out, then would not conservation of an essential natural resource suffer? If price does not justify building a pipeline to a gas field, will a State commission continue to bar wasting of gas? Certainly there could be no law to require a company to build a pipeline.

The Federal Government can and has exercised wide powers in many fields. It has been demonstrated time and time again that it can require men to do any number of things such as to serve in the military, or pay taxes, but I doubt if even the greatest advocate of Federal control of the gas industry would venture a prediction that even an all-powerful Federal Government could force anyone to hunt and explore for gas when the price of that product is unknown and undetermined. On the contrary, the regulations of the Federal Power Commission will certainly discourage producers to continue their never-ending search for new supplies of natural gas which are so essential to maintain an adequate supply at a fair price for our expanding economy.

There has been some respectable opinion to the effect that Federal control of the petroleum industry would mean cheaper prices for the consumer. This line of thinking is hard to follow, when it is a known fact that less than 10 percent of the price paid by the consumer for natural gas goes to the producer.

The rest of the price represents the cost of gathering, transportation, and distribution. In view of this, it can be readily seen that even if the producer made a gift of the gas to the consumer, the price would not be materially affected.

The production of oil and gas is so closely related that it is impossible to divorce one from the other. The production of gas is an integral part of oil production, and it certainly seems reasonable to assume that the next step that those who would impose dictatorial Federal control on the gas industry would be the regulation of the production of oil. What would happen if the policy of the Texas Railroad Commission might come into conflict with the policy of the Federal Power Commission? I am fearful that there are many who would argue long and loud that the policy of the Federal Commission would prevail if the policy established by the Commission is not changed by proper legislative action. We can all prepare ourselves for the Federal Power Commission to move in and take over the oil industry. No other conclusion can be reached, for the gas industry, which they now, under the doctrine of the Phillips case, has set out to control is such an integral part of oil recovery that forcing the separation of oil from gas by artificial regulation is not only uneconomical and wasteful but is also impossible from a practical point of view.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I think a study of the oil and gas business of the Nation shows they have to operate together to operate efficiently and furnish the country with plenty of their products at the lowest possible price.

I am a little alarmed to find the Supreme Court taking the position it has taken now, which is absolutely against the consumer, against the producer, for greater regulation, for more application of bureaucracy, and against a business that has been able to furnish oil and gas together to the people of the Nation in unlimited quantities of the finest possible grade at only a little more than it could be gotten for 20 years ago. In fact, if you took the taxes off oil today, it would have cost you 7 cents more 20 years ago than it does now, and they put this high-grade gasoline, which is a byproduct of oil, into your cars, service your cars, and wipe off the windshield. Yet we find certain people in Government that would stop the progress and turn the wheels back and interfere with these two great business organizations that have done so much not only for the defense of our country but for the industrial development and happiness and comfort and use of all of the American people. I hope a remedy can be found to override this decision of the Supreme Court. I shall be happy to support the gentleman in his efforts toward that end.

Mr. IKARD. I thank the gentleman very much. I know that he is probably one of the best-informed men in this body on the problems affecting the oil

industry. I am certainly glad to have his views.

Although the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission denies any intention to bring oil or other industries under the jurisdiction of the Commission, I think everyone would feel a lot better, and obviously we would all be safer from further encroachment of Federal authority, if an amendment to the Natural Gas Act were enacted clearly reflecting the intent of Congress as to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

It is my hope that this brief review of the complicated problems arising out of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips case has made clear the confusion that this decision and the subsequent actions under it by the Federal Power Commission has created in the production and gathering of natural gas. Effective public practices which have been developed over the years have been undermined. It should be repeated here that the production of natural gas does not possess the attributes of a public utility, and it is one of the most speculative and competitive enterprises in our whole American economy in which there exists not the slightest hint or suspicion of monopoly. Those engaged in this business face high odds against finding and bringing in paying fields of natural gas. They are not in any sense in that type of business which heretofore has been thought of as a public utility which requires Government regulation for the public good; however, they have effectively and increasingly been regulated in the public interest by State bodies which have kept close to the problems in properly developing gas fields. Are these effective working relationships between the State governments and private business to be permanently disrupted by a decision based on a forced interpretation of statutory language? Certainly the answer should be "No." It is necessary that Congress quickly consider and pass amending legislation which will clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and make clear that the producing and gathering of natural gas which Congress had intended to exempt from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission is really as a matter of fact exempt; that such producing and gathering is a matter of State concern which the Federal Government should let alone. I am introducing legislation that will have this effect, and it is my hope that many of you will join in urging immediate favorable action on this question by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following my announcement of the appointment of the majority whip and the remarks I made about the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, I may be permitted to include an exchange of letters between me and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CI—14

THE KOHLER STRIKE—A STRANGE WAY TO LESSEN UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a strange way to minimize unemployment. Let me read to you from an issue of the UAW-CIO News which, I think, came to the desk of all of us yesterday, Sunday.

Under a picture which, of course, cannot be printed in the RECORD, I find this: "Protest United States Strikebreaking—President Allan J. Graskamp of CIO Auto Workers Local 833 (right), presents to Bradley Welfare, Pentagon aide, petitions from 7,500 Sheboygan County, Wis., citizens protesting awarding of defense contract to strike-bound Kohler Co., near Sheboygan."

On page 9, of the same paper, at the top line, we find the following: "Long Strike in Tenth Month."

Then across the page—in large type—"Uncle Whiskers Gives Kohler Helping Hand."

I suppose "Uncle Whiskers" refers to Uncle Sam.

Then we have an article by Charles Baker, UAW-CIO publicity department, which reads this way:

The Kohler strike last week went into its 10th month.

Among the members of strikebound local 833 of the CIO Auto Workers, the feeling is growing that the biggest remaining obstacle to a just settlement is "Uncle Whiskers."

They point out that Federal laws and Federal action are the chief support to their tear-gas-loving employer.

For example: Since the approaching building season is the second in which Kohler Co. will not be a major factor in the construction market they should have real bargaining power. But the Defense Department has just put props under Kohler Co. by awarding it a \$2 million shell contract.

Kohler Co. spokesmen have admitted losing \$46,000 a day on the strike, but much of this can be absorbed by carry-back and carry-forward provisions of tax laws covering corporations.

Kohler Co. has been found guilty of violating National Labor Relations Board regulations. The company has refused to comply with NLRB order, and has it bottled up in the courts where it may remain for months.

The company is getting partial production, but only by recruiting scabs, most of them unskilled workers with no factory experience. While refusing to comply with NLRB suggestions that it bargain in good faith, the company is encouraged to continue its monumental strike-breaking effort by Taft-Hartley provisions enabling decertification votes by scabs only.

Few present-day locals have been subjected to the caveman tactics employed by Kohler Co. Its president, Herbert V. Kohler, admitted under oath that the use of tear gas (now removed from the plant) has his approval.

Traitors to the work force who led early (and unsuccessful) efforts to recruit a significant scab force from Kohler workers

were rewarded with fine new homes inside Kohler Village.

Other turncoats have been made deputies on the Kohler Village police force which has a tear gas supply which union attorneys contend is a clear violation of the law.

Kohler Co. has turned down a dozen attempts by State, local and Federal institutions to get it to bargain in good faith; has run to court more than a dozen times in efforts to hogtie the union.

The Kohler Co. president even threatened a man on the picket line with a billy club. (He was on the policymaking levels in the 1944 strike when the company's private army fired on a crowd, killing two persons and wounding 46.)

The Kohler situation is a striking example of how Federal laws are rigged against unions.

And how are the Kohler workers reacting to all this? Recently they voted 98.5 percent in favor of continuing their strike until they get a just contract.

And they'll get it.

The article in the same issue refers to certain correspondence. The first is a letter from Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, to Herbert V. Kohler, president of the Kohler Co., dated December 31, 1954, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 31, 1954.

HERBERT V. KOHLER,

President, Kohler Co.,

Kohler, Wis.:

I have been advised that the labor-management dispute between Kohler Co. and its employees which has been going on since April 5, 1954, has been characterized by flagrant and persistent violations of National Labor Relations Board orders and complaints issued under the Labor-Management Relations Act. I am further advised that union members in Kohler are intimidated by the fear that your company has built up an industrial munitions arsenal within the plant and that company policy in its relations with the union is predicated on a willingness to resort to use of such arms rather than to the collective-bargaining procedures which the Congress has established. I am further advised that our Federal tax law may be used by your company indirectly and in violation of the intent of those laws as a means of prolonging the dispute and as a strike-breaking weapon. Should these allegations have substance, I believe the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will most certainly want to investigate the situation at Kohler. Will you therefore please advise me immediately as to:

1. What quantities and types of industrial munitions if any, are or have been stored on the company premises at any time since the beginning of the current labor dispute on April 5, 1954?

2. Your company's policy with respect to the intended use of any such industrial munitions, including tear gas, during the current dispute?

3. If the Kohler Co. is losing \$46,000 a day in expenses because of the strike, as you are reported to have stated to the United States District Court in Milwaukee, what if any part of this \$13 million in strike costs, will your company attempt to recapture under the carryback-carryforward provisions of the tax law?

4. Why have you and other company officials rejected efforts to negotiate an agreement with the employees' recognized collective bargaining agent, including the proposal to submit the dispute to arbitration made by Gov. Walter J. Kohler?

JAMES E. MURRAY.

The answering letter reads:

DEAR SIR: Answering your day letter dated December 31, 1954, the advice you say you have received is completely erroneous.

1. The charge of "flagrant and persistent violations of the National Labor Relations Board orders and complaints" on the part of the company is absurd. No NLRB order has ever been issued in connection with the strike or events relating to it, so none could be violated.

As you should be aware, a complaint issued by the Board is not equivalent to conviction, and there can be no violation of a complaint.

A complaint, dated October 26, 1954, was issued by the regional office of the NLRB on charges filed by the union July 12, 1954, and is scheduled for hearing January 25, 1955. The complaint alleges unfair labor practices commencing in February 1954, but the charges were not filed by the union until 5 months later, as a last desperate expedient after a campaign of illegal coercion, mass picketing, and violence had failed.

2. No one has been intimidated by any action or threat of action by the company.

Many persons have been intimidated by the reign of terror carried on by the United Auto Workers—CIO since the first day of the strike, which has included assaults and beatings, some so brutal that the victims were hospitalized for extended periods and their recovery was in doubt; kidnapping, mass picketing, shotgun blasts into homes, picketing of homes, smashing of windows and paint bombings of homes and automobiles, slashing of tires, damaging of property with acid and chemicals, threats and coercion. There have been over 300 of these acts of violence and vandalism which still continue.

One UAW-CIO goon imported from Detroit is now serving a sentence in the State penitentiary for assault with intent to do great bodily harm, while another imported UAW-CIO goon is a fugitive from justice on a similar charge, and is being assisted by the union's lawyers in fighting extradition.

In answer to your specific questions:

1. The company has had armed guards since the beginning of the war, as was required by Government security regulations in connection with defense contracts.

During the early part of the strike there was stored on company premises 275 tear-gas shells and 2 guns for discharging them. This materiel was in the custody and control of a deputy sheriff, and the district attorney of Sheboygan County has determined, after investigation, that no law was violated in the possession or control of this tear gas.

2. The materiel was kept for the protection of the plant, including Government property for which the company was responsible, as well as the personal safety of persons lawfully in the plant. No one who did not contemplate an illegal assault on the plant or on persons lawfully in it has ever had any reason to fear the use of any means of plant protection.

Knowing, as all employees did and do, that the company had these protective responsibilities and had had armed guards long before the strike, the union made this a subject of questioning at a hearing before the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board in order to create a phony issue solely for publicity purposes. The hearing resulted in an injunction against the union for mass picketing and other violent, coercive, and illegal conduct during the strike.

There was reasonable cause for the company to apprehend an assault on its plant and make preparations to meet it, as shown by the following facts:

(a) From the first day of the strike the company's plant was besieged by a riotous mob, estimated by the union at as high as 2,500.

(b) The sheriff of Sheboygan County publicly expressed his inability or unwillingness to restore law and order, stating that he feared attempts to do so would lead to bloodshed.

(c) In 1934 the company experienced extensive damage to its plant and injury to the persons of its employees as a result of a riot during a strike.

(d) Invasions of plants have occurred during strikes conducted by this same union, the UAW-CIO. The CIO assault on the Shakespeare plant in Kalamazoo, Mich., resulted in brutal beatings of the personnel and made the plant a shambles.

The company intends to exercise its right to defend its plant and the safety of persons lawfully within it from any riotous and unlawful assault in the event that law-enforcement officers refuse or fail to do their duty.

3. The company has not stated that it is losing \$46,000 a day in expenses because of the strike.

In a proceeding in the United States District Court in Milwaukee last May, the company pointed out that it had been completely deprived of the use and occupancy of its plant by an illegal mass picket line from April 5.

It estimated this loss, based on insurance policies covering loss of use and occupancy from other causes, at \$46,000 per day.

The company's operations for the year 1954 cannot result in the application of the carryback-carryforward provisions of the tax law, since we operated at a net profit.

4. We have not rejected efforts to negotiate an agreement with the collective bargaining agent.

We executed a contract with the UAW-CIO in 1953 and have at all times been willing to execute another contract provided agreement could be reached as to its terms.

We have had 62 bargaining meetings, 47 of which were with the assistance of Federal conciliators, State conciliators, and other mediators, a total of over 260 hours.

We have refused, and will continue to refuse, to be coerced by illegal conduct of the union into agreeing to demands which we know to be against the best interests of the company and its employees.

We are enclosing herewith copy of our reply to Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr., which sets forth in full our reasons for rejecting his proposal that we give an arbitrator the authority to write a contract for us.

In summary, we refuse to divorce authority and responsibility by giving a person who has no experience with our business or responsibility for its successful operation the authority to prescribe vital elements of cost, including wages, fringe benefits, and working schedules, while we remain responsible for operating the business and providing employment.

The practice of bailing labor unions out of impossible positions in which their own rash demands and conduct have placed them has increased labor disputes, not decreased them.

If an investigation is undertaken by the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we shall insist that this company be given an adequate opportunity to present its case.

Such an investigation, to be impartial, must include the illegal and coercive conduct of the union beginning the first day of the strike and continuing to date.

Your telegram is merely a reshaping of propaganda the union has carried on for months and could well have been lifted from their publications.

That you intended it as propaganda is evidenced by the fact that it is the union that has given it to the newspapers and radio stations.

Accordingly, our reply is being made available to the channels of news distribution and will be given the widest possible publicity.

Very truly yours,

KOHLER CO.,
Per HERBERT V. KOHLER,
President.

Also I call attention to a letter written previous to that dated July 9, 1954, addressed to Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr. I have no knowledge as to whether Walter is related to Herbert, but in any event the letter is the company's answer to a proposition that an arbitrator be appointed to write the contract. The letter reads as follows:

GOV. WALTER J. KOHLER, JR.,
State of Wisconsin,
Executive Office, Madison, Wis.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge your letter of July 8, 1954, suggesting that we have an arbitrator make a contract for us with the UAW-CIO.

We are fully aware of the economic consequences of the strike at Kohler Co. It was the union which called this strike and must bear the responsibility therefor.

The economic and other consequences have been greatly aggravated by the fact that for eight weeks the plant was closed by an illegal mass picket line which by coercion and violence prevented employees who desired to come to work from doing so.

They have been further aggravated by the reign of violence and intimidation which still persists in this county despite the cease and desist order the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board issued against the union.

We believe this phase of the matter should be your proper concern as chief law enforcement officer of the State.

We are concerned not only with the immediate consequences of the strike, but with the long term effects upon the economic welfare of the company, the community, and the State, were we to submit to an improvident settlement under the pressure of illegal coercion.

Such a settlement would—

1. Impair the ability of the company to compete successfully and, in the long run, be to the detriment of its employees, the community and the State.

2. Insure that illegal violence and coercion would continue to be concomitants of strikes. We are convinced that so long as violence in connection with a strike is rewarded by favorable settlements, it will continue.

The offers which we have made to the union represent, in our considered judgment, the maximum which we can offer, giving due consideration to the future of the company as a producer and as an employer of labor.

In the past 2 years, since we have been dealing with this union, we have granted wage increases of 18 cents per hour, plus fringe benefits estimated by the union at an additional 6 cents per hour.

We have granted wage increases of 6 cents per hour in the past year.

Our wages, including our present offer to the union, exceed the average for Sheboygan, where the plant you head is located, by 43.4 cents per hour, and by \$23.30 per week.

Experience has shown that arbitration of the terms of a labor contract, or of wages, leads to settlements based on "peace at any price," which promote further labor unrest and do not result in any permanent solution.

As you are aware, one of the principal issues in dispute is the extent to which the judgment of an arbitrator having no knowledge of the business or its problems and no responsibility for its successful operation, should be substituted for the judgment of the management of the company.

We have agreed to arbitration on the application and interpretation of any contract we have made or may make.

We have refused to divorce authority and responsibility by giving an arbitrator the authority to manage the business while the responsibility for mistakes remains ours.

We will not grant to anyone, having no experience with the business and no responsibility for it, the ultimate authority to pre-

scribe such vital elements of cost as wages, working schedules, fringe benefits, etc.

One of the major demands of the union is for the union shop.

We have refused to coerce our employees to join a union against their will and will continue to refuse.

We will not give anyone the authority to order us to grant the union shop or other form of compulsory union membership.

We have been unable, even with the assistance of the mediation officers of both the State government and the Federal Government, to get this union to agree to terms which we can in good conscience accept.

We will not yield to any pressure to make a "peace at any price" settlement. This would assure that the union, having been rewarded for its rash and illegal conduct, would continue it and that we could look forward to continued trouble in the future.

The practice of bailing labor unions out of impossible positions in which their own rash demands and conduct have placed them has increased labor disputes, not decreased them.

We do not accept your suggestion that we turn the making of a contract and the decision as to wages over to an arbitrator.

You are so far wrong in your suggestion that our refusal to let an arbitrator write a contract for us will embarrass us before the public, that we shall see to it that the stand we have expressed in this letter gets the fullest publicity.

Sincerely,

HERBERT V. KOHLER,
President, Kohler Co.

The only statement I care to make in addition to this correspondence and what I have already said is that this is a very strange way to increase employment. If you will read the correspondence, of which I assume each and every Member of the House has a copy this morning, you will learn that that strike has been on for 10 months.

Of course, there is a great deal of unemployment. Because it needs the material, the Government—the Defense Department—proposes to award a contract for \$2 million for the production of defense material to Kohler, yet the president of the union who is presumed to represent the employees, protests the awarding of that contract to the company. Does he wish to put the company out of business? If he does, has he arranged for jobs for members of his union?

What his action means is this: If you are in business and I am your employee, and we cannot agree, I hope you fail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE and to include a statement.
Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG and to include a letter.

Mr. HOPE.

Mr. SCOTT in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROYHILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include an address by General Ridgway.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. MOULDER) for 10 days, on account of death in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 11, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the part of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes,' approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

208. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948 (ch. 511, 62 Stat. 489), relating to the retention in the service of disabled commissioned officers and warrant officers of the Army and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

209. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

210. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize at the United States Military Academy and at the United States Air Force Academy an additional permanent professor, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

211. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers for their respective services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

212. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled 'An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold'; to the Committee on Armed Services.

213. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 508 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, relating to the compensation of cadets and midshipmen"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

214. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Uni-

versal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

215. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the status of citizens or nationals of the Republic of the Philippines who are retired members of the uniformed services and who hold offices of profit or trust under the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

216. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to allow credit for certain service for purposes of pay, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

217. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

218. A letter from the vice president, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1954; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

219. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with the Naches Co., Inc., which will, when executed by the superintendent on behalf of the Government, authorize the company to operate portable and/or semiportable rope ski tows and to provide light lunch service, to sell ski accessories and supplies, and to rent skis within Mount Rainier National Park during the term of 9 months from October 1, 1954, through June 30, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

220. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession operating permit to the Ranier National Park Co. which will, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service on behalf of the Government, authorize the furnishing of accommodations, facilities, and services for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

221. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a certification by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States Navy at the Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J., in the sum of \$110,854, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the chairman, board of directors, Future Farmers of America, transmitting a report on the audit of the accounts of the Future Farmers of America for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 14, paragraph (b), of Public Law 740, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Col. Walter E. Ahearn, and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

224. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc., transmitting the audit report of the Reserve Officers Association of the United

States, Inc., for the period as of March 31, 1954, pursuant to section 15 (b) of Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

225. A letter from the executive officer, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting the annual report of all tort claims paid by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the period January 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 773, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

226. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of Nick A. Mavros or Nicholas P. Cimeon or Nicholas Simeon or Nicholas Symeon, Case No. A-1119913, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

228. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the grant or retrocession to a State of concurrent jurisdiction over certain land"; to the Committee on Public Works.

229. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

230. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

231. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision increasing limitations for the fiscal year 1955 for the Federal Housing Administration (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

232. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the fiscal year 1955 for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (H. Doc. No. 61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to reproduce and to sell copies of official records of their respective departments, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

234. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report showing certain final valuations of properties on a list of carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

235. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 68th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

236. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

237. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

238. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1753. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1754. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to remove domestic trade barriers affecting milk and milk products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1755. A bill to extend certain benefits to persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in Mexico or on its borders during the period beginning May 9, 1916, and ending April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1756. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1757. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1758. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn \$250 per month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1759. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to remove the restrictions on the importation of feathers of wild birds for use in the manufacture of artificial files used for fishing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1760. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 1761. A bill to relieve certain veterans who relied on an erroneous interpretation of the law from liability to repay a portion of the subsistence allowances which they received under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 1762. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1763. A bill to permit retired personnel of the uniformed services and their widows and children to receive benefits under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act without relinquishing retirement pay or annuities based on retirement pay, to which they are otherwise entitled; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 1764. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to allow credit for certain periods of civilian employment abroad by the Government of the United States in satisfying the requirements of 5 years' residence within the United States immediately preceding the date of filing petition for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 1765. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1766. A bill to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide penalties for certain narcotic-law offenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1767. A bill to revise the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1768. A bill for the relief of the Jefferson and Plaquemines Drainage District and certain persons whose properties abut on the Federal Government's right-of-way for Harvey Canal in Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1769. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in the southern portion of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1770. A bill to provide for the improvement of the waterway between Barataria Bay, La., and the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, so as to facilitate marine-mortgage transactions by eliminating certain procedural difficulties arising under that act; and to make preferred marine mortgages available on all towboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1772. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 1773. A bill 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1774. A bill to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 1775. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 1776. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the Agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 1777. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1778. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 1779. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper division of the Wapinitia Federal reclamation project, Ore-

gon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 1781. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for payment of taxes or payments in lieu of taxes with respect to real property transferred from Government corporations to other agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1782. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1784. A bill to provide for apprentice or other training on the job in agricultural occupations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that certain gains and losses in respect of contracts for the sale of real property, or in respect of mortgages on real property, shall be capital gains and losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1786. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in Haskell County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1787. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1788. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1789. 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; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1790. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to fix the minimum wage at \$1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1791. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 1792. A bill to permit the President under certain circumstances to suspend certain provisions of law embodying the buy American principle; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1793. A bill to prescribe certain limitations with respect to outpatient dental care for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1794. A bill to effectuate the recommendations in the report of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953 (Public

Law 220, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1795. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 1796. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer, including the exemptions for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness, from \$600 to \$800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1797. A bill to provide the United States with a gold standard and redeemable currency, and to correct other defects in the monetary system of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1798. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission to provide for plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1799. A bill to provide for the deduction and credit of contributions or subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 1800. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1801. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1802. A bill to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1803. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1804. A bill to authorize a survey and investigation with respect to the relocation of the Ferry County Highway, paralleling Lake Roosevelt, Columbia Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1805. A bill to provide a limitation on the application of section 691, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and of section 126, Internal Revenue Code of 1939, to prevent confiscatory double taxation of livestock, growing and harvested crops in the estates of deceased farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1806. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 1807. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1808. A bill to provide that certain individuals who served on active duty with the Armed Forces for a period of 180 days and who served overseas shall not be liable for induction under the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1809. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$700 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes to extend to fruit and vegetable storage facilities the same amortization deduction now provided for grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1811. A bill to provide salary increases for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed and regulated by the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1812. A bill to provide that the rates of duty on certain goods manufactured from cotton shall not be reduced below the rates applicable to such goods on January 1, 1955; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1813. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1814. A bill to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1815. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to \$1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1816. A bill to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1817. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 1818. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 1819. A bill to provide uniformity in the rates of disability compensation payable to certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1820. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of 1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1821. A bill to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1822. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1823. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1824. A bill to establish national policy respecting the development and use of

water resources, to redefine the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to water resource development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1825. A bill creating a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 1826. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 1827. A bill 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1828. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a \$1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1829. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for navigation and flood control on the Big Sandy River and the Tug and Levisa Forks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 1830. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain employees' cooperative earnings shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1831. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 1832. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the Agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1833. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act, so as to confer authority upon the Surgeon General to assist in the elimination, control, and abatement of pollution in certain international waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1834. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1835. A bill to provide for the discharge of tax liens on certain real property deeded to the United States of America subject to unpaid taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 1836. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., lands surplus to the needs of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1837. A bill giving the Commissioner of Education the authority to issue to certain local educational agencies quitclaim deeds to certain temporary facilities, upon a

showing of need therefor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1838. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1839. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1840. A bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1841. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 1842. A bill to further amend section 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 1843. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1844. A bill to amend the acts authorizing agricultural entries under the non-mineral land laws of certain mineral lands in order to increase the limitation with respect to desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 1845. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted United States Government life (converted) insurance or national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1846. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1847. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1848. A bill to provide the House of Representatives with a staff to make reports on proposed legislation, and objective analysis of the reports from the executive branch on proposed legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1849. A bill directing that special consideration be given to excess agricultural commodities produced in the United States when entering into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1850. A bill to provide for the waiver of premiums on the national service life insurance and United States Government life (converted) insurance issued to certain former servicemen who are disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1851. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture be included as a member of the Advisory Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and as a member of the National Advisory Council of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1852. A bill to provide that 75 percent of all moneys received by the United

States from the sale or lease of mineral rights in certain of its lands be paid to the former owners of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1853. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1854. A bill to authorize the construction of highways and other facilities within the boundaries of Government-owned lands for recreational or other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1855. A bill to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1856. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1857. A bill defining certain unfair trade practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1858. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 1859. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which prohibits payments under the agricultural conservation program in certain cases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 1860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the deduction of certain premiums paid for life and fire insurance in computing the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1861. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1862. A bill to repeal those provisions of law which exclude from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child in the employ of his father or mother; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1863. A bill to provide that the sale of narcotic drugs to a minor shall be a criminal offense punishable by death or life imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1864. A bill to create a Department of Urbiculture, and to prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1865. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to medical expenses); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of a Commission on Security in Industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to increase 1955 cotton allotments of certain farms receiving 5 acres or less; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution declaring the 14th day of June in each year to be a legal holiday, and requesting the President to issue a special proclamation commemorating the 176th anniversary of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36,759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND (by request):

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution relating to Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEED:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to establish the Highway Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution designating the 26th day of May of each year, beginning with the year 1955, as National Hillbilly Music Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 76. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives so as to restore the 21-day rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 77. Resolution creating a Standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to appoint a select committee regarding the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 79. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the use of facilities and manpower by the Department of Defense and by other departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 80. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the select committee authorized by House Resolution 60; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Luis Deriberprey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Eliseva Kaufman (Saltz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Marian Wojcik-Wojnowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Joao Henriques Gravato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of James Flying Horse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of the Employers' Liability Assurance Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Roberto Fantuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Maria Schurhoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1880. A bill for the relief of E. Brevard Walker and E. Brevard Walker, Jr., trading as E. B. Walker & Son Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1881. A bill for the relief of Bianca Carpensee and Margherita Bruni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1882. A bill for the relief of Eva Elisabeth Uber English; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1883. A bill for the relief of Margaret Gartner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1884. A bill for the relief of Vitus Johannes De Vries and his wife, Antonie Paula Elise De Vries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1885. A bill for the relief of Orlando Lucarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Irving I. Erdheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tsi Au Li (Tsi Gziou Li), Ru Ping Li, Teh Yu Li (a minor), and Teh Chu Li (a minor); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Sister Lella Juditta Rora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 1889. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Hsi-Sun Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of Dr. T. F. Tsai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 1891. A bill for the relief of Chung Herp Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1892. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1893. A bill for the relief of Myung Sik Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1894. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Cecil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 1895. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Aglipay (also known as James or Jimmy Flores); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1896. A bill for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 1897. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Tambarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1898. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hezekiah Nicodemus, his wife Grace, and daughter Sally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 1899. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to R. R. Crew, A. G. Gibson, C. F. Bliss, Jr., and others; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1900. A bill authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to George C. Stratton and Ellen J. Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Galen H. Clark Packing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1902. A bill for the relief of Paul Skuntz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1903. A bill for the relief of Rabbi Moshe Rosenblatt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 1904. A bill for the relief of Ioannis (John) Kritikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1905. A bill for the relief of Hugo Edward Kullberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1906. A bill for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of James Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1908. A bill for the relief of Chu Hui-Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1909. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Puga de la Cerna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1910. A bill for the relief of Blanka Goldstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Schwalm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of Howard Rieck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1914. A bill for the relief of Shalom Fred Ron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Donata Giorgio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Markos G. Kaminis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1917. A bill for the relief of Ezra Chitayat; his wife, Violet; and their daughters, Georgette and Linda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Hal A. Marchant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1919. A bill to authorize the award of a medal to Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1922. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1923. A bill for the relief of Kevin Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1924. A bill for the relief of Hermos Michael Esho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1925. A bill for the relief of Henry Brambila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1926. A bill for the relief of Nellie A. Ridings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 1927. A bill for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 1928. A bill for the relief of Basil Constantine Mavromichalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Eufemia Benich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of Anna Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo Montalto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1932. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Peppas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of Dason Equipment Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1934. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Rosario DiStefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1935. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1936. A bill for the relief of Antonio Doncovio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1937. A bill for the relief of Andrea Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1938. A bill for the relief of Elsa Schott Ciccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1939. A bill for the relief of Rosa Stangl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1940. A bill for the relief of James J. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1941. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mateo Ortiz Vazquez, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1942. A bill for the relief of Rosario Placentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1943. A bill for the relief of John G. Zeros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1944. A bill for the relief of Chin Yam Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1945. A bill for the relief of Albert Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1946. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1947. A bill for the relief of Katarzyna Pienkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of John Grady Cobb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1949. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Garcia Gordillo, Mrs. Concepcion Garcia Benet, Alfredo Garcia Garcia, and Maria Angeles Garcia Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of Stjepan B. Carija, Nevenka Olga Carija, Tatjana Mira Carija, and Igor Ivan Carija; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 1951. A bill for the relief of George Lahood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Clarence Christensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Virginia Hell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Samson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 1955. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Rinn Marchand and her daughter, Gudrun Rinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Arthur Guilherme Dos Reis Melo Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of Elfrieda Haberl and her children, Frank Haberl, Rosemary Haberl, and Peter Haberl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg Maria Zochbauer Horgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Miss Martha Kantelberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1963. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1964. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 1966. A bill for the relief of Tai Jong (Billy) Ryu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1967. A bill for the relief of Onorato Biagioni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Maria do Santo Christo Amaral Moniz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1969. A bill for the relief of Chin Buck Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 1970. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Bider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Leila Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 1972. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Lucente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1974. A bill for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Hanka and Kenneth Kerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 1976. A bill for the relief of Luigi Tomasella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of Julio Martinez-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Ying Kie Mok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Chokichi Iraha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Hamdi Ahmad-Tamini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Dora Camalich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1982. A bill for the relief of the Denver Live Stock Exchange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of George Karl Heinrich Willy Junker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Zivoin Mitich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1985. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosa Largaiolli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Deckard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Kimlie Hayshi Crandall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of George D. Hopper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Michael Aristides Tseperkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Nouritza Terzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Jabor Hassan El Assaad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alkos Giagtzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1994. A bill for the reconveyance by the General Services Administration of certain surplus realty to the Hermann Hospital estate, Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 1996. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Battista Campoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 1997. A bill for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 1998. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Pineiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1999. A bill for the relief of Heinz Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of Dr. Olin S. Proctor, a resident of the 18th Congressional District of California, relating to a claim to certain submerged lands within the continental limits of the United States and off the shores of Los Angeles and Orange

Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Helen L. Lichtweis, Peoria, Ill., requesting that the Federal oath of office be denied to Robert Bruce Chipfield for the term of office for the 84th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

50. Also, petition of Helen L. Lichtweis, Peoria, Ill., relative to amendments to the Constitution of the United States of Amer-

ica: Amendment I—"To petition the Government for a redress of grievance"; to the Committee on House Administration.

51. Also, petition of Francisco Cepero, 1951 Blanca Cerra Street, Santurce, P. R., relative to Civil No. 95-4, legal protection to filing fees paid on Civil No. 4833 and liquidated damages, *Francisco Cepero, Plaintiff v. United States Government, Defendant*, southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I released on January 10, 1955, regarding the President's state of the Union address, and the comments contained therein on the role of the Federal Government in developing hydroelectric power.

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

STATEMENT BY HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON

In his state of the Union message on January 6, 1955, President Eisenhower abandoned the pretense of an impending Federal power monopoly, which has so long served as a political scarecrow for the opponents of continued public power development in the Columbia River Basin.

Inasmuch as the likelihood of a Federal power monopoly has been cited by Secretary McKay as a main reason for abandoning the magnificent Hells Canyon power site to the Idaho Power Co., I call upon the Secretary to reverse his stand.

At McNary Dam in Oregon, on September 23, 1954, the President warned against Federal operation of a gigantic, overwhelming nationwide power monopoly.

On November 4, 1954, Budget Director Hughes warned against committing the Nation to a policy of establishing a nationwide Federal power monopoly.

In campaign speeches in Oregon, the Secretary of the Interior likewise warned frequently against this so-called Federal power monopoly.

But in his 1955 state of the Union message to the Congress, the President flatly declared that "Federal hydroelectric development supply but a small fraction of the Nation's power needs."

I think this is symbolic of the administration's confusion in the field of power. It emphasizes why our great public-power program in the Pacific Northwest has come to a standstill under this administration. For many months the President and his leading subordinates warned us of the imminence of a Federal power monopoly. Now the President himself tells the Nation that the Federal Government generates only a tiny portion of the country's waterpower.

This, of course, is the true situation, rather than the misleading talk of Federal monopoly

used to swing votes last fall. The Federal Government today generates only about 13 percent of our electricity, as contrasted with 81 percent by private utility corporations.

With the President recognizing that Federal kilowatts are but a small segment of the national total, Hells Canyon cannot be considered as in any way contributing toward a possible Federal power monopoly.

Thus the state of the Union address effectively repudiates one of the principal arguments used to oppose and block a high multipurpose dam in Hells Canyon—the kind of dam advocated in the famous 308 report of the Army engineers.

I urge authorization of such a project by the 84th Congress.

Imports of Foreign Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil. This bill is designed to check the present unfair competition now facing the coal industry of the United States. The continued unrestricted flow of cheap, foreign residual fuel oil created this unfair competition.

The depression now existing in the coal producing areas of the United States is unprecedented in the history of the entire industry. It is heartbreaking to see the mass unemployment; workers denied the right to employment through no fault of their own in one of America's major and most important industries. This unemployment, with its resultant unrest, has also spread to the railroads and other major industries dependent upon the production of coal.

On a recent trip to Europe I had an opportunity to see at first hand a number of communities where industrial recovery has been slow and real prosperity is still not in sight. Let me point out, however, that nowhere did I find the economic stagnation that has enveloped the coal producing communities of West Virginia since foreign residual oil began its relentless surge into the fuel markets of the east coast.

To my way of thinking, our first obligation is here at home, and for that reason I would say that the time for

action is long since past due. From experience we know that the executive branch of government will not correct this grossly unjust situation. In fact, it has yet to take the first effective step to limit this importation of foreign residual fuel oil. Therefore, this limitation of imports must come through congressional action and we must act now.

In conclusion, let me point out that this same foreign product has washed out coal production capacity that is vital to a defense program. If an emergency should come, none of the platitudinous statements about high levels of trade will be of any value in meeting the demands of a stepped-up industrial effort in a fuel-hungry mobilization economy. We will need coal and more coal, but we will not get it unless we act now to keep our coal mines open in the interim period.

A Department of Urbiculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker I am today reintroducing my bill for the creation of a Department of Urbiculture at Cabinet level to deal with the special problems and welfare of municipalities.

These include such economic and social problems as slums, dope, juvenile delinquency, housing, and smog.

Smog, fast becoming a nationwide problem in metropolitan areas, was mentioned by the President in his state-of-the-Union message as a problem in need of a strengthened combative program. This would fall under the jurisdiction of the new department, if created.

The bill, which I introduced last July shortly before adjournment of the 83d Congress, has created tremendous interest among Washington legislators, who feel it could lead to the solution of one of the most important problems of American cities.

When the Department of Agriculture was established in 1862, 80 percent of the population lived on farms. Now the situation is reversed, with 85 percent in urban communities and only 15 percent rural.

It is only natural then that Government emphasis should be placed on solving the problems of this new majority of urban dwellers as it formally was for the majority of rural dwellers.

The bill, which has received extensive press coverage on a national scale, has brought forth a volume of correspondence from interested citizens and groups approving the action.

The term urbiculture was a coined word to describe a "new science" which would result from the discovery and application of natural law to the utilization of urban lands.

The new department would consolidate the urban functions of various other Federal agencies—notably Home Finance, Housing, Public Health, Department of Justice—which have dealt with areas of the problems of city folk.

Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when the rules of the 84th Congress were before the House for adoption I proposed an amendment in the form of House Resolution 61, a resolution which was approved by the Subcommittee on Legislative Procedure of the Committee on Rules of the 83d Congress. This subcommittee was composed of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and myself as chairman.

Since this amendment was not adopted at the beginning of the session I plan to request the Committee on Rules to hold a hearing on this proposal.

House Resolution 61 provides as follows:

House Resolution 61

Resolved, That paragraph 25 (a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "standing" and by adding at the end thereof the following: "The rules of committees are hereby made the rules of subcommittees so far as applicable. Committees and subcommittees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the Rules of the House."

Sec. 2. Paragraph 25 (e) of such rule is amended by inserting ", finding," after "measure."

Sec. 3. Paragraph 25 (g) of such rule is amended by striking out "standing committees or their subcommittees" and inserting in lieu thereof "committees."

Sec. 4. Paragraph 25 of such rule is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Unless otherwise provided, committee action shall be by vote of a majority of a quorum."

Sec. 5. (a) Paragraph 26 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting "(a)" after "26," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) No person shall be employed for or assigned to investigative activities until approved by the committee.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided, subpoenas to require the attendance of witnesses, the giving of testimony, and the production of books, papers, or other evidence shall be issued only by authority of the committee, shall be signed by the chairman or any member designated by the chairman, and may be served by any person designated by the committee, the chairman, or the signing member.

"(d) No witness shall be compelled to give oral testimony for broadcast, or for direct reproduction by motion picture photography, recording, or otherwise in news and entertainment media if he objects.

"(e) Oaths may be administered and hearings may be conducted and presided over by the chairman or any member designated by the chairman. Unless the committee otherwise provides, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence and the taking of testimony; but no witness shall be compelled to give oral testimony before less than two members if, prior to testifying, he objects.

"(f) Witnesses shall be permitted to be advised by counsel of their legal rights while giving testimony, and unless the presiding member otherwise directs, to be accompanied by counsel at the stand.

"(g) Witnesses, counsel, and other persons present at committee hearings shall maintain proper order and decorum; counsel shall observe the standards of ethics and deportment generally required of attorneys at law. The chairman may punish breaches of this provision by censure or by exclusion from the committee's hearings, and the committee may punish by citation to the House as for contempt.

"(h) Whenever the committee determines that evidence relating to a question under inquiry may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons called as witnesses therein, the committee shall observe the following additional procedures, so far as may be practicable and necessary for the protection of such persons:

"(1) The subject of each hearing shall be clearly stated at the outset thereof, and evidence sought to be elicited shall be pertinent to the subject as so stated.

"(2) Preliminary staff inquiries may be directed by the chairman, but no major phase of the investigation shall be developed by calling witnesses until approved by the committee.

"(3) All testimony, whether compelled or volunteered, shall be given under oath.

"(4) Counsel for witnesses may be permitted, in the discretion of the presiding member and as justice may require, to be heard briefly on points of right and procedure, to examine their clients briefly for purposes of amplification and clarification, and to address pertinent questions by written interrogatory to other witnesses whose testimony pertains to their clients.

"(5) Testimony shall be heard in executive session, the witness willing, when necessary to shield the witness or other persons about whom he may testify.

"(6) The secrecy of executive sessions and of all matters and material not expressly released by the committee shall be rigorously enforced.

"(7) Witnesses shall be permitted brief explanations of affirmative or negative responses, and may submit concise, pertinent statements, orally or in writing, for inclusion in the record at the opening or close of their testimony.

"(8) An accurate verbatim transcript shall be made of all testimony, and no alterations of meaning shall be permitted therein.

"(9) Each witness may obtain transcript copies of his testimony given publicly by paying the cost thereof; copies of his testimony given in executive session shall be furnished the witness at cost if the testimony has been released or publicly disclosed, or if the chairman so orders.

"(10) No testimony given in executive session shall be publicly disclosed in part only.

"(1) Whenever the committee determines that any testimony, statement, release, or other evidence or utterance relating to a question under inquiry may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate persons who are not witnesses, the committee shall observe the following additional procedures, so far as may be practicable and necessary for the protection of such persons:

"(1) Persons so affected shall be afforded an opportunity to appear as witnesses, promptly and at the same place, if possible, and under subpoena if they so elect. Testimony relating to the adverse evidence or utterance shall be subject to applicable provisions of part (h) of this rule.

"(2) Each such person may, in lieu of appearing as a witness, submit a concise, pertinent, sworn statement which shall be incorporated in the record of the hearing to which the adverse evidence or utterance relates.

"(3) The chairman or a member shall when practicable consult with appropriate Federal law-enforcement agencies with respect to any phase of an investigation which may result in evidence exposing the commission of Federal crimes, and the results of such consultation shall be reported to the committee before witnesses are called to testify therein.

"(1) Requests to subpoena additional witnesses shall be received and considered by the chairman in any investigation in which witnesses have been subpoenaed. Any such request received from a witness or other person entitled to the protections afforded by part (h) or (i) of this rule shall be considered and disposed of by the committee.

"(m) Each committee conducting investigations shall make available to interested persons copies of the rules applicable therein."

SEC. 6. Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"7. All bills and resolutions to authorize the investigation of particular subject matter shall define such subject matter clearly, and shall state the need for such investigation and the general objects thereof."

Mr. Speaker, I have also included copies of various reports of our Subcommittee on Legislative Procedure containing these and other recommendations which will be found elsewhere in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I would like to have the following report of the Subcommittee on Legislative Procedure of the Committee on Rules of the 83d Congress inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

House Resolution 571 has been reintroduced as House Resolution 61 of the 84th Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE
(Statement by Mr. SCOTT to the Committee on Rules, May 1954)

Your subcommittee was appointed June 10, 1953, to make a study of legislative procedure.

dures with particular reference to procedure governing the conduct of investigations by congressional committees. This summary of findings and recommendations which I am submitting today is in the nature of an interim report. In the past 11 months we have held extensive hearings, have studied various pending proposals and suggestions made to us, and have developed a proposed set of rules which is submitted, in its latest version, herewith.

A formal analysis and report, intended to accompany the proposed rules, is in preparation. This latest revised draft is submitted meanwhile, for consideration by the full committee, in order to expedite its being reported out in final form at an early date. A copy of House Resolution 571 is attached.

I am deeply appreciative of the contributions of both my colleagues, Mr. SMITH and Mr. CHENOWETH, have made throughout this undertaking. We have differed among ourselves from time to time, so our conclusions—in which we all now concur—have resulted from deliberation, discussion, and a good measure of amiable give-and-take. The end product of our efforts is doubtless much improved on this account.

THE NEED FOR RULES OF PROCEDURE

Public interest in problems relating to congressional investigations has been growing steadily. In recent years, the entire Nation has been made conscious of the sweeping powers vested in Congress for the purpose of conducting factfinding inquiries. It is unfortunate that the public knows so little of the scores and hundreds of routine investigations which are quietly and efficiently conducted each year by committees of Congress, and that only the most sensational and controversial fall under the spotlight.

But because of this distorted observation, and because a few regrettable episodes have been so widely publicized, a large segment of the public has come to believe that congressional investigations are not infrequently unfair, or even outright abusive of the rights of persons affected.

At the same time, and this impressed your subcommittee very much, both Members of Congress and responsible members of the public at large seem urgently aware that the coin has another side, that persons called as witnesses before these congressional bodies have sometimes contrived, in their turn, to affront the investigators, to defy their powers, and generally to frustrate the investigative purpose without being in any way penalized or punished therefor.

So the apparent need for rules of procedure is twofold, to satisfy everyone concerned that proceedings before investigating committees will be held to reasonable standards of fair play, on the one hand, and to assure potentially defiant witnesses that congressional committees have adequate powers to get tough if they need to, on the other. As will be emphasized hereafter, the danger of weakening the necessary powers of committees has been kept in view throughout this work; your subcommittee adopted as a starting premise the proposition that no rules of procedure would be proposed which could operate in any way to impair the legitimate investigative activities of congressional committees.

Thus while a need for rules of procedure exists, and while the promulgation of such rules is strongly recommended, yet we note that even the word rules is almost too restrictive in its connotations. What is called for seems more accurately describable as principles, i. e., precepts of fair play, set forth for the guidance of committees and the reassurance of witnesses.

Your subcommittee heard more than a score of witnesses, including 10 Members of Congress and representatives of bar associations, labor groups, church groups and veterans' organizations. The testimony was

overwhelmingly in favor of an exercise of Congress' rule-making powers in this field, though we were repeatedly warned of the danger already noted, i. e., the danger of unduly restricting Congress in the process.

One witness, the Honorable George MEADER, urged upon us the proposition that under the doctrine of *Christoffel v. U. S.* (338 U. S. 84 (1949)), any rules whatsoever, promulgated to govern the conduct of investigations by congressional committees, would subject committee action pro tanto to review by the courts. Representative MEADER therefore opposed all rule-making efforts. We have given this point careful study, and have concluded that the doctrine of the *Christoffel* case (wherein the Supreme Court relied upon a rule of the Senate for guidance in interpreting and applying a Federal perjury statute) would be inapplicable to rules of the type it is recommending.

In sum, it is concluded that rules of procedure for committee investigations are both necessary and proper—with the reservation that such rules should be conservatively cast to serve as standards of guidance without imposing burdensome procedural restrictions. Committees are not courts. It is a mistake to equate committee hearings with the highly technical and formalized procedures that have been developed in the judicial domain. Your subcommittee has carefully rejected proposals and suggestions which appeared to be cast in the rigid form of judicial rules.

Furthermore, we have taken a relatively conservative position in other respects as well. The original version of House Resolution 447, prepared to consolidate all the seemingly meritorious ideas and suggestions which had been submitted in the hearings and in earlier bills and resolutions, contained a number of features which have subsequently been deleted. The version submitted herewith by your subcommittee is the product of repeated revisions, so that it represents a fair minimum, and in no sense a radical maximum.

At the end of this presentation we shall summarize briefly, for your information, the more important additional suggestions which have been considered and rejected in our deliberations.

Finally, in concluding this presentation, we shall note briefly three pending bills which would strengthen the hands of investigating committees, and which are deemed appropriate for consideration and endorsement by your subcommittee since they also concern procedures, and tend to complement the rules proposed herein.

EXISTING RULES

The power of each House of Congress to determine its own rules of procedure is directly conferred by the Constitution (art. I, sec. 5, cl. 2). It seems clear that this is the appropriate power to be called into play for the instant purpose. Determining procedures to be followed by its committees is within the province of each House of Congress, and should not be attempted by joint action of the two Houses; for even if uniformity between the two were insisted upon and achieved at the outset, each would remain free to depart from the uniform pattern at any time. Rules currently in force in the Senate differ materially from those now observed by the House of Representatives.

Indeed, it is precisely this absolute, unqualified, and continuous control by each House over its own rules that provides ultimate assurance against the dangers of unduly hampering House proceedings, if the new provisions are adopted as House rules. No rule thus adopted will be enforceable, as a practical matter, if the House does not wish to enforce it; and no rule will remain binding, as a precedent or otherwise, if the House wishes to drop it. This is the status of existing rules. It is the status properly to be

accorded the new provisions recommended by your subcommittee. Even the rights directly conferred on witnesses (and there are only three—see paragraph 26 (d), (e), and (f) of the draft) would merely operate to excuse witnesses who relied on them from compulsion, i. e., from punishment for contempt. They do not create any basis for outside intervention.

The present rules of the House of Representatives number 42; of these, only 3 relate to committees. Rule X governs the creation and composition of the House's 19 standing committees; rule XI determines the powers and duties of committees; and rule XIII concerns procedures for the calendaring and consideration of the reports of standing committees.

Matter pertaining to the investigative function thus logically belongs in rule XI. This rule contains in turn 29 numbered paragraphs, of which only 2, paragraphs 25 and 26, presently relate to the general fact-finding powers and functions of committees.

The amendments which your subcommittee proposes are therefore designed to be incorporated within paragraphs 25 and 26 of rule XI. The existing text of these two paragraphs is unaffected, except for slight editorial changes. Thus the structure of the rules is undisturbed and the entire proposal (except the slight addition to rule XXII, on the subject of resolutions) consists only of enlarging 2 subdivisions of 1 rule.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED RULE

The changes proposed to be made in the present text of paragraph 25 (i. e., by the draft attached), are indicated in the following full reproduction thereof; their purpose needs no elaborate explanation. They merely broaden the paragraph so as to make it applicable to special and select committees and to all subcommittees, as well as to standing committees:

"25. (a) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its committees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in said committees. The rules of committees are hereby made the rules of subcommittees so far as applicable. Committees and subcommittees may adopt additional rules not inconsistent with the rules of the House.

"(b) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such records shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

"(c) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access to such records. Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee.

"(d) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by this committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

"(e) No measure, finding or recommendation shall be reported to the House from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

"(f) Each committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentation to brief summaries of their argument. The staff of each committee shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.

"(g) All hearings conducted by committees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for

voting or where the committee orders an executive session."

The new subsection (h), added at the end of paragraph 25 (by sec. 4 of the draft) establishes the general principle, "unless otherwise provided," that all committee actions shall be taken by vote of a majority of a quorum of the committee. This is a very generalized provision intended to suggest that committee authority must not be usurped by the chairman or by any individual member, unless the same has been specifically delegated.

The present language of paragraph 26 of rule XI, incorporated into the rules from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, is unchanged by the draft, and reads in its entirety as follows:

"26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government."

The meat of the proposals contained in the draft are incorporated in the new subsections to be inserted immediately after the present text of paragraph 26. These begin at page 2, line 9 of the draft, and will be briefly explained in the order in which they appear.

26 (b). This recognizes a new problem which has proved acute in some instances, namely, the authority of any single member to select people to go forth as investigators and to deal with the public in the name of the committee. It is believed that the committee itself should have the final say in this matter, at least in the rare instances when controls become important. Note that regular professional staff members hired by standing committees are already subject to a similar requirement (rule XI-27 (a)).

26 (c). This subsection on the issuance and service of subpoenas is paraphrased from the special provisions in rule XI which control the subpoena powers conferred specially on three standing committees (rule XI-2 (b), 8 (d), and 17 (b)). Such subpoenas are to be issued "only by authority of the committee" unless the committee makes other provisions and, in effect, delegates its authority to the chairman or a single member. The terms as to signature and service are intended to be as broad as possible to defeat any purely technical attack on the validity of a committee subpoena.

26 (d). This is the first of the three absolute rights conferred personally upon witnesses appearing before committees. It is the right to be spared compulsory appearances in news and entertainment broadcasts via television or radio, if the witness interposes an objection. It is noteworthy that some of the views expressed to the subcommittee on this point supported a far stronger rule, namely, an unqualified prohibition against such coverage of committee hearings. Your subcommittee believes that the instant middle-of-the-road provision affords adequate protection.

26 (e). The first sentence of this subsection affirms the statutory power of any member to administer oaths, and resolves all questions as to who may preside over committee hearings. The second sentence deals with the thorny problem of whether one member may sit alone to hear witnesses and receive evidence. It is very desirable to establish the validity and regularity of the one-man quorum in ordinary circumstances, because of the holding in the Christoffel case alluded to above. But at the same time so-called one man subcommittees have been severely criticized from time to time. The

proposal therefore contains two safeguards: It is specified that the committee may "otherwise provide," i. e., may pass a rule of its own imposing a more rigid quorum requirement; and—the second absolute right conferred on witnesses—no one may be compelled to testify before a single member if he makes timely objection. In the latter event, at least two members must be present to hear the testimony. Consideration was given to requiring the presence of more than two members and/or members representing more than one political party, but it was concluded that two would suffice to prevent the abuses sometimes charged to one alone, while the requirement as to partisan representation might make it possible for a minority to block a committee's work entirely by merely absenting itself.

26 (f). This is the third absolute right of witnesses, to be "advised by counsel of their legal rights." Counsel may also accompany the witness at the stand "unless the presiding member otherwise directs." The last-noted limitation is to make it perfectly clear that counsel may be ordered to stand aside if he indulges in the commonplace practice of coaching the witness so that the latter is in effect merely parroting the testimony of his adviser.

26 (g). This subsection merely prescribes general standards of behavior for counsel and other persons attending the hearings. The chairman's right to punish by censure or exclusion and the committee's right to cite offenders to the House are specifically noted.

26 (h). Into this subsection have been gathered all the seemingly meritorious protections which have been urged from time to time for the special benefit of witnesses involved in investigations aimed at their own reputations or possible guilt. Emphasis on the fact that the rules are really mere precepts and principles of fair play are obviously most apposite here.

It will be noted that the introductory language of subsection (h) leaves complete and absolute discretion in the committee as to the application of all which follows. The entire subsection applies only "whenever the committee determines" that some particular evidence to be adduced may tend to injure some particular person or persons to be called as witnesses—and even after such a finding the committee is bound only to follow the specified procedures "so far as may be practicable and necessary for the protection of such persons." Thus, it will be seen that the subdivisions of subsection (h), numbered (1) through (10), truly have the force of suggestions of fair play, and nothing more.

Subdivisions (1) through (3) of 26 (h) are self-explanatory. Subdivision (4) pertains to the rights of counsel (i. e., under these circumstances, where the witness is somewhat in the position of a defendant), and it will be noted that here, out of an excess of caution, still further qualifications have been added: "in the discretion of the presiding member" and "as justice may require." The rights, so diluted and qualified, are: to be heard briefly by the committee in argument, to examine their own clients briefly for clarification, and to question other witnesses by means of written interrogatories submitted through the committee.

Subsection 5 provides that to the extent necessary to shield the witness and other persons about whom he may testify, testimony should be taken in an executive session, if the witness is willing. The last clause is in recognition of an opposite consideration, namely, the possibility of affording protection to witnesses against potential abuses of the secret session, which your subcommittee considered and abandoned. Subdivisions (6) through (10) appear to be self-explanatory.

26 (i). This subsection is designed to protect persons who, while not called as witnesses, may nevertheless be injured by

evidence adduced before a committee. Note that the same elaborate modifications, reducing the entire subsection to a mere affirmation of principle, are incorporated in the introductory language. The two subdivisions that follow merely give persons so affected a double option: to appear as witnesses in their own behalf (and to enjoy the benefits and protections conferred by 26 (h) if they do so), or to submit a sworn statement in lieu of such appearance. The words "under subpoena" have been added merely to assure payment of mileage fees, etc., which are available only to witnesses appearing under compulsion, in case extensive travel is necessary to enjoy the benefits of the provision.

26 (j). This is another provision which is rendered advisory only by insertion of the words "when practicable," and which is narrow in its application but potentially important when it does come into play. Whenever investigating committees approach fields where Federal law-enforcement agencies are active, there is danger that the former may defeat efforts of the latter. An unimportant Communist hanger-on, for example, called as a witness by an investigating committee, might easily defeat long-laid plans to apprehend and prosecute his important bosses; and the same is true of other Federal law enforcement, including the enforcement of regulatory statutes and the punishment of tax evasion. This subsection therefore suggests that a representative of the committee should confer with Federal law-enforcement agencies involved, and should report the results of such conference back to his colleagues before the committee plunges into the field.

26 (k). This provision concerns a problem which occasionally presents itself where a witness, or a nonwitness involved in a particular hearing, believes he has a meritorious case for demanding that the committee should call additional witnesses on his behalf. It is simply specified that such requests shall be considered by the committee itself if they emanate from a person who has been found to be threatened with injury under subsections (h) or (i).

26 (l). This requirement is self-explanatory. It is contemplated that if rules such as those proposed here are adopted, a single standard print could be made available for use and distribution by all committees having need of them.

Finally, the new paragraph proposed to be added at the end of rule XXII—which pertains not to procedure but to the form and content of petitions, memorials, bills, and resolutions submitted to the House—is offered as a suggested improvement in the investigative process at another point, namely, in relation to the subjects upon which investigations are authorized in the first place. Resolutions calling for special investigations are presently sometimes worded so generally that it is not clear what is sought to be studied, and the suggested language would enjoin the sponsors of such measures to take pains to reveal and justify the objects which they are pursuing.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS REJECTED

As has been emphasized already, the draft resolution analyzed in the foregoing discussion is conservative in scope and operation. Several of the proposals now pending in the House go further. Your subcommittee studied all of these with care, and considered, besides, numerous suggestions offered in the course of the testimony it heard.

The features which are noted hereafter were rejected during the deliberations of your subcommittee, and are not contained in the final version of our draft resolution. Nonetheless, several of the most interesting are discussed briefly, since it is believed they will likely be the subjects of further discus-

sion when the final version of the draft is reported.

Generalizing the investigative power: Under present rules of the House of Representatives, as established by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, only three standing committees enjoy subpoena powers—Appropriations, Government Operations, and Un-American Activities. Other standing or select committees desiring to send for persons or papers must seek and obtain special authorization from the House for this purpose. It is noted that such powers are vested in all committees of the Senate by a single blanket provision. While a similar provision would make for greater uniformity of authority and practice among House committees, it would, at the same time, remove a potentially important check, i. e., the necessity of affirmative action by the House before any but the three named committees is entitled to make use of these investigative prerogatives.

The witness' absolute right to be heard in public: There is some basis for urging that witnesses should be entitled, if they insist, to be interrogated in public rather than before a secret session. It was suggested to your subcommittee that secret hearings could be used as star chamber proceedings to place the witness at a very unfair disadvantage. Nevertheless, the opposite consideration seemed more weighty: Certain witnesses, especially uncooperative individuals summoned from the executive branch, could seriously embarrass certain inquiries by demanding publicity. The executive session is more frequently a device for protecting witnesses than a threat, and it is to be hoped that other safeguards, such as the requirement of an accurate transcript in the case of witnesses whose reputations are in jeopardy, etc., will prove adequate. Note that the phrase "the witness willing" has been retained in subsection (h) (5) (draft, p. 4, line 13), as a suggestion that the witness' desire to be heard publicly ought always to be taken into account.

Appeal, review, or enforcement machinery: It has been suggested that reference should be made to the manner in which rules governing the conduct of investigations might be enforced. Proposals embracing elaborate enforcement provisions were considered. It is recognized that enforcement problems in connection with rules of procedure differ slightly from problems relating to general rules of the House in that personal, adversary interests of outsiders are not at stake in usual applications of the latter.

Nevertheless, we believe elaborate machinery and detailed procedures should not under any circumstances be considered for this purpose, for essential flexibility would be sacrificed thereby. At most, an informal submission of problems arising under such rules might be made at the outset to some body less than the full House, e. g., to the Rules Committee or a similar House group. This matter seems best left open for further consideration after experience has been accumulated with actual problems of enforcement, etc.

The right of cross-examination: Opinions are widely divided on whether counsel for a witness should ever be permitted to cross-examine his client or other witnesses directly. After carefully considering the alternatives, your subcommittee decided to recommend the use of written interrogatories only. In appropriate circumstances, the committee could still permit limited cross-examination if it wishes to do so; thus the omission merely serves to discourage potential abuses by contentious advocates.

RELATED PROPOSALS IN PENDING LEGISLATION

In conclusion, we wish to note briefly three bills now pending before the House, which deserve consideration in connection with these proposed rules of procedure: H. R. 4975 and H. R. 6899, introduced by Mr. KEATING, and H. R. 7955, introduced by myself,

H. R. 4975 would greatly improve the machinery now available to congressional committees to deal with persons who refuse to testify or otherwise to comply with committee subpoenas and orders. At present, the only recourse for a committee when so defied is to submit a resolution citing the defiant person for contempt before the full House, after which, if the resolution is passed, the matter must be referred to a United States attorney for prosecution as a criminal offense under title 2, United States Code, section 192.

The result is delay, often amounting to months or even years, before the issue comes to trial. And in consequence, contempt convictions under this statute are very rare; defying the authority of congressional committees has become relatively safe; excepting the cases of Communists, Federal courts have bent over backward to exonerate persons hailed before them under this statute. Under Mr. KEATING's proposal, the committee would be given another alternative. It could address itself forthwith to a Federal district court, and make application for an order of the court compelling obedience to its own subpoena, etc. If the relief sought by the committee were improper for some reason, the defiant witness would be entitled to a hearing and to immediate exoneration; if the committee's position proved sound, immediate compliance would be compelled, by the sanctions of the court's own plenary contempt powers. It is noteworthy that the proposal has ample precedents. Federal agencies such as the FTC, the SEC, the ICC, etc., have long enjoyed precisely this power in aid of their fact-finding prerogatives, and have found it to work admirably for all parties concerned.

Mr. KEATING's second bill, H. R. 6899, is an immunity measure, aimed at reviving the powers once enjoyed by Congress under title 18, United States Code, section 3486, but which have been virtually dead for many years. With such powers, congressional committees could once again overcome pleas of privilege under the fifth amendment by granting immunity for any incriminating effects of testimony sought to be compelled. Such legislation in slightly different form has already been favorably acted upon by the Senate, (S. 16, 83d Cong.). H. R. 6899 has the unqualified endorsement of Attorney General Brownell, and has also been formally approved by the American Bar Association. The passage of such immunity legislation would tend to reduce or eliminate a number of difficulties now encountered in congressional investigations dealing with controversial matters.

My bill, H. R. 7955, makes a simple change in the existing congressional contempt statute, title 2, United States Code, section 192, by adding the offense of misbehavior. At present, a witness whose affront consists not in defying the authority of a committee but in offensive conduct in its presence, etc., is not punishable under the statute. Committees have occasionally been obliged to put up with very serious abuses on account of this deficiency. H. R. 7955 corrects the situation, so that such offenders can be properly dealt with in the courts.

Rules of Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert the following state-

ments concerning House Resolution 571, 83d Congress. This resolution has been reintroduced as House Resolution 61, 84th Congress.

RULES OF PROCEDURE, HOUSE RESOLUTION 571

Representative HUGH SCOTT, Republican of Pennsylvania, today introduced a revised version of the proposed rules of procedure for committees in the House of Representatives being developed by a subcommittee (SCOTT, chairman; CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado; SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia) of the House Rules Committee. The new resolution is House Resolution 571. SCOTT emphasized that this final version has yet to be considered by the full Rules Committee of the House. He added that he had been assured of such consideration by the full committee (of which he is a member) in the near future.

Said SCOTT, "This is the product of more than a year's work; we have been through four revisions, and I feel that we are very close to a final version which should be acceptable to everyone."

The SCOTT subcommittee was created in 1953 to make a study of House Resolution 29 (introduced by Representative KEATING, Republican, of New York) and other proposals then pending on the subject of rules of procedure. After holding extensive hearings, the subcommittee introduced a set of rules incorporating its own views, together with ideas and suggestions it had received. This was House Resolution 447, introduced on February 17, 1954. Subsequently, House Resolution 447 was widely circulated for criticism, and modified in successive revisions. House Resolution 571 is the result.

Senate Resolution 253, introduced on May 24, 1954, by Senator BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut, for revision of the Rules of the Senate, closely follows the SCOTT subcommittee's proposals for House Rules revision. The similarity between the two resolutions may serve to expedite action during the present session of Congress. Both SCOTT and BUSH are urging their respective Houses to take action on these proposals at once.

"I think the administration tends to share our viewpoint; the American people want something to be done to insure fair play before congressional committees. And current interest is at an all-time high because of the televised hearings which have attracted so much attention to the whole investigative process. There is a widespread feeling that the pursuit of desirable ends requires clear statement of the ground rules governing the means (i. e. the methods) employed.

"In both Houses, rules proposals have become so popular that there is no serious question of partisan disagreement. Our subcommittee's work has proved more timely and fruitful than we dared hope. My only regret is that we did not have the benefit of so much support and emulation earlier, when the calendar was less crowded with priority items.

"The only substantial difference between House Resolution 571 (and Senate Resolution 253) and those currently sponsored by our Democratic colleagues is in the matter of enforcement of the rules we propose. Our subcommittee considered suggestions as to special enforcement procedures and rejected them—at least for the present—on the ground that the mere adoption of a real set of ground rules will probably suffice. When everyone knows the rules, no one will be likely to flout them. The whole trouble now is that there is no accurate standard to measure by. The American people have a very strong sense of fair play. If we give them something definite to judge by, they will insist on reasonable compliance. And of course Congress already has ample enforcement machinery if it wants to compel obedience to its rules by its own Members."

Scott explained that his resolution is proposed for adoption by the House of Representatives only, since the existing rules of the House and the Senate differ in some particulars and since neither House could be expected to surrender exclusive power over its own proceedings. The resolution is thus in the form of an amendment to the existing rules of the House (a feature accepted in the Bush resolution in the Senate).

In brief summary, the resolution provides:

1. All committees and subcommittees of the House are to be subject to uniform rules of procedure.
2. All committee action must be approved by a vote of a majority of a quorum of the committee (or subcommittee).
3. Committee personnel to be assigned to investigative activities must be approved by the committee.
4. The committee shall have control over the issuance of subpoenas, unless it expressly delegates this power.
5. Witnesses shall have the absolute right to bar television and radio broadcasting of their testimony if they object to it.
6. One-man quorums are allowed only if the witness is willing to give his testimony before a single member; otherwise, on demand of the witness, at least two members must be present. This is designed to meet criticism of the so-called one-man subcommittees, without, at the same time, unduly hampering committees in the conducting of routine hearings.
7. Witnesses are given an absolute right to legal counsel.
8. All participants in a hearing must observe proper order and decorum, subject to censure and punishment.
9. Whenever a witness is likely to be injured in his reputation or defamed or incriminated, by the nature of the inquiry, the committee will be expected to follow certain additional procedures:
 - (a) The subject of each hearing must be clearly stated and all evidence adduced must be relevant to the subject.
 - (b) No new line of investigation can be developed until the committee approves it.
 - (c) Everyone appearing in such proceedings must testify under oath.
 - (d) Counsel for witnesses may address the committee briefly and may ask questions of his own client to clear up points on the record. Questions to other witnesses, when pertinent, may be submitted in writing.
 - (e) Executive sessions must be used to protect the witness when necessary.
 - (f) The secrecy of executive sessions must be protected.
 - (g) Witnesses will be permitted to submit brief-written statements for inclusion in the record.
 - (h) An accurate transcript must be kept.
 - (i) Transcript copies must be made available to the witness.
 - (j) No testimony heard in executive session shall be released in part only.
10. Anyone, not being called as a witness, who is named in a derogatory or irresponsible fashion in a hearing shall be entitled to appear promptly as a witness and testify in his own behalf, in refutation of charges or alleged "smears," or to submit a written statement for incorporation in the record. This provision is designed to protect innocent persons from unwarranted assaults upon their reputations by any participant in, or before, an investigative committee.
11. The committee will be required to consult with law-enforcement agencies, such as the FBI, before undertaking investigations into areas where they might conflict with law-enforcement activities. The purpose of this is to avoid blundering into criminal cases which the enforcement agencies have already prepared—a real danger where extensive undercover work has been done but not yet presented to a grand jury.
12. The committee will entertain proper requests to call additional witnesses, from

witnesses or others who feel that such additional testimony is necessary in their behalf.

13. The foregoing rules of procedure shall be freely available to all interested persons. It is essential that witnesses be advised of the "ground rules" relating to their rights and responsibilities.

14. Resolutions introduced in the House for the purpose of authorizing investigations must specify exactly what is proposed to be investigated and what is expected to be accomplished by the investigation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HUGH SCOTT, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE, HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 571, AND INTERIM REPORT RELATING THERETO

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am submitting today an interim report on the work of our subcommittee in developing rules of fair play to be proposed for congressional committees.

Because of the heavy workload that always falls on this committee during the last weeks of a session, it has not been possible to secure an earlier hearing. Also, we have wished to avoid any interpretation of these proceedings as being in anyway in conflict with hearings before a committee of the other body. The objects of general rules of fair play are much broader than any of the issues that attracted so much attention during recent hearings; it would have been harmful to confuse the two—just as, I think, it was greatly harmful to let people confuse the televised proceedings with courtroom standards or practices as much as they did.

I aimed from the outset to be able to have a set of rules revision proposals considered by our full committee and reported out to the House before this session ended. That is still my hope. The American people are concerned with the problem; the President has alluded to it a number of times; and it is an exclusive, internal responsibility of ours which must be met, in recognition of the need for clarification of existing rules.

The full analysis and formal report referred to in our interim report has been deferred to await this presentation. But we can complete it rapidly if you wish to act before adjournment.

Otherwise, I suggest that you authorize us to prepare and submit our formal report on or before the opening day of the first session of the new Congress. If I have the honor to serve again next year, and if we have not achieved our goal before then, I intend to offer these revisions of the rules as the first order of business when we reconvene.

We have worked long and carefully and our proposals are sound. One additional item, which has been developed in the deliberation of the recently-formed Senate subcommittee addressing itself to the same subject, is a special limitation on the creation of subcommittees—whether the chairman can do it or whether only the full committee ought to have the power. In my opinion this would have to be "committee action," subject to the rule we propose at lines 3 and 4 of page 2 of House Resolution 571. But you might wish to consider it specially.

In concluding, let me reaffirm my strong disagreement with the estimable people who have suggested from time to time that all new rules are undesirable. To some of these, the existing rules are seemingly as sacred and inviolable as the Ten Commandments; to others any efforts to establish principles of fair play raise the terrifying specter of total interference and total failure of the workings of Congress. These attitudes are totally unrealistic.

Here, for example, is an excerpt from this immutable body of precepts, House rules XIV, paragraph 7, provides (and has always provided) that "during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat." This

ironclad pronouncement is unqualified by any limitation as to the places where it applies, nor does it make any exception for our charming lady colleagues. So, literally and in the inflexible tradition urged upon us, we wear headgear anywhere in or out of the Capitol during a session at the peril of clashing head-on with the overbearing wisdom of our ancestors in the matter. And worse than that, any John Doe opposing a law we have enacted, if he can show a hatted Member at the time of the vote would have a clear argument that we were acting in violation of our rules—ergo, the law is not a law at all. Incidentally, while our rules forbid wearing hats, there is no prohibition against the carrying of firearms.

Despite my respect and affection for some of the people who have expressed similar alarm over our proposals, I think it may be fairly observed that there is nothing sacrosanct about the rules governing the conduct of the House. If the occasion arises for improvement in our laws, we change the laws. If our present rules do not meet present day situations, it is worse to endure them supinely than to change them intelligently.

Size and Weight Limitations on Parcel Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege in the 83d Congress to sponsor in the House of Representatives a bill designed to repeal the discriminatory Public Law 199 of the 82d Congress, and restore parcel-post size and weight to the historic limits in effect for 20 years prior to January 1952.

Eight days of hearings were held a year ago this month on the subject of parcel-post size and weight limitations by the St. George Subcommittee on Postal Operations. Ninety-four witnesses submitted statements to the subcommittee urging repeal of Public Law 199. They represented all segments of business; two farm organizations and other agricultural and consumer groups. There were spokesmen from the Post Office Department; a witness appeared for a postal workers' organization, and one from a housewives' organization—all urging repeal of the law. There were only five witnesses appearing in opposition, all representing the Railway Express Agency, or the railroad interests—the only interests in all the world that stand to gain anything under this inequitable law that operates to the inconvenience and expense of all senders of small parcels.

Letters poured in to the Members of this body, urging passage of my bill. Many of my colleagues told me of their hope that my bill would be favorably reported in committee so they could vote for its passage on this floor. The advisory council to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the other body said quite forthrightly that Public Law 199, 82d Congress, should be repealed, and weight and size limitations should apply uniformly to all post offices.

But, in spite of the overwhelming support for my bill, it was never reported out of committee.

On Wednesday, January 5, 1955, I again introduced a bill to restore the parcel-post size and weight limits to the reasonable limits the postal patrons of this country had come to look upon as standard through 20 years of use.

Enactment of my bill will be looked upon as desirable by the vast majority of the people of this country, including the Post Office Department, whose own figures show that its financial position would be bettered by some \$70 million a year by repeal of Public Law 199. Enactment of my bill will greatly facilitate the flow of goods to market and to the ultimate consumer, with a maximum of convenience and economy through the use of the nationwide distribution system now held by the Post Office Department and paid for by the users of parcel post, with the ultimate savings in distribution costs going to the consuming public.

I know that the beneficiaries of the special advantages under Public Law 199 will again wave the banner of free enterprise. But, Mr. Speaker, the only interests who stand to benefit by retaining Public Law 199 on the statute books are not really free enterprise at all; they are a wholly owned monopoly.

On the other hand, my bill will have the support of at least two of the major farm groups. It will be upheld by the housewives of America, many of whom trudged back home with their relatively small packages in the recent Christmas season, because Public Law 199 had denied them the use of their own postal facilities for mailing those packages of good cheer. My bill will have the support of all businessmen, but particularly the small businessmen who are unable to hire traffic experts or cooperate in joint shipping endeavors to save themselves heavy transportation expenses. My bill will have the support of such business organizations as the National Retail Dry Goods Association, which is very well known for its espousal of ideas for good government, and which is on record for not opposing any postal rate increases necessary to put the Post Office Department on a self-sustaining, efficient operating basis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the support of every Member of this body for my proposal to repeal Public Law 199. Passage of my bill would be to place the interests of 160 million American people above those of a single special interest.

Penalty for Sale of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the death penalty or life imprisonment for anyone convicted of the sale of narcotics or marihuana to minors.

Selling narcotics to young people, in my estimation, is the most vicious crime that can be committed and it must be stopped through drastic Federal legislation calling for the death penalty for violators.

I feel that the introduction and distribution of narcotics to teen-agers in the Nation's high schools condemns them to a fate worse than death and should be punished by death or life imprisonment to offenders.

My decision to introduce the bill has been endorsed in statements from numerous parents throughout my San Mateo County district and environs.

A typical parent wrote a letter in which she said:

My son is now 23 years old but has been on the stuff since he was a teen-ager, and if this bill is passed it will not only protect my son from further contamination from this evil, but also save many boys and girls from a slow death.

She went on to state:

My son is at present serving a term in prison for forgery. Of course, he wanted money for this stuff and would do anything to get it.

Several doctors have written me their enthusiastic endorsement of the bill.

I also propose that marihuana, not now included as a narcotic under Federal definition, be incorporated in its definition by this bill.

I cite the logic of the Lindbergh law, which has virtually stopped kidnaping in the Nation through fear of the death penalty, in strong support of the bill.

Eighty-fourth Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are honored to serve our great people in their Federal Congress, are of course, and properly so, the recipients of large amounts of mail from them. Indeed, it is traditional in our land for the citizen to write to his Congressman or his Senator on the least provocation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, too many of us upon whom rests the responsibility for our legislative affairs are inclined to ignore the importance of these letters. Nothing could be more foolish. These letters are, in a very real sense, instructions from our employer; and, if we want to be good and faithful servants, it behooves us to take heed of the counsel with those who employ the people of the United States. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one of these letters, which I am sure has been received by all of my distinguished colleagues, is the inspiration for this address. The gentleman who wrote it, Mr. Bluford H. J. Balter, is an outstanding citizen of my own State, although not of my district. He is no personal friend of mine, although I wish that he were. I do know,

however, that this patriotic man has spent a fortune in his efforts to aid in the survival of his country. Is it any wonder, then, that his letter has inspired this address? Mr. Speaker, the letter of which I speak is worthy of a permanent place in our national archives, and I make it a part of this address.

All experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed.

The little-noticed words quoted above were inserted in our Declaration of Independence before the meeting of the First Congress of the United States of America. They gave clear and ringing notice to the world that Americans, though disposed to be long suffering in the face of governmental oppression, did have within them a point beyond which no king nor potentate might proceed in interfering with their inalienable rights.

When His Britannic Majesty, George III, disregarded this warning from his American subjects they proceeded to turn from long-suffering subjects of a European nation, to violent and aggressive citizens of their own free and independent nation, determined to preserve their freedoms with their lives, and responsible only to their God for their actions. Now, 179 years later, that same grave and portentous warning is in order. Our Nation again stands in grave peril; whether or not it survives may well depend upon the strength and integrity of the men and women who make up the 84th Congress of these United States.

Our valorous Founding Fathers rose up and "abolished the forms to which they are accustomed" because they valued the freedom and honor of themselves and their descendants more than they feared the horrors and sufferings of war. That freedom might not perish from the earth, they did not hesitate to face death as traitors if they failed in their high endeavor. They did not fail.

Having won their fight for human freedom and human liberty, our great forefathers on this continent then proceeded to draft, adopt, and promulgate the Constitution of the United States, one of the greatest documents ever devised by the mind of man. That Constitution and its first 10 amendments guaranteed to all Americans for all time that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" that was promised in the Declaration of Independence. Today, after some 164 years of the existence of our Constitution, we have life but precariously, dependent upon the whim of the brutal rulers of those governments who have embraced atheistic communism; if we have liberty at all, it is at the whim of some government functionaire, intent upon taking of our sustenance in order that the habitants of foreign shores may live better than we, and who fails to exercise the absolute power that government has wangled and decadent judges have affirmed, to take all of our property and all of our earnings to satisfy the needs of an ever-expanding worldwide giveaway program, designed to enrich and strengthen our enemies while pauperizing us; and if we may pursue liberty at all, we are pursuing only

an unobtainable myth, made unobtainable by unreasonable, unconstitutional, and confiscatory taxes that are driving our people to desperation, and which will inevitably destroy our Nation just as they have already destroyed the individual initiative that has made our country great.

Where along the way did we lose the freedom and independence for ourselves in the present and the hope for our descendants in the future, so carefully created and nurtured by our valiant forefathers on this continent? We have more than once demonstrated our valiance in war and our magnanimity in victory.

During the years 1941-45 our country, rightly or wrongly, was at war, and our people labored long and hard, and without thought of themselves, to carry the immense financial burden imposed upon them by the necessities of their native land. They did so gladly and cheerfully. With victory in Europe and Japan, our people continued giving of their sustenance without complaint in order that the enemies they had just made prostrate might have food and drink and continue to live. But now some 14 years have elapsed, during which the people of the United States of America have carried the financial burdens of most of the world, and with what results? In 1940, before we began our wasteful giving, we had friends all over the world. Today we have hardly a friend outside our own hemisphere.

But even with this dismal background our thoughtless leaders in our National Capital now propose to tax our people even more grievously and to assume now the additional burden of the support of the uncounted masses of the great land mass of Asia. What fools we are. If our generosity made only enemies among the Christian peoples of Europe, by what logic may we expect friends as a result of foolish give-aways in hostile, non-Christian lands?

Our great Constitution guarantees us the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. All of these guarantees become meaningless in the face of illegal and confiscatory taxes. We could serve the cause of communism no better by sending them vast shiploads of armaments than we do by senseless spending ourselves into chaos and national bankruptcy.

Too long have we played the fool. Our national survival depends upon a sane reappraisal of the policies of folly that have made our continued existence a serious question at this tense moment of history.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I tender the letter from my fellow citizen of our wonderful State of Louisiana, Mr. Bluford H. J. Balter, the letter which was the inspiration for this address, and I ask that it be made a part of this address and take its place in the historical archives of our great Nation as witness to the fact that in our great land of the United States of North America the humble citizen as well as the statesman is aggressively determined that our free land shall survive and that our descendants shall enjoy, under our Lord and

Saviour Jesus Christ, that freedom and liberty to which we ourselves were born and which we are obligated to hand on to them undefiled.

NEW ORLEANS, U. S. A., January 1, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE S. LONG,
United States Representative from the
Eighth Louisiana Congressional District,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Exercising that inalienable right of free men to petition their government for redress of wrongs, as guaranteed by your illustrious predecessors gathered in constituent assembly to frame the Constitution of the United States, I now address you and implore you to save the very existence of our beloved Nation.

The Declaration of Independence, that great document by means of which our ancestors cast the die for freedom rather than tyranny, promises to us, as inalienable rights, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

After the bitter struggle for independence was won, that promise was made reality in the Bill of Rights comprising the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, and especially the due-process requirement of the fifth amendment.

Living under the Bill of Rights from 1789 to 1913, the United States of North America attained the highest standard of wealth, of living, and of culture that the world of man has ever known.

Then an iniquitous blight was impressed upon our constitutional system, the 16th amendment, declaring, in effect, that all the earnings of the citizen belonged not to him, but to the Government. Whatever amount of his earnings he was allowed to keep was by the grace of his all-powerful Government and not by reason of his natural and inalienable rights.

The 16th amendment had within itself the seeds that have now turned a proud Nation of free men into a Nation of ignominious slaves and regimented robots. The graft and corruption in high places, the mink coats and the freezers, yes, even the alleged action of Alger Hiss, Harry White, William Remington, and the Rosenbergs, as documented by the House Un-American Activities Committee, all are byproducts of a Nation of slaves, a people devoid of all hope of ever living in the blessed light of freedom and exercising the dignity inherently possessed and rightly expressed by all men who live not under tyranny.

For 14 years our people have supported from their earnings most of the rest of the World. During the great war that ended in 1945, they did so gladly; at the end of the decade that has since elapsed, they find the burden intolerable and the proposal to spend untold billions upon the teeming masses of Asia unthinkable.

History will hold to stern account the 84th Congress of these United States. It is to you that we look for the restoration of freedom and sanity in our beloved Nation. If you continue giving of our wealth and earnings to ungrateful and indifferent Europeans who give us only hate and ridicule in return and if you saddle us with the burden of supporting hordes of atheistic Asians, then truly we shall die as a free nation. If you take the first step toward returning us to sanity and Americanism, then shall you see a miracle among us. If you will but restore to us the right to use the fruits of our labor and our undertakings as we choose, limiting the arbitrary power of government to confiscate our wealth to some reasonable and predetermined amount, then shall you see American initiative and ingenuity come to the fore again and raise our living standards and our national prosperity to such undreamed-of heights that the rest of the world will live better than it ever has on the mere byproducts of American civilization.

Members of the 84th Congress:

If you fall us we die. If we die you and the hopes of mankind everywhere die with us.

Respectfully submitted.

BLUFORD H. J. BALTER,
Balter Building,
New Orleans, La.

The Late Kenneth Charles Morton Sills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to memorialize, briefly as I know I must, the life and services of a citizen of Maine who died on November 15 last. I refer to Kenneth Charles Morton Sills, president emeritus of Bowdoin College, one of the best known and best loved men who ever lived in our State.

Born in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on December 5, 1879, he came to Portland, Maine, with his parents in the year following. His father was for several years dean of St. Luke's Episcopal Cathedral in Portland. Kenneth Sills graduated from Bowdoin in 1901. He returned in 1903 as instructor for a single year in classics and English. He came back to the college again in 1906, to teach Latin, and remained at the college until his retirement in 1952. As it happens, I was a freshman at Bowdoin in 1906 and from the day of his advent to the college down to the moment of his death I was his devoted and admiring friend.

In 1910 Mr. Sills became dean of the college, in 1917, acting president, and in 1918, president. His services as president terminated with his retirement at the close of the academic year in 1952. For the rest of his life he was president emeritus. In the later years of his incumbency as president of Bowdoin, he was senior in point of service to most of the college presidents in the country. His judgment was sought and followed by educators everywhere. After his official retirement in 1952, he was constantly active in the cause of education and in an endless succession of good works.

I shall attempt no lengthy biographical sketch of former President Sills, nor shall I list his honors academic or otherwise. I should have made these remarks more seasonably had not the House been in recess at the time of his death, and thereafter until this month.

Kenneth Sills was above all an educator, concerned with the great responsibility of helping immature minds to become mature—of making boys into effective men. He believed in the liberal arts and in the humanities. In his life he exemplified the famous words of Terence, "Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto."

As president of Bowdoin College for 34 years and a member of its faculty for an even longer period, Kenneth Sills naturally left a strong impress on the college. No one who attended it in all

those years will gainsay his influence on the college and few will gainsay his influence on their own individual lives. That influence was unfailingly for good. He believed in men. He believed in men's hearts, and in their intellects.

Although we was primarily an educator his mind, like all first-rate minds, wandered into many fields and illumined whatever it touched. It goes almost without saying that he took an acute interest in everything that went on in the world about him. He was deeply concerned with the government of his State and of his Nation. A lifelong Democrat, and his party's candidate for the United States Senate in 1916, he was nevertheless no narrow or hide-bound partisan. Though he had not the temperament of the professional reformer, he was always thinking about how things could be better done. Only a few weeks before his death he and I were corresponding vigorously about possible amendments to our State constitution.

President Sills was a profoundly religious man. He was for many years one of the leading laymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

One cannot write about Kenneth Sills in terms of particular things he did or said or even of his opinions and judgments. He will be most remembered by everybody who knew him for his capacity for friendship, and the generosity of feeling which endeared him to all with whom he came in contact. He had a warm, responsive nature. To the students of the college, to its alumni, to the members of its boards of trustees and overseers, he gave himself ungrudgingly. His friendship was always stimulating. He brought out the best in people because he believed in them. I can never forget his kindness to me on occasions without number and for much more than a generation.

Also I cannot forbear to mention his devoted wife, now left a widow. The hearts of all his friends go out to her in her sorrow.

Thirty-fourth Anniversary of the Temporary Establishment of Freedom in the Armenian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Friday, February 18, marks the 34th anniversary of the temporary establishment of freedom in the Armenian Republic, a freedom which only lasted a few months and was then overthrown by the dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

I am pleased to call the attention of the House to this anniversary in view of the often-expressed hope of the administration and the Congress that the

day will soon come when all subjugated peoples now behind the Iron Curtain will again enjoy the right of self-determination and a government of their own choice. I, therefore, trust that the Armenian people will continue to keep alive the spirit of hope for the time when they, too, will once again breathe the air of freedom which they enjoyed so briefly 34 years ago.

Congress Charts a New Course for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on December 15 I had the honor of delivering an address at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation in New York City. I ask unanimous consent that my address be incorporated in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS CHARTS A NEW COURSE FOR AGRICULTURE

(Address by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida)

I am happy, indeed, to be the guest of the American Farm Bureau Federation and to appear on your program today. I was sorry that I was forced, by a very bad throat, to cancel my visit with you at Chicago last year. I count it a very special courtesy that you have invited me a second time.

My association with your splendid organization has been, to me, a succession of pleasant and helpful experiences. At the national level I have found my own thinking on agricultural legislation, in most instances, in quite close accord with your official positions, and I have frequently sought and obtained valuable assistance from the members of your exceedingly capable Washington staff. When you have not agreed with me you have always been courteous and tolerant.

On the State level there is no other organization besides the Florida Farm Bureau which contains strong representation from all branches of our highly diversified Florida agriculture, and which can therefore speak with such authority for the agricultural groups in our State as a whole. In my opinion your approach to all questions, both National and State, has been both constructive and well informed, and I look forward to a permanent continuance of my friendly association with you.

I am glad, too, that my appearance today happens to be at the same time as your visit from the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. I feel that Mr. Benson has rendered very great service to American agriculture and that his leadership has been fundamentally in the right direction. The sooner we all realize that agricultural problems are economic problems of great national importance and that they may never be dealt with upon any narrow partisan basis, the better it will be for American agriculture and for the American people. In my judgment, Secretary Benson's approach has been courageous and essentially nonpartisan, and I think that Congress has been similarly broad in its reaction. Both Houses of Congress have

given Mr. Benson bipartisan support, which is as it should be.

A noted speaker once said that no greater misfortune could befall any speaker than to be on a program where everybody present knows more about his subject than he does, yet that is precisely the situation in which I find myself. I shall hope, however, that my point of view, as a legislator, may contribute some small new light upon the problems of American agriculture—my subject being "Congress Charts a New Course for Agriculture."

The 83d Congress, during its 2 years, 1953 and 1954, has probably passed more legislation than any earlier Congress which vitally affects agriculture. It is timely to analyze this mass of new legislation to determine what has been the general philosophy of this Congress in enacting laws for agriculture. I shall leave for later discussion the price-support programs, which are included in the Agriculture Act of 1954, the most important single law passed by us. At this time I shall mention three general fields of legislation which the 83d Congress evidently regarded as of great importance to agriculture.

1. EMPHASIS ON INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

It is quite clear that the Congress placed much emphasis on the responsibility of the individual farmer and made available additional tools which farmers can use, either individually or collectively, in solving their own problems relating to the production of their crops or to the distribution of their crops in the American market.

The Water Facilities Act, for instance, was expanded and enlarged so as to apply to all areas of the Nation, rather than simply to the arid and semiarid States of the West as heretofore. This legislation will enable and encourage the expansion of conservation practices and improved use of soil and water throughout the Nation by allowing substantial loans to any individual farmer or rancher for water facilities and general conservation development, and much larger loans to associations of farmers. The extended Water Facilities Act also sets up a new program under which, in addition to direct Government loans, many loans for these same purposes may be insured by the Government, thus making commercial loans much easier to obtain. This act should be of great importance everywhere, but particularly in drought areas or where reclamation or drainage is under way.

A second act which creates new tools for the use of farm producers is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Its purpose is to recognize the fact that the Federal Government has an interest, in the upper watersheds of streams, in doing those things that go beyond ordinary soil-conservation practices which already receive some repayment out of Federal funds. As to those things which require collective action, such as the building of dams over the upper streams, where the question is not one of direct flood control, navigation, or waterpower, this act makes it possible to bring about better practices above the dams and improved conditions downstream. This act requires an integrated community approach to the development of small watersheds. The Federal Government participates in the planning and the cost, but the work is done and the project administered by the local soil conservation district or some similar public body, which must also have State approval.

A third new measure, which gives added encouragement to the adoption of conservation practices by farmers, is a section of the general tax revision law under which, for the first time, an income-tax deduction is permitted to the farmer for his reasonable cost of conservation practices up to 25 percent of his gross income.

Additional tools are also given to various groups of producers by two interesting amendments of the law relating to marketing agreements and orders. In the case of grapefruit producers, the law was changed so as to permit the bringing of grapefruit for canning within the terms of a marketing agreement which formerly could only control grapefruit consumed as fresh fruit. If used, this provision will afford an interesting test of whether or not two-thirds of the producers of the fruit, who are equally interested in the sales price of their raw product, regardless of whether it is to reach the consumer in fresh form or in cans, may, with half of the canners joining them, bring to an end a situation under which their processed fruit has sometimes brought them only salvage prices.

Another interesting change in the Marketing Agreement Act, which is applicable in the case of tomatoes, Irish potatoes, avocados, grapefruit and other fruits and vegetables which meet with direct competition from fresh foreign imports, should make the marketing agreements and orders much more useful by applying to imported competitive products the same standards of grade, size, quality and maturity which the marketing agreements impose on the domestic products.

Still another change in the law which makes the farmers much more the masters of their own destiny than heretofore is that by which the Farm Credit Administration is taken out of the Department of Agriculture and made an independent agency governed by a board of 13 members, of whom 12 are named from lists nominated by the farmers who make up the various regional farm credit organizations.

To close on this point, it seems clear to me that the changes in law which I have mentioned, and others which were enacted by the 83d Congress, greatly accentuate both the responsibility and the opportunity of farmers to handle their own problems and also greatly increase the effectiveness of the various helpful tools and devices which are given to them by Federal law.

2. EXPANSION OF RESEARCH

I am sure that every American farmer knows that not only the 83d Congress, but also the present national administration, has placed great emphasis on the expansion of agricultural research and education. This step is in complete accord with the recognition of greater individual responsibility for the farmers, as already mentioned, and is the best method of developing new information which, when passed on to individual farmers, should enable them to produce more economically, more abundantly, and in higher quality, thus giving them increased opportunity to solve their own problems. The plan of reorganization for the Department of Agriculture which was developed by the present administration and approved by Congress combines into one major division—called the Agricultural Research Service—the many agricultural research activities which had been scattered through various divisions under the earlier hodgepodge organization. The fixing of responsibility in one place, as well as the assignment of major importance to the Research Service, properly reflect added emphasis upon the benefits of research as well as upon the educational process by which the new information is communicated to the farmers.

To keep in step with the increased emphasis given to research activities, the Congress appropriated for the current fiscal year 1955 increased funds for research in the amount of \$12,311,000 above fiscal year 1954, much of which is for expanded work in the State experiment stations, and also increased funds for education in the amount of \$8,248,000, most of which goes to the Federal-State Agricultural Extension Service, making a total Federal increase of more than \$20½ mil-

lion for research and education above the amounts appropriated for last year.

In a further effort to assist the Department of Agriculture in the field of research, a bill was passed in the second session of the 83d Congress which authorized the Department of Agriculture to contract with private persons and agencies for production research, which relates to growing crops in the fields, plant diseases, etc. The Department had already been authorized in the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 to contract for utilization and marketing research and presently is contracting approximately \$1,700,000 in this research, and now that the contract authority is extended to include production research, the amount of contracted research should increase substantially to the benefit of all agriculture.

It is my feeling that the important new emphasis which has been placed on research activities by the 83d Congress will be further expanded in the future, since the benefits of research have been so pronounced in the past, and since there can be no possible question as to the propriety of organizing, operating, and financing increased research activities by Government. Individual farmers and even groups of farmers are rarely in position to handle research programs adequately, and it is inconceivable to me that there should be any difference of opinion on the fact that we are on sound ground in enlarging the research program for the Federal Government, as well as in its cooperation with the several States, and in expanding the educational machinery by which the benefits of research may be promptly communicated to individual farmers so that they may make effective use of new and valuable information. This, then, is but another important method by which farmers are enabled to help themselves.

3. EXPANSION OF FOREIGN MARKETS FOR FARM PRODUCTS

One of the most important fields of new legislation enacted by the 83d Congress is that of expanding the use of our agricultural products in foreign markets. Agriculture has been acutely conscious of the fact that the major part of the loss in the export trade of our Nation in recent years has fallen on agriculture, despite the fact that many friendly peoples have actual need of our products.

One important accomplishment was the transfer of agricultural attachés in our foreign Embassies from the State Department to the Department of Agriculture. We have had many disappointing experiences in recent years growing out of the fact that the agricultural attachés have been completely controlled by the Department of State. It is, of course, true that the State Department is unfamiliar with agricultural problems and that it has the heavy burden of handling many problems which relate directly to its primary field of foreign diplomatic relations. Nevertheless, our agricultural people have been keenly disappointed that they have been unable to take advantage of promising openings in foreign markets, particularly for the greater export of perishable commodities. Now it will be possible, I hope, for such matters to receive prompt and sympathetic handling by persons experienced in agricultural trade, and I am confident that our foreign markets will be enlarged thereby.

There are now 59 agricultural attachés assigned to 44 posts in 42 countries. They will continue to be stationed at our Embassies, but their activities will be reported directly to the Department of Agriculture, and they will devote their full time to representing United States agriculture. I am sorry to hear that already there is some indication that State Department redtape is reappearing, and I think we should be most diligent to prevent the thwarting of the completely clear intent of Congress in this matter.

The extension of the International Wheat Agreement and the inclusion in the new Mutual Security Act of 1954 of a provision earmarking \$350 million to finance the export and sale of surplus agricultural products both constitute important machinery for the disposal abroad of substantial additional amounts of American wheat and other American farm products.

Perhaps the major effort of the 83d Congress, however, in the field of expansion of foreign markets was the enactment of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which makes available for a 3-year period the sum of \$1 billion for the expansion of foreign use of our agricultural products. Of this, \$700 million is provided to expedite the acceptance of foreign currency for our products by allowing the Federal Government to absorb the difference in exchange, a factor which has heretofore discouraged the sale of our farm products to foreign nations whose currencies were softer than ours. A major difficulty we have experienced heretofore has been not to find markets, but to absorb the loss required by unfavorable exchange rates.

To a certain degree, this large sum will represent a new subsidy of our foreign agricultural exports, but much of the investment will not be lost in view of the fact that we have need for foreign exchange in connection with the maintenance of our military forces, our embassies, and other activities in many friendly foreign nations and also in the purchase of needed strategic materials. And so we have strong hope that this Federal financing of \$700 million to increase the use of agricultural commodities for export will enable our Nation to sell more of its surpluses and our private traders to trade more effectively with foreign nations by allowing the Federal Government to absorb the loss resulting from unfavorable exchange rates.

I am happy to report that the Department of Agriculture is pushing this program and, with the cooperation of the State Department, is now negotiating with various nations under the authority of this law. In November it was announced that Turkey was the first to sign a surplus disposal commodity agreement, which provided for Turkey to take \$35½ million of our surplus wheat and feed grains. At about the same time the Department announced the details of a \$85 million surplus commodity program for Japan. I hear that similar negotiations are nearing completion with Pakistan and Yugoslavia.

The remaining \$300 million under the Agricultural Trade Development Act, available, also, for the next 3 years, will permit the President to use our own surplus commodities in said amount in doing errands of mercy, or of strategic national importance, such as those which we have done in East Germany, Pakistan, and India. The President may donate commodities from our overabundance if he determines that such will alleviate human suffering, or will serve our cause in our worldwide conflict with communism.

Still another program coming out of the 83d Congress may not have been noticed by you. We made an appropriation of \$5 million at the request of the President, which is to be used to give our agricultural and other industries the opportunity to exhibit in trade fairs all over the world in an effort to show foreign purchasers what great things are being accomplished through American genius. In his message, the President stated that he hoped to go into not less than 30 of the 75 great trade fairs which are to be held this year. Our Florida delegation has asked for processed citrus to be represented in these fairs because we are proud of the progress which we have made in citrus processing and want our achievements to be better understood by the rest of the world. I am sure

that there are similar values in various other industries represented by this great group of producers which would justify exhibits in other lands so that the people there may be more impressed by the fact that free men know how to get things done.

Then, too, our program is expanding for the export of agricultural products through the payment of subsidies from section 32 funds. I shall not enlarge upon this subject, but will say that large sums of money are still available for such use and that they are being helpfully utilized in greater measure than heretofore.

I am sure that all of you recognize that the very large program for the expansion of our exports of agricultural products, which is covered by the measures which I have mentioned and by other acts of the Congress, represents an aggressive and extremely worthwhile effort through which the Nation should enlarge its disposal of surplus commodities acquired under its price-support programs, and at the same time private initiative will be encouraged, through the use of these new tools, to vastly enlarge its activities in foreign markets. It seems self-evident that much further expansion in this field must be accomplished in the future. The furnishing of more food and other farm products to the people of other nations not only serves a good domestic purpose, but it also enhances our standing abroad, since there is no doubt whatever that millions of people within our sphere of influence badly need the food and other values which flow from our agricultural abundance.

OUR PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

The principal agricultural measure enacted during the 83d Congress is, of course, the new general price-support law, known as the Agriculture Act of 1954, which, in my opinion, could not have been passed without the vigorous support of your fine organization. I strongly commend your leaders and particularly your president, Mr. Kline, and your legislative counsel, Mr. Woolley, for the strong and effective support which you gave this legislation.

Except for the production of sugar, by producers of both beets and sugarcane, this act, taken in conjunction with the Anderson Act of 1949, which it amends and supplements, covers all agricultural production throughout the Nation, and is therefore of very great importance to agriculture as a whole, to those industries which supply agriculture, or handle or process agricultural products, and to the general public. This act is the most exhaustive effort to accomplish stabilization of agriculture in time of peace that has ever been enacted by any Congress.

So many different devices and formulas for different branches of agriculture are set up by the act that I can make only brief reference to those programs which apply to the principal agricultural groups. I mention first the program for wool, under which production payments are authorized at a rate not to exceed 110 percent of parity. Since wool is a storable product, of high strategic importance, and since we produce only a fraction of what we need for our own use, this wool program must be strongly differentiated from the other programs which deal with major crops which are already in surplus production or could quickly become in surplus. As to wool alone, we are endeavoring to substantially increase our domestic production.

In the case of only one of the so-called basic crops, tobacco, was the high rigid price support of 90 percent continued as embraced in earlier law. There are compelling reasons for this distinction between tobacco and the other basic crops, chief of which is that tobacco has become such an important crop from the standpoint of the vast public revenue from excise taxes which it makes available to the Federal Government, the

States, and the municipalities. It is now a matter of important national concern that a fairly constant level of tobacco production shall continue without heavy surplus or deficit, and that the producers of tobacco shall have a stable economy so that there will be minimum fluctuation of the volume of tobacco production. You know, I am sure, that the annual tax revenue derived from tobacco is about \$2½ billion, which is about equal to the farm price for a bumper crop of wheat. The 83d Congress increased the penalty for the overplanting of tobacco, but otherwise left the 90 percent rigid price support structure undisturbed, with all of its regulations and controls.

In the case of the other five basic commodities, wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and peanuts, the rigid 90 percent price support program was replaced by a flexible support base, which is at the rate of 82½ to 90 percent of parity for 1955 and 75 to 90 percent in subsequent years.

Of course this return to a flexible price support base was the issue which produced the heaviest controversy, and which also proved to be most highly emotional. I cannot at this time discuss in detail this grave issue, with which I am sure most of you are completely familiar. Suffice it to say that until World War II flexible price supports had been regarded as the proper and most helpful approach. The 1938 law, which was the most generous peacetime law on the books, prescribed a support program at from 52 to 75 percent of parity. The 90 percent rigid price support program was a war device which was designed to greatly increase production to meet war needs, and which accomplished that end.

When extended into peacetime, the high rigid price support program continued this greatly increased production, which rapidly created large surpluses in the hands of the Government. The losses sustained by the Government in connection with these surpluses became heavy and even greater losses were impending. The warehouse expense to the Government for storing surpluses reached about three-quarters of a million dollars a day. The confidence of the general public and of large segments of agriculture which produce nonbasic supported crops or unsupported crops was also greatly impaired, and dangerous divisions appeared among agricultural leaders and groups.

It seemed clear to me and apparently to the majority of Congress that restoration of a peacetime flexible price support program had become of primary importance, from the points of view of protecting agriculture itself and of being fair to the general public. A flexible price support program had been voted by Congress in 1948 and again in 1949, but its effect had been postponed in recent years. Furthermore, the measure which we enacted this year has for its minimum or floor rate 75 percent of parity, which was the ceiling or highest rate under the 1938 law. It seems to me that this fact alone increases the inducement to farmers to reasonably control their production rather than to continue excessive production in order to sell their products to Uncle Sam.

Three other features in the new law were of maximum effect in their application to these five basic commodities, though they also apply to other crops. These three features are, first, the gradual transfer to modernized parity so as to bring the computation to the immediate past rather than to leave it in the unrealistic, remote past, under which it had generally been based on prices obtaining from 1910 to 1914; second, the provision for so-called set-asides which operate to remove substantial quantities of the surpluses from consideration in figuring the current carryover of supplies for price support purposes; and third, the provision for control of acreage which will be diverted from the excessive amounts of land which

were being used in the production of the surplus crops, particularly wheat, corn, and cotton. It is obvious, I think, that these three major provisions in the new law were designed to make the law more reasonable, to cushion the impact of the application of the flexible price support structure to the five basic crops which were affected, and to give greater protection to that vast number of agricultural producers who do not produce either the basic crops or any other price-supported commodity. In passing, I think it is necessary that we shall always remember that the value of the five basic crops now affected by the flexible program is less than 20 percent—less than one-fifth—of the total value of our national agricultural production.

It is obvious that the flexible program will allow, at least in part, for essential differences among the several basic crops which were not being recognized under the rigid price support program, and this is highly important. Each basic commodity has peculiar characteristics or unique competition which sets it apart from other basics and from other crops in general, and require for it a distinctive support program. To some extent flexible price supports should allow for these differences. Flexible supports should also greatly increase the responsibility of farm groups which produce basic crops to better adjust their production to the needs of the market and to bring to an end the recent excessive production and dumping on the Federal Government which has given the whole price-support program a black eye and has threatened its very existence.

Many hours could be spent in discussing details of price support for milk and milk products, which presented one of our most perplexing problems. These commodities were not price-supported until wartime, but thereafter the 90-percent support rate was allowed them for some years even though they did not come within the basics, nor within any group on which a rigid 90-percent support was ever contemplated. Milk products are, in some respects, much like Irish potatoes and eggs, on both of which price-support programs proved to be so expensive, so wasteful and so indefensible that those programs were abolished.

Dairy products present a spotty problem, existing on a large scale in relatively few areas where generally local production greatly exceeds the demands of nearby milksheds. This problem pertains to an industry which has not done, for itself, anything like what it should do in decreasing costs, in research, in better distribution and marketing, in diversification, in advertising and in increasing good will and average consumption. Too frequently dairying has played second fiddle to its processors.

And yet the dairy industry presents a very large public problem, vitally affecting many thousands of good people and numerous splendid communities. It received much attention from this last Congress and certainly will receive much attention in the future. The reactions of prices in the industry to the 75 percent price figure which I think was correctly applied by Secretary Benson under the law will be awaited with anxiety. The Congress did not, in this field, change the support setup under the old law because of our feeling that the old provision fairly gives to dairying its full recognition as compared with other price-supported agricultural industries.

As you know we did enact several helpful additions to the dairy products program, apart from direct supports. And we likewise required an intensive study of dairy problems by the Secretary of Agriculture and his report and recommendation of the best available support program, or alternative programs, by January 3, 1955, which is next month.

Frankness compels me to say that many in Congress favor the entire abolition of

price support for dairying—just as was true earlier in the case of Irish potatoes and eggs. There is certainly much public sentiment to that effect. I personally feel that more than any other industry covered by the 1954 law, dairying must show greater alertness, as well as greater willingness and ability to help solve its own problems than it has yet manifested. I shall hope strongly to see indications of such an attitude in the near future, and I congratulate the dairy industry on the good beginning which it is now making.

I regret that time is lacking to discuss the various other programs for price support which are embraced in the new law. Suffice it to say that this new law, together with the Sugar Act, will afford many opportunities for comparison and contrast of differing types of price-support programs, some directly fixed by law and some growing out of the administration of the law by the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that additional progress is possible, which will be reflected in subsequent legislation or changed administrative handling or both. In summary there are certain observations which I wish to make on this vastly important field.

First, products under the flexible program for both basics and nonbasics are not barred by the new law from having 90 percent price support, but to the contrary such support is within reach, if the producers use such co-operation and restraint in production as to prevent the accumulation of disturbing surpluses. I hope that we may never lose sight of this open invitation to agriculture to co-operate more fully with Government as a good partner.

Second, though there are very great differences of opinion in this controversial field of price support, I hope that they may not bring about any further postponement of the use of the flexible price support provisions. It is manifestly in the Nation's interest that a full and fair trial be given to the flexible program, as well as to all the other programs, so that we may have a clear comparison of results upon which to base future decisions. I shall strongly insist upon such a full and fair trial. No one contends for a moment that we have yet attained perfection.

Third, every emphasis must be placed on confining Government controls and regimentation to a minimum and leaving the producer the maximum amount of freedom of action, always assigning greatest importance to his willingness to use restraint and self-discipline. In every program and for the overall effort, no unnecessary curbs must be placed on private initiative and on the opportunities for practical and scientific advancement by the development of more economical production methods, improved products, wider consumer demand, new uses of products, better distribution and selling and every other improvement which can be attained in the American way by keen and ambitious producers. A frozen or static agricultural industry cannot long remain prosperous. We must not forget that for many farm commodities high prosperity already prevails, despite the absence of price support or regimentation. It is my hope that as a result of the great and varied effort which will be under way, and the numerous contrasts and comparisons which will be available, agriculture will be assisted to make tremendous and permanent advances, but always by leaving to the individual farmers a high degree of private initiative.

At this point, I want to say that regardless of strong differences of opinion which led our Senate Committee on Agriculture to divide, for instance, on an 8 to 7 basis on the flexible price-support program, I recognize that all members of our committee are sincerely devoted to the cause of agricultural producers and are equally anxious to work out the best possible program for a stabilized and prosperous agriculture. I am

sure that this same observation applies generally to Congress as a whole, to the personnel of the Department of Agriculture, and to all of the interested producing groups throughout the Nation.

Surely by the combined efforts of all of us, and by taking full advantage of all of the new facts which will be developed in the many and varied programs which will be under way, we shall be able to come up with answers which will bring sound permanent conditions for agriculture, which will be wholly compatible with American traditions.

Historically, American agriculture has always been one of the strongest bulwarks and one of the proudest illustrations of what the American system of private enterprise can accomplish. I strongly hope, and I deeply feel, that it must always remain such a bulwark and such an illustration. It is my unyielding conviction that only in this way can agriculture continue to make its maximum contribution to our great American experiment in self-government.

Unemployment in Pennsylvania Coal Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release:

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, expressed concern, in a statement made today in Washington, with the failure of the President's state of the Union message to deal with the chronic unemployment problem in the coal fields in Pennsylvania. Congressman FLOOD, who represents Luzerne County in the anthracite coal fields in northeastern Pennsylvania, made the following statement:

"I was terribly disappointed that the President, in his state of the Union speech, failed to mention, in any way whatsoever, the desperate economic problems which are well known by the Government to exist as a chronic unemployment condition, in the anthracite and bituminous coal fields in Pennsylvania, and in particular am I concerned with this situation in the anthracite coal fields in northeastern Pennsylvania centered in Luzerne County.

"In his message to the joint session of the Congress, I quote, '1954 was the most prosperous year in our country.' Yet in the 1954 year end, total nonfarm employment is about 1 million below the level of the previous year. The average unemployment in 1954 was nearly 2 million higher than in 1953.

"In Luzerne County we have over 25,000 unemployed men between the ages of 18 and 60, who are employable and eager and anxious for jobs. Seventy-five percent of these men are veterans of our Armed Forces. I had hoped that the administration would recommend a public-works program, on a standby basis for the Nation at large, but for immediate application to any distressed area if and when the percentage of unemployed to the employable population reaches a danger mark to be determined by the United States Department of Labor in conjunction with all other United States Government agencies and State agencies which would be concerned also with this specific problem. It is said that the world cannot be free as long as any of its people anywhere are slaves. I say that this Nation cannot be considered as prosperous as long as the Government ignores and

refuses to help the Nation's basic fuel industry and fuel potential, which is coal; and at the same time being indisputably aware of all the facts, fails at this time to propose and use all its influence, the great prestige of the President himself, to pass legislation in the form of a public-works program to give immediate employment to all who seek employment in these distressed areas.

"Without going into detail, I would like to make it clear that by public-works program I mean an intelligent, constructive and desirable plan of necessary and essential and worthwhile projects which will contribute to the permanent general welfare such as schools, hospitals, sanitariums, and so forth.

"I have given much thought to this matter and I am preparing now the necessary legislation which I will introduce in the House within the next 30 days."

Agriculture Must Tell Its Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of a speech which I made at the annual meeting of the National Grange at Spokane, Wash., on November 16, 1954:

AGRICULTURE MUST TELL ITS STORY

(Address by Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas)

I greatly appreciate the honor which you have conferred upon me by inviting me to address this 88th session of the National Grange.

I am a member of many organizations, but in none do I value my membership more highly than in the Grange. I must confess that I am not a working Grange member. I am proud to have been a member of the Pioneer Grange near Lakin, Kans., for more than 20 years, but my work in Washington makes it impossible for me to attend many meetings. That is my loss.

In Washington I have enjoyed and profited by my association with the officers and representatives of the National Grange at national headquarters. I have had the privilege of working with three great Grange leaders—National Master Louis J. Taber, National Master Albert Goss, my dear friend for many years, and now with our present able and distinguished National Master, Herschel Newsom, and his associates in the Washington office.

Today as always the Grange represents the best in American rural life. During almost a century of service it has exerted tremendous influence for good in the life of farmers throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Since 1867, the Order of Patrons of Husbandry has adhered to the covenant of its declaration of purpose so well stated in these words: "To develop a better and higher manhood and womanhood among ourselves; to enhance the comforts and attractions of our homes and strengthen our attachments to our pursuits; to foster mutual understanding and cooperation; to maintain inviolate our laws and to emulate each other in labor; to hasten the good time coming."

There is something inspiring and stirring in these words. They ring with a constant reminder that while we have just pride in the accomplishments of our fraternity, the challenge of the work yet ahead transcends all else.

We are meeting here in Spokane in the midst of a critical period, both for this Nation and for the world which today is divided into armed camps in a state of cold conflict.

Bombs are not falling, but the men in the Kremlin are frank to tell us that they are waiting for the day when the economy of this and other free countries will collapse; when people will be hungry and ragged in the streets.

On that day they hope communism will ride triumphantly over freedom.

I do not know whether we can keep Russia from dropping bombs on this country. I do know our best hope is to maintain a position of strength.

That means not only military strength, even more important, it means economic and moral strength.

I sincerely believe that while we must maintain our defenses in a military way, our greatest protection against Communist domination throughout the world lies in the field of economic and moral strength.

Even more than on force, the Kremlin is betting that America does not have the economic and moral strength to win a cold war.

This puts a great responsibility upon the men and women who live and work on the farms of our country.

Historically, we know that depressions begin on the farms.

The lessons of history teach us also that the moral strength of every nation has found its greatest bulwark in the people living on the land.

It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that agriculture in this country remain the strong economic and moral force that it has been in the past.

Whether it does or not constitutes a great challenge to such an organization as the National Grange, because all is not well with agriculture. For several years past our national income as a whole has been increasing; our population is growing by leaps and bounds; but at the same time farm income is declining and people are leaving the land.

A hundred years ago almost 70 percent of our people were farmers, and even as late as 1910 a third of them were directly engaged in agriculture. Today less than 14 percent live and work on our farms.

It is a great tribute to the industry and efficiency of our farmers, however, that, although their numbers have been declining both relatively and actually, since 1939 we have increased our over-all agricultural production by more than 40 percent.

This has enabled us to not only take care of the needs of an increasing population for food and fiber, but it has enabled us also to carry on a great moral and economic battle against communism because we have had food and fiber to feed and clothe hungry and distressed people in all parts of the world.

If we win the cold war the part played by the farmers of America will stand out in bold relief.

Along with the decline of agricultural population great changes have taken place in the whole economic structure of agriculture.

Until comparatively recently farming was largely a self-contained industry. The farm itself produced most of the family food; woodlots and forests most of the fuel; horses and oxen produced on the farm furnished the power. They were fueled by hay and grain grown on the farm. The farm produced its own fertilizer.

There was little expense for hired labor, because families were large, and work was interchanged with neighbors.

Taxes were negligible.

Capital investment was low.

Interest charges were unimportant.

In other words, until comparatively recent times the farmer had little need for cash income.

Contrast that with the situation of the farmer today—not only the big farmer and the medium-sized farmer, but even the little

farmer requires a heavy cash outlay to carry on his operations.

He must purchase his power on the farm in the form of tractors and other equipment.

He must buy gasoline and distillate as fuel.

He must buy fertilizer.

Hired labor is costly, if he can get it.

His large investment in plant and equipment, and necessary working capital makes interest charges an important item.

He has a heavy outlay for insurance and taxes.

In other words, the farmer today is in the same position as any other businessman.

He must have substantial cash receipts to meet his current operating expenses, and his prices must be high enough to pay for these charges and lay aside a reserve for depreciation, to say nothing of the reasonable profit to which he is entitled as legitimately as any other businessman.

So while the market price of farm products may have been unimportant in the past, today it is everything and it determines whether or not a farmer is going to be able to stay in business.

Thus one of the greatest if not the greatest problems of the farmer is to have something to say about the prices of the things he buys and the things he sells.

With few exceptions his costs are determined by someone else. He has no bargaining power to enable him to reduce them.

If he consumes electric power, the price is fixed by a public commission.

The wages of his hired labor are fixed by competition with industrial enterprises where wages, hours, and working conditions are determined by collective bargaining between well entrenched labor unions and industries which can pass high labor costs on to consumers.

His taxes, his transportation costs in getting his products to market centers, his insurance rates are all fixed by the action of State and Federal agencies.

The price of his fuel, his fertilizer, and his farm machinery and equipment is not the subject of bargaining as far as he is concerned.

He pays what the seller demands.

On the other hand, with certain unimportant exceptions, and in the absence of help from farm programs the farmer has nothing to say about the price of his products. If he ships his cattle and hogs to Kansas City or Chicago he takes what the buyers offer him, and they all offer him substantially the same.

His alternative is to ship his livestock home again.

When he takes his grain to market he doesn't say how much he will take for it.

He says, "How much will you give me?"

Furthermore, the farmer is subject to all the vagaries of the weather as well as the destructive effects of plant diseases and insect pests. These factors very largely determine his yields, and his unit cost of production depends upon the yield.

His corn may make 80 bushels an acre one year and 40 bushels the next. In the latter case, assuming that his expenses are the same, the cost per bushel is twice as much as it was in the previous year.

That is not to say that good farming does not pay or that efficiency does not reduce costs. The point is that no farmer can tell in advance what his costs are going to be.

What other businessman could stay in business if his costs and selling prices were determined by someone else and the quantity and quality of his product was determined in most cases by weather and other factors beyond his control?

It is the recognition of these facts which has brought about Government farm programs in recent years. The fundamental purpose of these programs has been to enable farmers to maintain some balance between supply and demand in connection with the marketing of their products.

Most of these programs have been on a trial and error basis. We have been dealing with something new, and have had to feel our way as we went along, but they have been reasonably successful. Changes have been made as we went along, and a considerable variety of programs has been developed.

I do not want at this time to get into the controversy over price-support programs except to say that experience has demonstrated as we have gone along that the Grange position is right, and that our greatest mistake as far as farm programs is concerned, is to attempt to apply one magic formula, one cure-all, that will answer the problems of all agricultural products.

Furthermore, I think we have to recognize that there are some commodities which do not adapt themselves to direct price-support programs.

That great man in agriculture, Albert Goss, warned us years ago that there is no such cure-all and that there are almost as many problems as there are commodities.

I remember he used to tell our committee that just as we can't cure appendicitis with castor oil or smallpox with surgery, we must have a bag full of remedies as a country doctor carries a bag full of different pills, so to speak.

Our experience has demonstrated the value of attempting to tailor a program to meet the needs of a particular commodity.

Take the case of sugar, with which many of you are familiar. The sugar program stands by itself. It was worked out to meet the particular needs of that commodity, and it has worked more successfully, perhaps, than any other program.

The same can be said of the tobacco program. Ninety-percent price supports with strict controls have worked so well on that commodity that practically everyone has agreed—no matter what his views might be as to other commodities—that such a program should be continued for tobacco.

In the last Congress, recognizing the fact that wool has peculiar problems of its own, we set up a wool program to meet the needs of that commodity.

All of this is in accord with the views expressed by President Eisenhower in his message to Congress on January 11, 1954, entitled "Recommendations Affecting the Nation's Agriculture."

In that message he said, and I quote: "No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another."

In the farm bill which the House Committee on Agriculture reported to the House, we carried out the policy recommended by the President in this regard. That is, we provided for keeping tobacco supports at 90 percent of parity with strict controls. We set up a separate program on wool. We did not deal with the sugar program because that has always been carried out as separate legislation.

But we went further than this in applying the principle laid down by the President, in that we set up a plan for wheat along the lines of the certificate form of a two-price system.

We set up some special provisions for the dairy industry and directed the Department of Agriculture to make a study of two price plans for rice.

The Senate did not go along with us with respect to the new program for wheat, nor with most of our provisions relating to the dairy industry.

In conference we were able to keep many of the dairy provisions, however; among them a provision directing the Secretary to

make a special study of dairy price-support programs, including the self-help plan proposed by dairy producers.

The final form of the bill also contained the direction to the Department of Agriculture to make a study of a two-price system for rice.

In these matters we had the invaluable support of your great leader, Herschel Newsum, one of America's greatest farm leaders of all times, who speaks with a strong, clear voice on all agricultural problems.

To sum it up, I feel, that while agriculture in the overall may be one big industry, contained in it are a great many smaller industries, some of which are in a degree in conflict with each other.

No one plan can meet all of the many problems.

In the overall program, we must keep and use the best tools we can devise but at the same time we must constantly study and test new approaches, always keeping in mind the interests of both farmers and all of our citizens.

Personally, I want to use fixed supports when fixed supports work best. I want to use flexible supports in areas where they work best. I want to employ marketing agreements and orders where they work best.

I want to manage and remove surpluses in such a way as will be in the best interests of farmers, consumers, and taxpayers.

However, while I feel we should be flexible as to the tools and methods that we use, in our objectives where agriculture and the good of this country are concerned, we should be rigid and inflexible.

What I want to see is economic equality; that is, a fair share of the national income for agriculture. I believe that this is only simple justice, and furthermore I am convinced that the health of the whole economy and the well-being of all our people depend upon it.

There are of course many vital Government programs in agriculture besides those relating to price supports, including soil and water conservation, adequate credit, research, education, cooperative marketing, expansion of markets, crop insurance, rural electrification and telephones and many more.

I shall not go into them at this time, but there is one thing we must stress in all of our programs: that is the encouragement and preservation of the family type farm.

We hear too much talk now about getting rid of the so-called inefficient farmer, of consolidating his land with somebody else's and sending him to town to look for a job. I am afraid this may cause some people to believe that a small farmer is an inefficient farmer. Quite often the case is directly the contrary.

One great motivation, one of the strengths of our free-enterprise system, is the hope of every young man that some day as a reward for his labor and frugality he may have his own farm or his own small business.

We have long since realized the dangers of monopoly in business through enactment of our antitrust laws. It is equally as important that we protect the opportunities for individual ownership in agriculture.

So it would behoove all of us to talk less of liquidating the so-called inefficient farmer and put greater emphasis on improving the position of the family farm. We should do everything possible to improve and adapt machines, methods, and programs to make this the most productive and prosperous unit of agriculture. Otherwise we will be losing one of our greatest moral assets, both in agriculture and in the Nation.

I mentioned a while ago that those engaged in agriculture now represent less than 14 percent of our population. That poses a real danger for agriculture, because it means that only a comparatively small number of our people understand its problems. And so

great have been the changes in agriculture that even men and women who grew up on farms a generation ago and have since gone to the cities know little about agriculture and its problems today.

I think it is entirely possible that at least 80 percent of the people of this country have little or no knowledge of the problems which now confront the farmers of this country. This is a dangerous situation because the farmer must depend upon the understanding of the people in the cities if he is to obtain economic equality and justice through fair and just laws and economic policy.

Moreover there seem to be influences at work that tend to separate the interests of rural and urban peoples, and which are even building conflicts among the farmers themselves.

Our Committee on Agriculture took note of this in presenting to the House the Agricultural Act of 1954, when in our report we said, "the committee deplors any tendency in the consideration of farm programs toward a separation of the interests of the farmers and our great consuming population of the cities. These interests are one and the same. They are inseparable. Stability of agriculture is equally as important to urban people as to people on farms."

Many thousands of fine people whom we respect differ with us on the nature or even the need of a farm program.

They are intelligent people.

They are fairminded people.

But they have been misinformed.

We of agriculture are largely at fault because we have the poorest public relations of any large group in our national life. That is the situation which must be changed not only in the interest of agriculture but of the country as well.

Frankly I am amazed at some of the misconceptions which exist in the minds of nonfarmers with respect to farming.

There is no use denying that this misinformation exists.

What we must do—all of us who are interested in agriculture—is to frankly face the situation and then take steps to build up better public relations for the farmers of this country.

It isn't a difficult thing to do provided we get out and do it, because all that needs to be done to refute the erroneous impressions which exist is to tell the truth—the real truth about farmers and their problems.

What are some of the misconceptions that we find in the minds of nonfarmers?

Well, for one thing we find an impression among a lot of people that farmers as a class are getting rich.

We find that there are many who think that farm prices and food prices are high with respect to other prices.

There are others who think that farm programs have worked to the disadvantage of consumers.

There are still others who are convinced that agriculture is being subsidized in vast amounts by the Federal Government and that Government subsidies are exclusive to agriculture.

Not one of these misconceptions is based upon fact, and their very existence demonstrates that in some way agriculture has failed to get its story across to the country.

Take the first misconception I mentioned: that farmers as a class are getting rich.

I know of no reason why the opportunities which other Americans have to achieve material prosperity should not also apply to farmers, and it is true that some farmers through frugality and good management have achieved a competence.

But the answer to those who think that farmers are getting rich as compared to the rest of the population is given by the cold statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture. These figures show that in 1953 the farm population had a per capita income

of \$882, including cash from marketings, Government payments, value of home consumption, and rental value of buildings.

For each person in the nonfarm population the average income was \$1,898.

Thus the average income of a person on the farm is less than half of that of the average person living off the farm.

But tell that to your nonfarm friends and see how many of them believe it.

Now perhaps the greatest resentment against farmers and agriculture comes from the prevalent fallacy that farm prices and food prices are high with respect to other prices. Before going into that, I think it should be pointed out that of each dollar spent by the American housewife for domestically produced food, 57 cents now goes for processing, marketing, and transportation charges. The farmer receives 43 cents.

That figure has been going down year by year since 1946, when the farmer's share was 52 percent and the processor's and distributor's share was 48 percent.

This is reflected in the fact, as shown by a study made by the Committee on Agriculture, that as of last July farm prices had fallen approximately 19 percent since 1951 while in contrast, retail food prices remained right at the postwar peak.

Since 1948 the price of wheat has declined 32 percent, but the price of bread has advanced 23 percent. The amount of wheat in a 17-cent loaf of bread comes to 23/4 cents.

In June, New York and Chicago housewives paid 25 cents per quart for milk delivered at their doors, while farmers who supply milk to the Chicago market received 6 1/2 cents per quart for class I milk and farmers participating in the New York City market received 9 1/2 cents for this milk.

Similarly, there is less than 30 cents worth of cotton in a \$3.95 cotton shirt.

In the case of tobacco, Federal, State, and local taxes on the 1953 crop amounted to almost three times as much as farmers received for that part of their crop consumed in the United States.

The Grange had something to say about middlemen in its declaration of purpose written in 1874 and now called the Farmers Declaration of Independence: "For our business interests, we desire to bring producers and consumers, farmers, and manufacturers into the most direct and friendly relations possible, hence we must dispense with the surplus of middlemen, not that we are unfriendly to them, but we do not need them. Their surplus and their exactions diminish our profits."

We want no surplus of middlemen or unfair profits among them at the expense of the producers on the farm. In all fairness, however, the consumer should understand the essential part distributors, processors, and transporters play in the drama of food and that much of the costs added to food after it leaves the farms is due to the consumer's demand for better processing, new mixtures, improved sanitation and more convenient and attractive packaging, plus increased labor costs in processing, distribution, and marketing.

The food industry must continue to give consumers what they want and what they are willing to pay for. But at the same time the industry should let consumers know that these increased costs occur after the products leave the farm and do not add to the income of the farmer.

And that brings me to the third fallacy I mentioned a while ago, namely, that farm programs have worked to the disadvantage of consumers.

The fact is consumers get more and better food today with an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than at any other period in history.

Figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture show that in 1929 the average

factory worker could buy 6.4 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings. Today the average hour's earning will buy 10.3 pounds.

The average hour's wage would buy 1 pound of butter in 1929 and 2.6 pounds today; 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 and 7.9 quarts today; 1.4 dozen eggs in 1929 and 2.9 dozen today; 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929 and around 30 pounds today; 4.4 No. 2 cans of tomatoes in 1929 and 10.3 cans today; 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929 and 2 pounds today, and so on down the list.

Our earliest farm programs began in 1929. Thus it will be noted that this large reduction in the price of food in relation to wages has occurred during the years of the development of the present program, which has for its overall aim a parity of income for agriculture.

In other words, it is clear that consumers have gotten the greatest real reductions in prices of food and fiber during the time of growth toward farm income stability.

And then we come to the belief that agriculture is being subsidized in vast amounts by the Federal Government and to a greater extent than other industries.

While it is the hope of all of us in agriculture that modifications of our programs which will better balance supply and demand, and the tailoring of specific programs to meet the needs of particular commodities, plus improved marketing policies and practices will reduce and perhaps in time eliminate most agricultural subsidies, I think we should point out to our friends in the cities that the subsidy is the oldest economic principle known in our Government, and only in fairly recent years has it been used to any appreciable extent to protect agriculture.

The First Congress in 1789 set up a subsidy program to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. Many billions in subsidies have gone to business and industry. The House Appropriations Committee in January 1954, published figures indicating subsidies amounting to about \$45 billion have been paid to business and to consumers during and since World War II. A large part of this was in business reconversion payments.

In contrast, farm price supports and surplus removal operations for the 20 years up through 1953 cost only \$3,500,000,000, or 1 percent of the value of crops and livestock marketed.

What is the answer to all of this? I think it has very largely with agriculture itself.

I think it should be the first duty of the Department of Agriculture, of farm organizations, of the farm press, and of the agricultural committees in Congress to tell the truth about agriculture and to point out to those who are misinformed on these matters just what the facts are.

We must plant a new crop—a universal crop with a universal harvest—a harvest of understanding. We must tell the people in the cities what they do not know—tell them of the fallacies that tend to separate us.

Let them know that the people on the farms have less than half the average income of people who live elsewhere.

Let them know that fewer than half the farm homes in the United States have running water. They perhaps will be surprised at this, but it is true.

Tell them that farmers cannot conserve their soil and maintain its fertility for future generations unless they have adequate incomes with which to do it.

Emphasize the social and moral values as well as the general economic necessity of maintaining the prosperity of the family-size farm.

Tell our city friends why we need the farm program, that as an individual the farmer has no control over the prices he receives and no adequate way of adjusting his

production to the total market demand for his commodities.

Ask how long our free-enterprise system would last if all industry operated as must the producers of major crops in agriculture producing 11 months in the year and selling on overflowing markets at one season, not at what producers fix as a fair price as an industry, but at what buyers are willing to pay.

Tell them the safety of the consuming population requires that we have on hand more food than can currently be used, that this margin of safety is known as a surplus in the market place and constantly depresses the farmer's prices unless we have a farm program.

Tell them that one carload of potatoes on the market in New York City—just one more car than is needed—can depress the price of potatoes all over the United States.

Impress upon all our friends that we must recognize the interdependence of all segments of our economy; that what we are talking about is a tremendous economic problem affecting every phase of our national life; that any farm program must be fair to farmers and consumers alike and serve the best interests of all our people.

All of us who are interested in agriculture must have a part in this public relations program to convince the consumers that the farm problem is everybody's problem.

I know of no organization or group better fitted to undertake leadership in such a program than the National Grange. With its background of almost 100 years as a great farm organization, its record of standing for the solid, traditional American virtues, with the prestige that comes from generations of wise leadership, and with the respect in which it is held by farmers and nonfarmers alike—the Grange and its officers and members can do much to bring about that sympathetic understanding by everyone of the problems of the people who live on the land.

I am sure that this is a matter which has been given consideration and attention by the officers and leaders of this great fraternity. I am bringing it up today because I am convinced of its urgency and importance.

It is a problem which cannot be met in a passive way. It constitutes a challenge and an opportunity which I am sure must appeal to you as leaders in agriculture and as good citizens who are striving to make a better nation of this great land of ours.

Address of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway Before the West Point Society of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the views of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff, United States Army, whenever expressed, are always worthy of profound consideration and study.

I include in my extension an address made by General Ridgway on December 14, 1954, in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, before the West Point Society of New York.

Every part of his address is significant and particularly when he said:

It is only through possession of adequate military strength that the efforts of the splendid leaders of American diplomacy can realize their fullest success.

I have stated in and out of the House that "the strength and power of our military force is the main avenue by and through which our national objectives in the field of foreign affairs is attained."

There are many Americans, of which I am one, who are very much concerned with the reduction in our Army in recent months, and particularly with the sharp reduction proposed during the next 18 months. I have a feeling of confidence that General Ridgway is also one of those Americans.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to be here today with you who share the deep love of country and the ideal of service which West Point engenders and exemplifies. The words "duty," "honor," "country" express tersely the soldier's ideals of purposeful service, ennobled by high standards of personal integrity and personal dedication. These are times when ideals or spiritual values of the highest type are called for, if our Nation is to endure, and its precious heritage of freedom is to be preserved unimpaired. Our Nation's spiritual resources, more than its material resources, will be the ultimate determinant of our place in history.

Our Nation today is faced with a military threat unique in its history. It is a threat, though, which menaces, not our Nation alone, but every nation outside the Communist bloc. The military strength of the Communist world is such that if it were thrown against us, an adequate defense could only be through the combined efforts of those free nations who see the peril for what it is and who have therefore allied themselves, with their combined strength, in unswerving opposition to it.

The alliances that add strength to the free world were formed in the face of this common danger. If they are to endure, they must be nourished by mutual trust and confidence arising from mutual understanding and common interest.

These alliances, and their military significance to us, form my topic today.

The military man is deeply concerned with the strength of our alliances because he appreciates full well the contributions to our Nation's security which such allies can make. Our national goals of deterring war by all honorable means, and of achieving victory should war be thrust upon us, are best attainable within a framework of effective alliances.

Were we as a nation to rely solely upon our own industrial and manpower resources to defend ourselves against the full military strength of militant and aggressive communism, our Nation might find the task desperately difficult. The threat against us is total in its maleficence, and in the various areas in which its influence is being exerted—in the psychological, economic, sociological, diplomatic, and cultural fields—as well as in the purely military.

Perceiving the comprehensive nature of the defenses we must erect in all these areas of human activity, and fully realizing their interdependence—I should like to discuss with you some of the military implications of our alliances, and the extent to which the security of our Nation is bound up with the security of our allies—how much they contribute to our military strength, as we contribute to theirs.

In any approach to a military problem, a logical starting point is the military capability of the potential adversary as revealed by

his forces in being in reserve, and in his capability to employ those forces against us.

The catalogue of Soviet military strength in being is an impressive list. Briefly stated, the Soviets have 175 divisions, and there are a million men in the armies of European captive states under varying degrees of Soviet control. In addition, the Red Chinese Army boasts 2½ million men. This Soviet-controlled ground strength, then, represents a military force far exceeding purely defensive needs. Its existence, in the light of the clearly demonstrated aggressive policies of the men of the Kremlin constitute a grave threat to world peace. And not only in ground strength, but at sea and in the air the Soviets continue to increase the effectiveness of their armed forces. The Soviet Navy is now estimated to be the second largest in the world with much of its strength concentrated in submarines. In the air the Soviets are estimated to have a total of 20,000 active planes, with an ever-increasing effort devoted to the production of jet fighters and long-range bombers, and a continuing buildup in the air strength of their satellites.

These formidable military forces respond to the orders of a small clique of powerful and ruthless men whose avowed aim is world domination and who, on the record, respect only force as the ultimate arbiter in the affairs of men. Their basic philosophy, abhorrent to us, stands revealed in historical record by their willingness to expend human lives on whatever scale the achievement of their aggressive aims demands.

Now the Soviet and satellite governments have certain military advantages which derive from the physical resources they control. They have an advantage in freedom of action which dictators always enjoy over democratic nations responsive to public support, and to the conscience of God-fearing peoples.

The Soviet bloc controls more than one-fourth of the earth's land surface. Applied to military considerations, this is an extremely significant fact.

Wars are fought, not for control of the seas or control of the air. These are but intermediate steps toward attainment of the final objective. That final objective is control of land and of the people living on it. Control of essential land areas is vitally necessary to the effective exercise of sea and air power, since seapower is dependent upon the continued use of land bases, and air forces upon the continued availability of landing fields. I scarcely need point out, however, the essential role of sea and air power in modern war, particularly in our case, with a continent to defend and worldwide allies to support. Yet, I do wish to put in clear and proper perspective the vital role of land power and the decisive instruments of land power—ground forces or armies—in the sum total of armed strength.

The more land an aggressive force controls, the more sea, air, and land power it can sustain. With the land comes the food for the armed force, the steel and coal to forge its weapons, the oil to power its engines of war, the industrial capacity to enlarge its war-making potential, the manpower to labor for its aggrandizement. Moreover, with conquered land comes space to add depth to the defense of an aggressor's homeland from retaliation.

It is not only that more land, with all the resources of that land, becomes available to strengthen the aggressor, the conquered land, and the people on it, are unable to join with those powers which would normally be its allies. Thus, to the extent an aggressor can establish and maintain his control, the conquest of more land strengthens and enlarges his capabilities for further aggression, while simultaneously weakening the capabilities of every other power successfully to resist him.

At present, Kremlin-led Communist control is exercised over some 800 million human

beings—roughly, one-third of the earth's population, inhabiting one-quarter of its land surface. Beyond the periphery, this force continues to infiltrate and attempt to subvert the governments of free countries. It seeks to exploit every weakness. Those who direct it have only too often stated their basic aim of world domination, and the pattern of their deeds continues clearly to support their words. They would, if able, destroy the institutions and ideals which have enabled man, with God's guidance, to achieve new heights of dignity. These men would, if they could, extinguish the light of freedom itself, for in their basic attitude toward life there is no place for freedom, no purpose of man, except to serve them and the state they represent.

It is, therefore, with due regard for the broad nature of the Communist threat and the urgency of that threat, that our Nation must build and maintain its defenses. It is enlightened self-interest for us to recognize that our safety is joined with the safety of other free peoples, that our strength is augmented by theirs and theirs by ours.

Only a part of the free world's important production centers and important sources of vital raw materials are located in the United States, or even in the Western Hemisphere. Other continents are rich in the materials on which our security and the continued progress of civilization depend. Africa holds much of the uranium required for our defense effort. Southeast Asia is a primary source of natural rubber and a rich source of tin. More than half of the world's known oil reserves are located in the Middle East. Japan, while short of many raw materials, possesses an industrial capacity of increasing importance. And in Western Europe there are rich deposits of coal and iron, as well as a population of 300 million, closely akin to us, with a high proportion of skilled workers and technicians.

All other considerations apart, the importance of such resources and capabilities to the strength of the free world makes it urgent that they remain on our side. If a Kremlin-launched war should succeed in seizing and controlling the vast productive capacity of Western Europe, the balance of military power would swiftly shift to our grave disadvantage. Then, even if many industrial centers behind the Iron Curtain were to be destroyed by allied retaliatory efforts, the seizure of Western Europe by the Soviets would have compensated, perhaps much more than compensated them, for what they had lost.

Besides the resources which we and our allies can contribute collectively to mutual defense, there are other distinct military advantages which accrue from our united efforts.

In a world in which time and space continue to shrink, our regional defense groupings would give more timely warning of aerial attack, more precious time to alert our collective defenses, both here and overseas. Bases on allied soil would enable the United States to employ its striking power against aggressors in any part of the globe. Land, sea, and air bases in the European and Mediterranean area and in the Far East make a vital contribution to the security of these coalitions, and no less so to the security of the United States. These numerous dispersed bases offer added insurance against the possibility of successful multiple surprise attacks, by which an enemy might seek to deliver a knockout punch, before the free world's men and planes and ships could retaliate.

Another advantage of mutual benefit is the increased effectiveness of combined intelligence efforts, so essential to the conduct of successful military operations. Further, our forces overseas are daily gaining familiarity with the language and characteristics of the nations with which we are working, and of the characteristics of the terrain over which

we may be called upon to fight. Such knowledge is of scarcely less importance in peaceful pursuits than in time of war.

Obviously, one of the great contributions of our allies is in the military forces which they contribute to the common cause and which, combined with ours, constitute a deterrent to Soviet armed attack and, if launched, an obstacle to its advance.

In proportion as the menace of Kremlin-inspired aggression has become more apparent and the power of Kremlin-controlled military strength a more ominous and obvious threat to world peace, the free nations of the world have increasingly recognized their common danger and the necessity for combining their military strength. Unfortunately, the converse has likewise been generally true. The more the Kremlin has disguised its designs and preached of peace, the more the Western World has tended to relax its efforts and drop its guard. Nothing could better serve the Kremlin's cause, or more injure our own.

The military contributions of Western Germany would add still further strength to Western Europe's defenses, and it is for this reason, among others, that so much significance attaches to the continuing efforts to bring Western, and ultimately all of, Germany into NATO, efforts which have come closer to realization through signature of the recent London and Paris agreements.

The military arrangements I have mentioned are dependent for their motivating power on much more than a mere pooling of our military and other material resources. There must likewise be some pooling of spiritual forces in support of the principles we all profess, some meeting of the minds in a great moral purpose—a purpose sufficiently idealistic to lift it above the purely material, yet sufficiently practical to promise true progress if fulfilled. In the moral factor lies that vital spark of vision and strength and determination which alone can bring our efforts to flower into a finer civilization. The destruction of our moral and spiritual standards therefore remains the final deadly aim of the Kremlin-controlled communism.

It well recognizes the importance and significance of cooperation—spiritual as well as military—among the nations of the free world. Wherever it operates, it strives to turn our allies against us, and to destroy the strength of the alliances that its own aggressive policies have forced into being. One theme is consistent through all the devious twists and turns of the Kremlin line, the "Hate America" theme. Simultaneously, the attempt is made to lull the peoples of the free world into complacency by constant repetition of hypocritical offers of world peace.

By propaganda, psychological warfare, subversion, and all methods short of open war, the struggle to isolate the United States continues. Its success would vastly increase our difficulties and our peril.

It is well, therefore, for the citizens of our Nation to appreciate the contributions of our allies and their importance to our national security. We should realize that alliances require both "give" and "take." We must likewise realize the necessity for patience and understanding, and bear in mind that the issues which unite free nations are far greater than those which divide them.

Any alliance—and, of course, I am here dealing with military alliances—must be of mutual benefit to the parties concerned. Trying to get something for nothing is no more praiseworthy or practicable in international than in personal affairs. Efforts to do so are rightly regarded as unethical. That our alliances meet the test of practicality is indicated by the fact that they were voluntarily entered into by free governments with the support of their respective peoples.

I have had occasion to serve with our allies in both Europe and Asia. I have served both here in the United States as well as in the Caribbean, with the military representa-

tives of our Latin American allies. The degree of unity and cooperation which I have observed in all those regions among the military men of the nations concerned, is a highly encouraging sign of the mutuality of interest that prevails and of a strong aspiration to achieve a common objective of strength through unity. It is an asset of intangible yet incalculable value.

Since military commitments are a necessary part of military alliances, international military arrangements by the United States must be carefully scrutinized to ensure that our commitments do not exceed our capabilities and that the benefits expected to accrue are worth the commitments. Obviously, perspective is required. The capabilities of our Nation, while enormous, are not unlimited, and selfishness still rides high in this practical world.

Yet, we can take pride in the leading and enlightened role our statesmen have played helping to forge a structure of international, or collective defense the better to safeguard our own national security.

American military men have played a prominent part, advisory in the formulation and executive in the implementation, of these arrangements. They have added greatly to the prestige and high reputation that our Nation's military forces enjoy in the world. Because our military capability is an important element of our diplomatic effectiveness, the significance of a potential enemy's respect for the capabilities of our military forces should be obvious. It is only through our possession of adequate military strength that the efforts of the splendid leaders of American diplomacy can realize their fullest success.

American officers of all our armed services are working with allied officers in all parts of the free world as partners in an international effort to preserve principles and to defend ideals, which basically have a great deal in common. In 39 countries of the world, officers of the United States Army, though relatively few in number, are helping to train and supply the fighting forces of our allies. These officers are securing excellent results in assisting allied military establishments to contribute more effectively to their own defense and so to ours, and perhaps of even more importance, in interpreting our way of life by precept and example. Our two United States field armies overseas—the Seventh in Europe and the Eighth in the Far East, together with their associated fleets and air forces—are conclusive evidence of our Nation's determination to help our allies to resist aggression, and to participate as a full partner in the common defense.

The great efforts we are exerting to secure world peace in partnership with the free nations of the world—efforts in which the United States Army is proud to have a major share—have for their goal the preservation of the freedom we have inherited from our forebears, the freedom we are determined to preserve for our children and our children's children, the freedom we continue to seek to extend by peaceful means for all men to enjoy everywhere.

For the sake of all of this, we must not isolate ourselves. He who advocates such a course is, I think, a dangerous counselor.

Lee, Maury, and Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 20, I had

the privilege of hearing United States Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, deliver a very inspiring speech at the meeting of the District of Columbia division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. By unanimous consent, I include Senator JOHNSTON's speech as an extension of my remarks:

Mrs. Harlee and my friends in the United Daughters of the Confederacy, there is more of realism than sentiment which keeps organizations like yours alive. An attachment to ideals and principles, often misunderstood, binds us together. A communion with the past strengthens us as we face our present and future problems.

Several years ago a friend of mine whom I have known since my college days received a letter from the distinguished and now deceased president of our college. In that letter was the statement, casually written:

"Whenever a people forgets its worthy past, the day will come when it will not have a past worth remembering."

Let that casual thought be the theme of our brief discussion and reflection this evening. It is no waste of our time to reflect upon the lives of some of the great men whose memory we honor tonight. Preeminent among the leaders in the tragic fratricidal conflict between the North and the South will always be the names of Lee, Maury, and Jackson.

To you, Daughters of the Confederacy, belongs a distinction I have always liked to recall. Besides the testimonials and enduring monuments of granite and marble which dot the Southland as living memorials of your evaluation of your heritage, the glory of our past and as a bulwark of hope for the future, there is the universally accepted national holiday—Memorial Day, May 30, of each year—which is credited to your acts of remembrance in placing flags and fresh-cut flowers on the graves of the Confederate and Union soldiers alike. The inspiration for the issuance of General Logan's famous order establishing Memorial Day in 1869, had its origin when he was witnessing the evidence of your patriotism. Later by act of Congress, Memorial Day on May 30 was established for the Nation. This fact has not altered the happy custom of celebrating other memorial days on other and separate dates in our Southern States. Your objects and purposes and those preceding you in this patriotic organization were to perpetuate the recollections of the sacrifices, hardships, and deeds of valor of our brave forebears in the struggles of 1861 to 1865. Just and righteous to them was their conception of duty and principle. They labored for a time in vain, but not without permanent rewards to us, the beneficiaries of their valor, heroism, and ideals. The pages of unbiased history record for all time their unprecedented genius for being able to accomplish so much with so little.

While we reflect with great and justifiable pride upon the achievements of our great generals and Commander Maury, I doubt but few, if any, there are who now would have history reverse the conclusion of the Civil War. The scars of that conflict are healed and these assemblages have higher purposes than to keep alive the strife of the days gone by.

We have builded upon the heritage of their sacrifices. The courage and loyalty to principle, exemplified in our leaders, are the common property of us all.

On Palm Sunday almost 90 years ago an undernourished, poorly equipped, and scantily clad army of less than 150,000 men began to slowly disperse from the several surrendering posts to wend its weary way homeward. Surviving loved ones welcomed their return as though they were conquering heroes. The plenty and security which they had left behind when they had volunteered to fight in a lost cause had disappeared.

They found instead shattered and destroyed homes. Cities, villages, and farms had been laid waste and pillaged. Pestilence, poverty, famine, distress, destitution, and desolation stalked every countryside. Indiscriminate waste, death, and destruction lay in the path of Sherman's march, 60 miles wide and 300 miles long. What a spectacle of hopelessness faced the veterans of our southland.

There was no money. The currency was valueless. The entire economy was wrecked. What small industries and manufacturers there were had been destroyed or rendered useless. Four years of neglect had rendered homes and dwellings almost uninhabitable. Farms had been scorched. Storehouses, mills, and small factories had been denuded. Our railroads were torn apart; communications were chaotic. Precious little of material value remained after the Civil War. The tangibles of life were few.

Under the beneficence of an almighty God, our men and women had preserved some of the great intangibles of life. There was courage, faith, hope, character, and a determination to rise again.

Contrast this condition with the problems of the war-torn nations of today. There is no parallel in all history. For 12 years following the Civil War, the South suffered under the unspeakable domination, economic and political, of its conquerors. Sordid pages of history record brother's mistreatment of brother. A sustained, calculated, and premeditated design of oppression was practiced upon a once proud but now subdued segment of our American Nation. Revenge, greed, avarice, and treachery were the daily experience of a struggling and suffering people.

A kind providence stood at our side. In gracious benediction. He lighted our paths and kept our spirits alive. Congress refused all relief appropriations. Less than \$1 million was donated for our relief by several philanthropic societies in Philadelphia and Baltimore.

Lend-lease was not then in the English or American dictionary. No point 4 program was projected. There was no Economic Cooperation Administration. No War Claims or War Damage Commission was created for us. No Marshall plan was established for the South. The ingenuity and kindness of man had not progressed to the point of being able to conceive of the term of "mutual assistance or mutual aid." Eighty-nine years had to elapse before the phrase "Foreign Operations Administration" could be born. The administration of the affairs of the South was marked with a suppression compounded by oppression.

I need only to refer to one illustration of the ruthlessness and utter indifference of the times with which you are all too familiar. The ancestral home of the Custis family, we known as the Custis-Lee Mansion, was appropriated by the Government. It has only been recently and within our lifetime, following years of persistent struggle, that meager compensation has been paid the survivors of the Lee family for this wanton act of banditry. Contrast this condition with the manner of our treatment of friend and foe alike after the close of World War II. We have spent many billions of dollars in rehabilitating the economies and restoring the damage caused by the war to the various countries all over the world. Even many countries rely on our bounty who took little part in the recent war. And in this connection, unless we keep constantly on guard, this generosity may become a permanent part of our national existence and to the point of so weakening our own economy as to make us the easy prey of our enemies.

But the spirit of the South would not die. Your early members kept it alive. Your recollections of the past and your intermittent meetings serve to refresh the spirit and to keep it alive. This is nurture for ourselves and future generations.

When the name of Lee is mentioned to the unprejudiced, at once he is associated with the great generals of all time. We link him with Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, Washington, Jackson, and a few others. Born the son of a distinguished Revolutionary soldier, his scholarly attainments at West Point made his recall there as superintendent a natural sequence. While he at first opposed secession with such means available to him as an Army officer and was offered the supreme field command of the United States Army, he, nevertheless, through loyalty and devotion to his native Virginia resigned his commission and became the leader of all the southern forces. His ability and leadership was demonstrated under General Scott in the War with Mexico. While he may have resisted to the bitter end, his regard for the welfare of his men, his beloved Southland and her future caused him to tender his sword to Grant at Appotomax on April 9, 1865. His greatness, his humility, and his reverence for the things eternal are reflected in his final order to his troops which he issued on the following day of April 10, 1865. His words in that order were:

HEADQUARTERS, ARMY OF
NORTHERN VIRGINIA,
April 10, 1865.

After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to this result from no distrust of them; but, feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that would have attended the continuation of the contest, I have determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen. By the terms of the agreement, officers and men can return to their homes and remain there until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection. With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

R. E. LEE, General.

The eloquent tribute to the bravery and devotion of his men were expressed in Lee's last order to his troops. His affection for them and consideration for their future led to the cessation of hostilities.

Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Fredericksburg, Va., having been educated at the United States Naval Academy, became an officer in the United States Navy. Historians say he was trained to the sea. After a few years, due to an accident, he retired but continued his devotion to naval affairs as a civilian. His worldwide fame was achieved at a conference in Brussels in 1855. This resulted in his restoration to active naval service as a commander. He had distinguished himself as head of the United States Naval Observatory and Hydrographic Office. His authorship of the Physical Geography of the Sea, Wind and Currents Charts, and other meteorological works resulted in the renown for him in his day as the world's most distinguished oceanographer and hydrographer. When the War Between the States began, he resigned his command in the Navy of the United States and assumed the harbor defenses of the meager southern navy. Upon the close of the war, he retired to Lexington as the professor of meteorology at the Virginia Military Institute. By training, study, and excellence in naval affairs we are happy to acclaim him as one of the leading naval authorities of our country and particularly of the Southland.

Thomas Jonathan Jackson, one of the most daring and successful military tacticians ever to wear a soldier's uniform was much younger than either Lee or Maury. From Clarksburg, then a part of Virginia, he entered and graduated from West Point. He gave evidence early in life of his military genius. His army career with the United States was of rather short duration, for we find him as military instructor at Virginia Military Institute when hostilities began. He became a colonel in the Virginia Militia and soon rose to the rank of brigadier and major general. His achievements, his courage, and valor have become the topics of discussion among military men of all succeeding generations. His surprise attacks and sudden exploits in the Shenandoah Valley confounded and surprised the Union forces to the extent that Jackson soon had the reputation of being the ablest of Lee's generals. While a strict disciplinarian, he was an ardent Calvinist and a devout Christian. His troops loved him for his genius, his abilities, and his personal worth. General Lee once said that had he had the services of Jackson at Gettysburg, the outcome there would have been different.

To praise these men is not to minimize others; nor does that praise detract from the respect and admiration, for the rank and file of our men and women; yea the debt, we shall never be able to pay.

Defeats and sorrows give us a better nature. They add to our resourcefulness. In

crises we surprise ourselves with what can be accomplished. I am indebted to the great minister who conducts the national pulpit of the air on Sunday mornings for the thought that in despair and reverses that Dante wrote his masterpiece. John Milton wrote his greatest work when blindness had fallen upon him. Tennyson, in struggle for light during his sorrow over the death of a friend, gave us his great In Memoriam. Continuing, Doctor Sockman said:

"Dr. Edwin Mims, of Vanderbilt University, once declared that Robert E. Lee did more for the South in the 5 years after his surrender at Appomattox than during the 5 years he was so brilliantly leading his troops. He took the leadership of a college in Virginia and with no rancor of spirit, he manifested a magnanimity and nobility which made him revered in the South and respected throughout the whole Nation."

While we could spend hours rehearsing the lives and deeds of any one of the three whom we honor tonight, vain would be our proceedings unless from "Defeat we receive its dividends." Surely the morale of the human race has been lifted more by those who have courageously borne their defeats than those whom success have ever attended. The inspiration of these lives to our fathers and mothers are ours to transmit to our children and they to theirs. In complete succession we shall ever keep fresh in the minds and hearts of our people the measure of gratitude to these illustrious men of our past. Back of me on the wall of my office is an almost life-size picture of Robert E. Lee. As I gaze upon it, my spirit from day to day is refreshed by thought and hope that in defeat, sorrow, and surrender comes crowning achievements if we will but persist in the right. So my friends, it is well that you have dedicated yourselves to carrying on in the paths your parents treaded. Surely, the joy, the happiness and blessings which are ours shall then increase for all. The faith of our fathers and mothers must remain with us as a constant reminder. In that faith, sustained by the influence of the Supreme Being are born the virtues of our existence exalted in the lines:

"God in all His glory rules

Watching over us with care

He sends us wisdom, love and truth

With his fellowman to share."

To Lee, Maury, and Jackson, representative as they are of all that is noble in a cause dear to their hearts, we of the South must never cease to acknowledge our debt of gratitude and appreciation. Their names as symbols of many others must ever be spoken of in reverence. To remember them is both an opportunity and a pleasure. To you and me it shall ever be a sacred duty.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1955

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

O God our Father, in the white light of whose presence all our motives stand revealed, for this hallowed moment, turning from our divisive loyalties and our party cries, we would bow humbly in a unity of spirit with a vivid realization of our oneness in Thee. Closing the door of prayer upon the outer world, with its tumult and shouting and its unpredictable trends, and bowing now in the searching light of Thy holiness, we know ourselves for what we are, petty and proud creatures who too often seek their own

wills and whims in spite of the polished courtesies and noble professions with which we come to Thee.

Cleanse the inner fountains of our hearts from all defiling foulness and from the secret sin of pretense. In tense days, when the words that are uttered here may affect the uttermost parts of the earth, fit us faithfully to protect the Republic from outward aggression and subversion and from the treason of inner selfishness. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the part of the House, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, of Texas; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; Mr. COLE, of New York; Mr. HINSHAW, of California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. PATTERSON, of Connecticut.