

by the duly elected members of each committee. This proposed change in the rules of the House of Representatives would have very wholesome and significant results and has long been overdue.

The rules of the House of Representatives provide amazingly well to let the majority eventually work its will while protecting all the proper rights of any minority. However, in actual practice the power of the Rules Committee to deep-freeze legislation is seldom successfully challenged, and the dictatorial control, where it exists, of the chairman of any standing committee over procedure and action in his committee is less seldom hurdled. I have earlier introduced legislation to partially dilute the power of the Rules Committee.

Why is there a need for a change in the manner of selecting committee chairmen? Every Member of the House knows and every student of committee procedures knows that the chairmen of the committees schedule pending bills for action in the order that they see fit. He may never schedule some bills at all; he may not assign them to a subcommittee; he may assign them to a special subcommittee of handpicked members; he may select or reject any witnesses for or against a given proposal. The chairman can limit the time of witnesses; he can select who does the questioning in hearings; he can determine in part who shall speak in the House and for how

long. He may even delay to death reporting a bill favorably acted on to the Rules Committee or the House. Likewise, in the selection of conferees the chairman may often control the shape and design of House-passed legislation, and he can dominate, terminate, or prevent investigations and studies by his committee. Further, the selection and direction of the committee staff members can be and generally is at the will of the chairman. Finally, the chairman can be most effective negatively by simply not calling meetings of the committee or stall a bill to death by hearings, protracted discussion, and intervening matters. All of these powers and more reside in the hands of the chairman of a standing committee and all of them have been abused too often.

How would the election of the chairman by the members of the majority party improve the situation? Most obviously by making the chairman of a committee responsible to the committee members instead of the seniority system, his power to behave in an arbitrary manner would be diluted if not eliminated. Certainly no chairman could long remain such or hope to be reelected if he did not treat his colleagues with the consideration they deserve as elected Members of Congress. Certainly any action on his part which was contrary to the will of the majority would place his chairmanship in jeopardy and he would know it.

It is also evident that in many cases; election of the chairman by the committee members would result in better-qualified chairmen. It is assumed that the senior member of any committee on the majority side, all things being equal, would normally be elected chairman under this proposal. But where it happens that the impairments of advanced age; lack of energy; lack of ability to properly explain or persuade; lack of consideration, fair play, and open-mindedness, and lack of proper qualifications generally makes a person unfit to be a chairman, someone else would probably be elected in his stead.

The election of the chairman of the standing committees would, therefore, end the dictatorial powers of the chairman and would frequently result in a more capable chairman filling that vital post.

All that has been said about the importance of electing committee chairmen applies with greatly decreased force, but nonetheless does apply to the office of minority leader of the committee. If we regard the committee system as making the House of Representatives a collection of little Congresses subject finally to the will of the whole House we have the picture quite accurately and consequently the election of a minority leader for the committee comes in regular order.

I commend this measure to the consideration of my colleagues many of whom know its necessity and desirability without any prompting by me.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1955

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

Almighty God, even amid the encircling gloom of anxious days, lift up our hearts by the assurance that behind the shadows, and in them, standeth One who slumbers not nor sleeps. Our shuddering souls are called to peer into pits of human horror which but reveal the awful depths to which man falls when he turns utterly from Thee. Take not Thy holy spirit from us, O Thou God of our salvation, who, only, redeemeth our life from destruction.

Steel our hearts to meet tirade and threats with quiet strength, to face falsehood resolutely with the truth, over which at last no weapon can prevail. Even amid a barrage of abuse from those who in their blindness imagine a vain thing, keep our hearts void of hatred, our speech temperate, the desire for a just peace our ruling passion, knowing he that keepeth his own heart is greater than he that taketh a city. In the unknown days of peril and of challenge which loom ahead, give us spirits that are calm and sure, wise and just, in the protecting shadow of Thy unfailing love. 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 Tuesday, February 1, 1955, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2010) to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2576) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1958; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan,

and Mr. BROWN of Ohio were appointed managers on the part of the House on the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message informed the Senate that Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, and Mr. LECOMPTÉ of Iowa, had been elected members of the Joint Committee on Printing; and that Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. LECOMPTÉ of Iowa, and Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska had been elected members of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The message also informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, sections 1055 and 1056, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. FORD of Michigan as Members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker of the House, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, had appointed Mr. NATCHER of Kentucky, Mr. LANKFORD of Maryland, Mr. OSTERTAG of New York, and Mr.

O'HARA of Minnesota as members on the part of the House to serve as members on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, 75th Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts; Mr. McDOWELL, of Delaware; and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, as members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed as members of the Joint Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, and Mr. REED of New York; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. MAHON of Texas, and Mr. TABER of New York.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 123, 84th Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. LONG, of Louisiana, and Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 581, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. LONG, of Louisiana, and Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, as members of the Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 705, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House has appointed Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey as members on the part of the House of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. ROBINO of New Jersey, Mr. COUDERT of New York, and Mr. REECE of Tennessee as members on the part of the House to serve with him, as members of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 263, 83d Congress, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. ROBESON of Virginia, and Mr. POFF of Virginia as members on the part of the House of the Jamestown - Williamsburg - Yorktown Celebration Commission.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 393 (a), United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. MILLER of California as a member on the part of the House to serve as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on the part of the House Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, and Mr. VORVY of Ohio.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 25, section 640 (a), United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. ENGLE of California, Mr. UDALL of Arizona, and Mr. RHODES of Arizona as members on the part of the House of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 394, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. STAGGERS of West Virginia and Mr. MILLER of Maryland as members on the part of the House of the Federal Records Council.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. PRESTON of Georgia, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN of Minnesota as members on the part of the House of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. GARY of Virginia and Mr. DORN of New York as members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 46, section 1126c, United States Code, the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. KEOGH of New York and Mr. DEROUNIAN of New York as members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate next Tuesday.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit during the next 2 weeks and hold hearings

on the so-called home-rule bill, while the Senate is in session.

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

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule there will be a morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection with the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, be limited to 2 minutes.

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

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

##### GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### REPORT ON STUDY OF PROGRAMS FOR HOMEBOUND HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a study of programs for homebound handicapped individuals, dated February 2, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

##### PENALTY MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, wrappers, cards, and other articles bearing penalty indicia procured or accounted for through the Post Office Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, by the executive departments, independent establishments, organizations and persons authorized by law to use the penalty privilege (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

##### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1945, PERTAINING TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER, BONNEVILLE, OREG.

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

##### REPORT ON LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Library of Congress, together with supplements thereto, for the year ended June 30, 1954 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.



## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By Mr. PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

## "House Resolution 12

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate Federal funds to assist municipalities within signatory States of the Ohio River Valley Compact in financing sanitary sewer systems and sewage treatment facilities

"Whereas the Federal Government was instrumental in securing the signatures of eight States to the cooperative inter-State anti-pollution agreement known as the Ohio River Valley Compact, and sponsored the organization known as the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, for the purpose of clearing the Ohio River, its branches and tributaries of pollution; and

"Whereas the antipollution program of the said Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission is rapidly moving forward and municipalities in signatory States are being called upon to immediately construct sanitary sewage systems and sewage treatment facilities; and

"Whereas many municipalities in this and other signatory States now find that they are financially unable to carry out the antipollution programs required of them by law, and appear to be powerless to help themselves: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates, That we urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate Federal funds for the purpose of giving assistance to municipalities within the signatory States of the Ohio River Valley Compact in constructing sanitary sewage systems and sewage treatment facilities required of them by law, and that we respectfully recommend that the Members of Congress from the State of West Virginia do everything within their power to further the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of West Virginia, to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and the clerk of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

## "House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

"Whereas the findings of the Pacific Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee and their engineering committee, representing all generating agencies, both Federal and local, show that power use in the region will increase 6,400,000 kilowatts by 1964, requiring the expenditure of approximately \$2 billion on the construction of new electrical facilities, at the rate of more than \$200 million per year over the next 10 years; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Oregon and of the Pacific Northwest region as a whole depend primarily upon the utilization of falling water for their supply of electric power; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-pur-

pose river projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the region; and

"Whereas it is of utmost importance to the Pacific Northwest that the Federal projects now under construction in the region be kept on schedule so that the estimated firm load requirements can at least be met until 1960; and

"Whereas the McNary, Chief Joseph and the Dalles projects, when completed, will have a combined generating capacity exceeding 3 million kilowatts; and

"Whereas it is of vital importance to maintain these Federal projects on a full construction schedule: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to give full recognition to the responsibilities of the Federal Government to make funds available for the completion on schedule of the Chief Joseph, McNary and the Dalles projects now under construction, upon which the Pacific Northwest unavoidably must rely for its growth requirements during the next 5 years; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress.

"Adopted by house January 13, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,

"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate January 20, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,

"President of Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

## "Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to repair of Morro Bay breakwater

"Whereas the Morro Bay breakwater which forms the harbor at Morro Bay, County of San Luis Obispo, has been in serious need of repairs for a period of 2 years; a breach in the breakwater which confines the present channel will allow the channel to become hopelessly choked and useless if allowed to become more extensive; and

"Whereas, unless the breakwater is maintained in a proper condition, the harbor will soon become inadequate as a haven for widespread commercial fishing activities, various types of ships and small craft, and United States Coast Guard stations; and

"Whereas extensive and serious property damage has occurred because of the inability of the breakwater in its present condition to protect the harbor of Morro Bay, and recent storms have considerably weakened the breakwater itself so that property damage is mounting in severity each day; and as the severity of the damage mounts the eventual cost of repair continues to increase in direct ratio, thus requiring the expenditure of a great deal more money for belated repairs than would be required if the already serious damage were corrected; and

"Whereas the serious condition of the channel has already reached a state of clogging which will soon require the removal of the United States Coast Guard Station to another base much less suitable to its operations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California earnestly requests the United States Army Corps of Engineers to take immediate steps to make such repairs to the breakwater at Morro Bay as may be necessary to adequately protect the harbor of Morro Bay and to protect Federal, county, and private property at Morro Bay; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief Engineer of the United States Army."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

## "Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and other officials and agencies authorized to act in the matter in relation to the regulation of fishing in Yosemite National Park

"Whereas the orderly regulation and preservation of the fish in the waters of Yosemite National Park are of great concern not only to the people of the State of California but to all citizens of the United States who visit this wonderful recreation land; and

"Whereas unnecessary confusion and hardship is presently brought about by the variance between the fishing regulations governing the Yosemite National Park area and the surrounding territory; and

"Whereas law enforcement agencies find it most difficult to properly protect and preserve this recreational activity so long as one section of streams lying within the boundaries of Yosemite Park may be fished at times differing from those during which the same streams may be fished outside of the park boundaries; and

"Whereas the territory of the counties surrounding the Yosemite National Park is all governed by the same opening and closing dates for fishing; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and all other officials and agencies possessing authority to act in establishing the fishing season in Yosemite National Park to establish such season to correspond with the opening and closing dates of the fishing season in the territory of the surrounding counties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

## "Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take appropriate action to permit prospecting and mining in the Joshua Tree National Monument

"Whereas hundreds of square miles of the area of California's Riverside and San Bernardino Counties are located within the Joshua Tree National Monument in a region which abounds in valuable strategic materials vital to national defense; and

"Whereas the Federal Government, at the present time, prohibits prospecting and mining in this vast area, thereby denying many citizens an opportunity to engage in profitable labor and depriving our national defense industries of this source of scarce raw materials; and

"Whereas prospecting and mining could be carried on without causing damage to the scenic desert growth for which this great primitive area is deservedly famed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respect-

fully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to take appropriate action to permit, with proper provision to prevent damage to the scenic desert growth, prospecting, and mining within the Joshua Tree National Monument; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

#### "Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to cause the issuance of a postage stamp honoring the California redwoods as 'the world's oldest living things'

"Whereas their living crowns borne on high by massive sparlike trunks, the California redwoods, from time immemorial have stood, as symbols of the power of God; and

"Whereas even when Christ walked forth among mere mortal man their lofty branches were arched against the blue; and

"Whereas during the vast span of their existence haughty empires have risen to rule the known earth then vanished virtually without trace, yet still the redwoods live on; and

"Whereas the glory of their story could be known to all the world if a properly inscribed stamp were issued in their honor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to cause the issuance of a postage stamp honoring the California redwoods as 'the world's oldest living things'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be, and hereby is, directed to prepare and transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Postmaster General."

A petition signed by M. R. McCann, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Parkway Council, No. 1433, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts

"Whereas Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court have through numerous opinions and decisions invaded the fields of the legislative and executive branches of government; and

"Whereas through numerous opinions and decisions Federal courts and more particularly the United States Supreme Court, have invaded the field of government which should be left to the control of the several States of the Union; and

"Whereas Congress is authorized under the Constitution of the United States to con-

trol and limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress be memorialized to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts so that the fields of government of the executive and legislative branches and that of the several States shall not be invaded, but shall remain separate and distinct; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States."

#### PARITY PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Williston (N. Dak.) Cooperative Credit Union relating to full parity prices for farm products.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WILLISTON COOPERATIVE CREDIT UNION, JANUARY 29, 1955

#### I

"We, the members of the Williston Cooperative Credit Union in annual meeting assembled this 29th day of January 1955, in Williston, N. Dak., do hereby respectfully petition and urge that the present Federal administration fulfill their campaign promises to work for and obtain for American agriculture full parity price for farm products; we further recommend that the administration and Congress increase the present minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to not less than 90 cents per hour; and we further recommend proposed minimum annual wages be established for all wage earners."

#### II

"We recommend that a farm program be created which will establish the size of a family-type farm based on production necessary to maintain a decent standard of living for the farm family operating such farm; and on such family-size farms no quota, allotment, or acreage restriction should apply, but such restrictions would apply only on farms exceeding such family-size farms."

#### III

"We favor the proposed congressional salary increase, in order to provide our Congressmen with a living wage; but only if included in the same bill is incorporated a provision for a \$1,000 Federal income tax exemption for all individuals."

#### IV

"We heartily endorse the present evident attitude of Congress to oppose the Dixon-Yates power contract; and we urge the fullest development of all natural resources in such manner as to insure to the American people the greatest benefits."

Moved and seconded that copies of all foregoing resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, to our Senators and Congressmen, to the North Dakota Credit Union League, the North Dakota Farmers Union, to Williston and Minot labor organizations, and to the North Dakota Federation of Labor. Carried unanimously.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR PREVENTION OF RIVERBANK EROSION—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution, adopted by the board of electors of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District, of Trenton, N. Dak., relating to appropriations for the prevention of riverbank erosion, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### BUFORD-TRENTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT

At a special meeting of the board of directors of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District duly called and held in their office at Trenton, N. Dak., on the 29th day of January 1955; all members being present the following resolution was offered for their consideration and approval:

"Whereas the Missouri River is badly cutting and eroding its banks immediately adjacent to Main Lateral 3.8 of the West Bottom; and Main Lateral 8.9 of the Middle Bottom; and points on the Main Canal of the Buford-Trenton irrigation project, and such erosion is so serious that it will cut out the canals of the project system and thus completely ruin the project; and

"Whereas the continuous relocation of said canals is not economically feasible, and the continuous deleting of valuable irrigable acres from the project lands by erosion further constitutes a serious hazard to the success of the project.

"Now, therefore, upon motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, it was—

"Resolved, That the board of directors of the Buford-Trenton Irrigation District hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make an emergency appropriation for the purpose of performing the necessary work to protect and stabilize the riverbanks so as to prevent such erosion."

RONALD GORDON,  
President.  
D. L. HOUSTON,  
Secretary.

#### REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1954 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

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

The report and statement referred to are as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1954, AND PAY, NOVEMBER AND OCTOBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY  
(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1954 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized.



Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total <sup>1</sup>	2,368,073	2,385,024	-16,951	\$781,995	\$757,942	+\$24,053
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,188,167	1,204,386	-16,219	402,628	393,463	+9,165
Department of Defense	1,179,906	1,180,638	-732	379,367	364,479	+14,888
Inside continental United States	2,141,110	2,156,660	-15,550			
Outside continental United States	226,963	228,366	-1,403			
Industrial employment	708,373	709,227	-854			
Foreign nationals	340,450	337,306	+3,144	25,133	\$24,560	+573

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.<sup>2</sup> Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside continental United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954, and pay for November 1954, and comparison with October 1954

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
<b>Executive departments (except Department of Defense):</b>								
Agriculture	70,348	72,202		1,854	23,424	23,192	231	
Commerce <sup>1</sup>	63,386	74,483		11,097	17,939	16,432	1,507	
Health, Education, and Welfare	36,677	36,446	231		12,975	12,653	322	
Interior	49,845	51,250		1,405	19,020	18,831	189	
Justice	30,249	30,502		253	12,965	12,459	506	
Labor	4,918	4,957		39	2,136	2,103	33	
Post Office	507,928	508,519		591	164,856	163,965	891	
State	20,997	21,074		77	6,820	6,901		81
Treasury	79,181	79,463		282	31,369	30,070	1,299	
<b>Executive Office of the President:</b>								
White House Office	263	265		2	137	136	1	
Bureau of the Budget	430	425	5		257	247	10	
Council of Economic Advisers	34	34			23	22	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	67	1		22	20	2	
National Security Council <sup>2</sup>	26	26			16	15	1	
Office of Defense Mobilization	295	291	4		153	147	6	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	5	1		4	3	1	
<b>Independent agencies:</b>								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	12	11	1		5	3	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	820	836		16	102	101	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	5,966	6,016		50	2,932	2,745	187	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	586	567	19		259	245	14	
Civil Aeronautics Board	533	535		2	279	262	17	
Civil Service Commission	4,106	4,120		14	1,698	1,651	47	
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	65	70		5	27	25	2	
Defense Transport Administration	18	20		2	11	11		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	131	4		73	65	8	
Farm Credit Administration	1,087	1,096		9	518	486	32	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	687	679	8		341	329	12	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	8		1	4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,094	1,091	3		541	517	24	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,086	1,091		5	504	460	44	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	355	354	1		233	215	18	
Federal Power Commission	636	639		3	322	308	14	
Federal Trade Commission	594	595		1	312	303	9	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	182	233		51	102	89	13	
Foreign Operations Administration	6,129	6,067	62		2,601	2,564	37	
General Accounting Office	5,791	5,829		38	2,415	2,315	100	
General Services Administration	25,863	25,897		34	8,341	7,938	403	
Government Contract Committee	10	14		4	4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,781	6,843		62	2,813	2,605	208	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,427	10,437		10	4,624	4,361	263	
Indian Claims Commission	13	13			9	9		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,831	1,847		16	869	834	35	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,160	7,141	19		3,115	3,004	111	
National Capital Housing Authority	287	287			97	98		1
National Capital Planning Commission	18	18			10	9	1	
National Gallery of Art	315	315			98	91	7	
National Labor Relations Board	1,172	1,167	5		605	476	129	
National Mediation Board	108	110		2	70	64	6	
National Science Foundation	250	227	23		95	86	9	
National Security Training Commission	7	6	1		3	3		
Panama Canal	15,758	15,751	7		2,717	3,944		1,227
Railroad Retirement Board	2,390	2,397		7	853	830	23	
Renegotiation Board	606	620		14	355	338	17	
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	23	23			13	13		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	22	413		9	3		3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	694	700		6	376	365	11	
Selective Service System	7,157	7,195		38	1,655	1,588	67	
Small Business Administration	756	746	10		394	371	23	
Smithsonian Institution	633	637		4	226	215	11	
Soldiers' Home	976	929	47		193	179	14	
Subversive Activities Control Board	35	35			20	19	1	
Tariff Commission	195	195			107	101	6	
Tax Court of the United States	142	142			74	72	2	
Tennessee Valley Authority	22,712	23,107		395	10,746	10,357	389	
United States Information Agency	9,551	9,526	25		2,335	2,301	34	
Veterans' Administration	177,735	178,051		316	56,413	53,293	3,120	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,188,167	1,204,386	486	16,705	402,628	393,463	10,474	1,309
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			16,219				9,165	

<sup>1</sup> December figure includes 508 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes extra Christmas employment.

<sup>3</sup> Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

<sup>4</sup> Revised on basis of later information.

<sup>5</sup> Revised to include 136 employees of the National Zoological Park and their pay.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954, and pay for November 1954, and comparison with October 1954—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,914	1,889	25		1,016	961	55	
Department of the Army	464,590	463,843	747		126,965	122,439	4,526	
Department of the Navy	408,885	408,969		84	149,056	144,896	4,160	
Department of the Air Force	304,517	305,937		1,420	102,330	96,183	6,147	
Total, Department of Defense	1,179,906	1,180,638	772	1,504	379,367	364,479	14,888	
Net change, Department of Defense			732				14,888	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,368,073	2,385,024	1,258	18,209	781,995	757,942	25,362	1,309
Net change, including Department of Defense			16,951				24,053	

\* Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture	69,144	70,950		1,806	Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,302	10,313		11
Commerce	60,510	71,536		11,026	Indian Claims Commission	13	13		
Health, Education, and Welfare	36,159	35,934	225		Interstate Commerce Commission	1,831	1,847		16
Interior	44,219	45,299		1,080	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,160	7,141	19	
Justice	29,735	29,994		259	National Capital Housing Authority	287	287		
Labor	4,807	4,845		38	National Capital Planning Commission	18	18		
Post Office	505,584	506,175		591	National Gallery of Art	315	315		
State	5,789	5,844		55	National Labor Relations Board	1,151	1,146	5	
Treasury	78,192	78,470		278	National Mediation Board	108	110		2
Executive Office of the President:					National Science Foundation	250	227	23	
White House Office	263	265		2	National Security Training Commission	7	6		
Bureau of the Budget	430	425	5		Panama Canal	551	541	10	
Council of Economic Advisers	34	34			Railroad Retirement Board	2,390	2,397		7
Executive Mansion and Grounds	68	67	1		Renegotiation Board	606	620		14
National Security Council	26	26			Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	23	23		
Office of Defense Mobilization	295	291	4		St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	22	13	9	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	6	5	1		Securities and Exchange Commission	694	700		6
Independent agencies:					Selective Service System	6,958	6,994		36
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	12	11	1		Small Business Administration	756	746	10	
American Battle Monuments Commission	17	17			Smithsonian Institution	631	635		4
Atomic Energy Commission	5,951	6,001		50	Soldiers' Home	976	929	47	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	586	569	17		Subversive Activities Control Board	35	35		
Civil Aeronautics Board	529	531		2	Tariff Commission	195	195		
Civil Service Commission	4,096	4,110		14	Tax Court of the United States	142	142		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	65	70		5	Tennessee Valley Authority	22,712	23,107		395
Defense Transport Administration	18	20		2	U. S. Information Agency	2,190	2,175	15	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	135	131	4		Veterans' Administration	176,476	170,797		321
Farm Credit Administration	1,075	1,084		9	Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,129,068	1,144,890	409	16,231
Federal Civil Defense Administration	687	679	8		Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			15,822	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	8		1	Department of Defense:				
Federal Communications Commission	1,067	1,064	3		Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,859	1,833	26	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,085	1,090		5	Department of the Army	373,050	373,343		293
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	355	354	1		Department of the Navy	377,552	377,894		342
Federal Power Commission	636	639		3	Department of the Air Force	259,581	258,700	881	
Federal Trade Commission	594	595		1	Total, Department of Defense	1,012,042	1,011,770	907	635
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,827	1,829		2	Net increase, Department of Defense			272	
Foreign Operations Administration	1,627	1,637		10	Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,141,110	2,156,660	1,316	16,866
General Accounting Office	5,742	5,780		38	Net decrease, including Department of Defense			15,550	
General Services Administration	25,751	25,782		31					
Government Contract Committee	10	14		4					
Government Printing Office	6,781	6,843		62					

1 December figure includes 508 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

2 Excludes extra Christmas employment.

3 Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

4 Revised on basis of later information.

5 Revised to include 136 employees of the National Zoological Park.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1954, and comparison with November 1954

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture	1,204	1,252		48	Panama Canal	15,207	15,210		3
Commerce	2,876	2,947		71	Selective Service System	199	201		2
Health, Education, and Welfare	518	512	6		Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
Interior	5,626	5,951		325	United States Information Agency	7,361	7,351	10	
Justice	514	508	6		Veterans' Administration	1,259	1,254	5	
Labor	111	112		1	Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,099	59,498	100	499
Post Office	2,344	2,344			Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			399	
State	15,208	15,230		22	Department of Defense:				
Treasury	989	993		4	Office of the Secretary of Defense	55	56		1
Independent agencies:					Department of the Army	91,540	90,500	1,040	
American Battle Monuments Commission	803	819		16	Department of the Navy	31,333	31,075	258	
Atomic Energy Commission	15	15			Department of the Air Force	44,936	47,237		2,301
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4			Total, Department of Defense	167,864	168,898	1,298	2,302
Civil Service Commission	12	12			Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,004	
Farm Credit Administration	27	27			Grand total, including Department of Defense	226,963	228,366	1,398	2,801
Federal Communications Commission	1	1			Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,403	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1							
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	4,502	4,430	72						
Foreign Operations Administration	49	49							
General Accounting Office	112	115		3					
General Services Administration	125	124	1						
Housing and Home Finance Agency	21	21							
National Labor Relations Board									

1 Revised on basis of later information.



TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1954 and comparison with November 1954

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Agriculture.....	2,819	2,805	14		Department of the Army:				
Commerce.....	2,110	2,111		1	Inside continental United States.....	1 207,800	2 207,955		155
Interior.....	7,846	8,037		191	Outside continental United States.....	1 26,934	1 26,934		
Treasury.....	6,534	6,543		9	Department of the Navy:				
Independent agencies:					Inside continental United States.....	236,791	236,914		123
Atomic Energy Commission.....	131	130	1		Outside continental United States.....	6,922	6,957		35
Federal Communications Commission.....	14	14			Department of the Air Force:				
General Services Administration.....	868	862	6		Inside continental United States.....	153,394	153,172	222	
Government Printing Office.....	6,781	6,843		62	Outside continental United States.....	15,113	15,241		128
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,160	7,141	19		Total, Department of Defense.....	646,954	647,173	222	441
Panama Canal.....	7,686	7,702		16	Net decrease, Department of Defense.....			219	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	19,470	19,866		396					
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	61,419	62,054	40	675	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	708,373	709,227	262	1,116
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....			635		Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....			854	

1 Subject to revision.

2 Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1954, and comparison with November 1954

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November
Austria.....	171	181					171	181
England.....	7,117	6,880					7,117	6,880
France.....	20,274	19,176	14,001	13,122			6,273	6,054
Germany.....	124,019	123,855	101,551	101,304	1,971	1,961	20,497	20,590
Japan.....	157,762	157,819	95,959	95,959	18,499	18,490	43,304	43,370
Korea.....	28,343	27,891	28,343	1 27,891				
Libya.....	1,077	200					1,077	200
Ryukyus.....	214	209			214	209		
Saudi Arabia.....	734	442					734	442
Spain.....	95						95	
Trinidad.....	644	653			644	653		
Total.....	340,450	337,306	239,854	238,276	21,328	21,313	79,268	77,717

1 Revised on basis of later information.

NOTE.—The Germans are paid from funds provided by German Governments. The French, English, and Austrians reported by the Army and Air Force are paid from funds appropriated for personal services. All others are paid from funds appropriated for other contractual services.

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,368,073. This was a net decrease of 16,951 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

The reported regular employment resumed the downward trend it has followed for 26 of the past 29 months. But the decrease resulted largely from the separation of temporary employees by the Bureau of the Census.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1955, which began July 1, 1954, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July.....	2,387,833		5,187
August.....	2,375,988		11,845
September.....	2,355,170		20,818
October.....	2,359,325	4,155	
November.....	2,385,024	25,699	
December.....	2,368,073		16,951

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of December was 1,188,167, a decrease of 16,219 compared with the November total of 1,204,386. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,179,906. This was a net decrease of 732 as compared with 1,180,638 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting the major decreases were: Department of Commerce with a decrease of 11,097, Department of Agriculture with a decrease of 1,854, Department of the Interior with a decrease of 1,405, and

the Post Office Department with a decrease of 591.

The Department of the Army reported an increase in civilian employment of 747 during December. The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 84, and the Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 1,420 in civilian employment during December.

Inside continental United States civilian employment decreased 15,550, and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 1,403.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 708,373, a decrease of 854 as compared with November.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

## FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,368,073 civilian employees certified to the Committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 340,450 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of December who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in November was 337,306. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria.....	171			171
England.....	7,117			7,117
France.....	20,274	14,001		6,273

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Germany.....	124,019	101,551	1,971	20,497
Japan.....	157,762	95,959	18,499	43,304
Korea.....	28,343	28,343		
Libya.....	1,077			1,077
Ryukyus.....	214		214	
Saudi Arabia.....	734			734
Spain.....	95			95
Trinidad.....	644		644	
Total.....	340,450	239,854	21,328	79,268

## 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. CLEMENTS:

S. 913. A bill to eliminate the need for renewal of oaths of office upon change of status of employees of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 914. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the production of alumina, abrasives, refractories, and cements from domestic clays in the interests of national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 915 (by request). A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 916. A bill providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Andrew W. Mellon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. DUFF, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 917. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 918. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 919. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 920. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 921. A bill for the relief of the late George Needham Cooke; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 922. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 923. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 924. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 925. A bill for the relief of Sun Fo (also known as C. S. Sun) and his wife, Mrs. Sun Fo (also known as Sukying C. Sun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 926. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 927. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the Southern District of California, and to redesignate the present Southern District of California as the Central District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUFF):

S. 928. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 929. A bill to provide for aid to the States in the fields of practical nursing and auxiliary hospital personnel services; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 930. A bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 931. A bill for the relief of the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 932. A bill to amend certain eligibility requirements in connection with the payment of benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to certain officers and enlisted men of the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 933. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

S. 934. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 935. A bill to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. 936. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 937. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late John Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 938. A bill to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 939 (by request). A bill for the relief of Demetrius John Monoyioudes and his wife Angelika Monoyioudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. BENDER):

S. 940. A bill to provide that the law limiting the hours of labor of certain officers and seamen on certain vessels navigating the Great Lakes and adjacent waters shall not be applicable to such officers and seamen on tugs principally used for harbor towing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 941. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and

S. 942. A bill to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1093), 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 Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 943. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 944. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Gray; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Sara Kapel Gildar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 946. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Ruth Long Crow Running Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 947. A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 948. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 949. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 950 (by request). A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; and

S. 951 (by request). A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to certain water carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 952. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Randall Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; and

S. 953. A bill to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Randall Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 954. A bill to redefine the commercial wheat area; and

S. 955. A bill to perfect the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to grain inspection under the United States Grain Standards Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 956. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNING, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 957. A bill to permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat



such child as a dependent for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 958. A bill relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents; and

S. 959. A bill to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 960. A bill for the relief of William T. Collins, also known as Vasilios T. Buzunis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 961. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 962. A bill to increase the specific amounts which are exempt from the tax on the transportation of persons from amounts which do not exceed 35 cents to amounts which do not exceed 76 cents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 963. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 964. A bill to require that the prices of 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity, to continue through 1957 the existing method of computing parity for basic agricultural commodities, to provide permanent price support at 90 percent of parity for soybeans, flax, and cottonseed, and to provide permanent price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum on the basis of their feed-value equivalent to corn; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

S. 965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to construct certain works of improvement for runoff and waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention, on the Beaver Creek watershed in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 966. A bill for the relief of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequalities and hardships due to 1955 cotton allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PREVENTION OF AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution.

This bill would permit the amortization, at an accelerated rate of 60 months, the cost of treatment works for the abatement of stream and air pollution. I wish to point out, Mr. President, that this bill contains controls which would permit only those facilities which are installed on the basis of a demand from a local governmental body, to qualify for certification. Thus, to qualify, a facility must be a part of an over-all program aimed at eliminating the present-day scourges of air and stream pollution.

President Eisenhower, in his health message on Monday of this week, called for more effective methods of control and a step-up in research in these areas. By encouraging the installation of abatement facilities, the bill I introduce could go far in helping to find quickly the most effective methods of control and, without question, would accelerate any research program.

The increasing seriousness of contaminations in the air we breathe and in the water in our streams and rivers is known to all. Surely every reasonable step should be taken at once to expedite the solution to these problems. This bill would go far in accomplishing that purpose.

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

The bill (S. 917) to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allotting the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORTS FOR BASIC COMMODITIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is my privilege today, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to introduce a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which would guarantee the farmers of our country support prices for basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity for the years 1955, 1956, and 1957. The bill reads:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That paragraph (6) of subsection (d) of section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price

for the 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas."

I feel strongly that the Congress made a mistake last year when it abandoned the policy of assuring the farmer at least 90 percent price supports for basic crops, and adopted, in lieu of 90 percent parity, flexible price supports. This action by Congress, based on the fact that there are surpluses of some farm products, was unfair and unwise, when we recall that, as recently as 1952, our farmers were being urged by the Government to increase production in order to meet the critical needs for our farm products here and abroad.

Farmers had responded to the plea of the Secretary of Agriculture, as they have always done. They had increased their production expenses, often went into debt, and had expanded their output, patriotically responding to the requests of their Government for all-out production. Farmers had assumed, in good faith, a moral obligation on the part of the Government to keep supports at a level which would protect them from heavy losses during the period of readjustment following the Korean conflict.

While suppliers of military goods were cloaked with cost-plus contracts to protect their financial positions, and certificates of necessity authorizing accelerated depreciation were issued by the Government in order to stimulate production of war goods, electric power, railroad equipment, and other lines of business and industry, the farmer was provided with no protection at all as a cushion during the cutback period.

Since the end of the Korean emergency, our exports have fallen sharply, as nations which had depended on the United States for supplies have cut back their purchases of our farm products. In fact, these foreign nations have expanded their own agricultural production, often with financial and technical assistance from this country. The result is that substantial surpluses accumulated in several crops; and, without adequate price supports, farm income may drop disastrously.

The need at this time is clear: Congress must provide price supports at the 90-percent level if we are to honor the Nation's moral obligation to our farmers. To refuse 90-percent support prices for basic commodities now would, in effect, ignore an obligation, and, just as important, would demonstrate a lack of reasonable and confident patience.

Congress has insisted upon treating suppliers of other classes of war materials in a fair manner. Now it must make certain that it is not placed in a position of treating one class of citizens—the farmers—less fairly and less generously than other groups. We owe a moral obligation to our farmers in this, their time of need.

Mr. President, any Member of the Senate who knows farmers as I know them, will agree that a failure to provide 90-percent price supports at this time, when farmers are beginning to make real progress in adjusting their production, would be unwise. It would serve to de-

feat the very farm programs which Congress has authorized.

When surpluses develop and market prices weaken, the farmers, unless they are provided with some protection by the Government, feel forced to offset lower prices by increased production. This is, as we all know, the course of desperation; and it tends to weaken their own economic position, as well as to damage the national economy as a whole.

We have had farm depressions time after time in the past, and no means of dealing with them except to permit prices to decline, leading ultimately to bankruptcy, foreclosure, and squeezing from among the farmers on the land a substantial group, forcing them into some other line of work. These forced marches from the farms need not be revived.

For many years the farmer has sought equality with other groups in our economy. One of the basic demands throughout these years has been recognition of the need for assistance from the Government to establish needed production-adjustment programs beyond the ability of farmers to undertake. This price support is such a program. Thus support prices at 90 percent of parity will serve as a major tool to assist farmers in an orderly retreat from overproduction in this period when we are returning to normal conditions. Price supports will help farm families stay on the farm, will assist in maintaining a "take-home pay" for farmers, and will provide a degree of stability which all too often has been denied to the farmers of our country.

Support prices at 90 percent of parity will help farmers weather the present and perhaps temporary crisis of surpluses and reduced exports. To cut and thus to weaken further the farm-commodity price support represents an unrealistic approach to our farm problem.

I know, of course, that the costs to the Government in connection with these surpluses are important; but they represent no burden of overwhelming proportions. In fact, the cost is small as compared with the money we have put into foreign aid or as compared, on the other hand, with the potentialities of this great and growing Nation.

Mr. President, in the past 2½ years, net farm income has declined approximately 15 percent. The loss of farm income, already felt by many segments of business and industry, will ultimately be reflected throughout our economy. Except for price supports, farm income during the last 2 or 3 years would have been several billion dollars lower. But with price supports at 90 percent of parity, farmers have been able to maintain a far stronger position than would have been the case; and they have thereby contributed more to a healthy national economy.

In my opinion, a flexible parity means only one thing—a lowering of farm income, for however much the support level is lowered, it represents a reduction in farm prices and income. The net result is that in 1955, 1956, and 1957, the net farm income realized may be below \$10 billion. Farmers know that means a farm depression. Such a

depression—which would eventually affect every segment of our national economy—is preventable if 90 percent price supports are adopted. The situation we face today is very much like the one which brought on the great agricultural and industrial depressions of 1920–21 and 1929–33. Farmers find themselves caught in a cost-price squeeze. Rising costs of the middleman have cut down the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar, and inflexible or rising prices of the goods farmers buy have cut down farm prices and income.

A major principle is involved between those of us who urge 90 percent price supports and those who favor supports at lower, or sliding, levels. Those who support lower levels embrace, knowingly or unknowingly, the principle that farmers must suffer low prices before they will cut down their crops to a level which will guarantee fair prices. They are wrong for two reasons: first they assume that farmers can shift from one cash crop to another, or decrease their acreage, without much trouble. That simply is not so. Farmers cannot move so easily from one crop to another. Second, when prices start dropping, farmers feel they must—and they will—increase their acreage and increase their production to a point where surpluses are increased and, of course, until prices are driven down further.

Mr. President, if Congress does not reestablish 90-percent supports now, when they are most needed, it will signal not alone weakness, but a lack of resolute courage to protect our farmers and our country from a depression.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge the Congress to enact the bill I am introducing today for the protection of our farmers and for the benefit of our entire national economy.

Mr. President, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. COOLEY, has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

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

The bill (S. 918) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### VENTURA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on numerous occasions I have pointed out to my colleagues and others how the conservation, distribution, and utilization of water is undoubtedly the most serious and immediate problem confronting my State of California. It is a matter of urgency, because of the steady migration of population, in many areas of the entire West.

The inadequacy and maldistribution of present supplies is reaching the critical point in a thriving section of California. Therefore, I am introducing at this time a bill to authorize the Department of the Interior to proceed with construction of the Ventura project.

I am joined in the introduction of this bill by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

This project has been thoroughly investigated by the Bureau of Reclamation, which recently reported that due to the wide variation in rainfall, the mushrooming population, and industrial growth, and the threat of salt-water intrusion into existing wells, development of an additional firm water supply is urgently needed.

The measure I am introducing would call for a project costing \$27,600,000 to be paid for within the usual 50-year period to serve an area of 20,000 acres. This is one of the fastest developing sections of our State and its growth is expected to continue. During the last 10 years the population of the city of Ventura and its immediate suburbs, which make up about 60 percent of the population within the project area, jumped from 16,000 to 25,000. The growth trend indicates an increase to more than 80,000 in the next 50 years.

This project has an exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio. The Reclamation Bureau studies indicate returns will be a little more than 3.3 times the expenditure. The Ventura Municipal Water District already has taken preliminary steps to contract for purchase of the water and for operation of the project. The district demonstrated its earnestness by paying half of the cost of the preliminary investigation.

I trust that this measure will receive early and favorable consideration.

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

The bill (S. 926) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### AIR POLLUTION RESEARCH

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during recent months both the executive branch of the Government and the Senate have displayed concern about the spreading menace of air pollution throughout major cities and industrial communities of our Nation.

In his health message earlier this week, President Eisenhower called on the Congress to take early action to step up research into this problem which endangers the health and safety of millions of our citizens. Because I come from an area which regrettably has been conspicuously plagued by this exasperating phenomenon known as smog, I was greatly encouraged to hear the Chief Executive say that the Federal Government must join the fight to clean up the contaminated atmosphere in which tremendous numbers of our people live and work.

The problem of air pollution has been most dramatically brought to the attention of the people of California, and is now brought to the attention of the people of the Nation. However, the menace



which smog presents to people, to growing things, and to livestock is present in many other areas and scientists have reported the threat can be found in widely separated parts of the Nation.

Many of my colleagues will recall the extremely serious seige of smog in Los Angeles last October. Photographs of the murk were published widely. None of them, no matter how graphic, could convey an idea of the extreme discomfort inflicted upon tens of thousands of residents and visitors. The condition shown in those pictures happily is a rare occurrence, yet the intensity of such attacks seems to be increasing despite bold and aggressive efforts in the metropolitan area to isolate and remove the causes.

Scientists generally agree that many factors are possible reasons for such conditions. Intensive research has been in progress for several years, but, so far, no solution has been found because the problem apparently is very complex.

The occurrence, intensity, and duration of smog unquestionably are linked with terrain and geography, weather conditions, presence of various industries, means employed to dispose of trash, volumes and movement of traffic, and many other influences.

To isolate the causes of air pollution is a momentous job. It must be done before successful countermeasures can be carried out.

The Federal Government possesses some unique, unparalleled facilities to carry on research and investigation in such fields. The know-how and techniques of such agencies as the Bureau of Standards, Bureau of Mines, Weather Bureau, and Agricultural Research Service cannot readily be duplicated, and are not easily equaled elsewhere.

Under President Eisenhower's direction, the United States Public Health Service is expanding its studies in the field of air pollution in its effect on human health. There are many aspects of the problem which seem to require attention from other agencies of Government, however.

Because this menace is increasing in seriousness and a potential threat exists in numerous places where so far the danger has not become apparent, I have become convinced that a broad attack must be made on smog without delay. I have consulted with eminent scientists, civic leaders, and public officials in all levels of government. They invariably concur in my feeling that Federal participation is essential if any campaign to clean up the atmosphere is to succeed.

For that reason, Mr. President, I am offering a measure which would make possible a vigorous antimog program by the Federal Government. I am joined in this by my colleagues the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF].

I believe this proposed legislation might well be linked with the measure introduced earlier in the week by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania to make permanent and broaden the water pollution control law. It is my intention to move this air-pollution proposal as an amendment to the water-pollution leg-

islation when the matter is considered by the Committee on Public Works.

This proposal would centralize in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare responsibility for directing and coordinating the efforts of the Government. It embodies features found in the water-pollution law and in the statute under which the Federal Government is aiding the search for ways to convert saline water into a potable and otherwise usable fluid. The bill would authorize the intensive investigation which I firmly believe is vital, but would give an incentive to efforts of others through grants-in-aid and contracts for research projects which other agencies might be specially fitted to carry out.

The program envisioned is of modest proportions. When one considers that the danger to health and life is so great, that injurious effects of smog may reduce the production of many agricultural crops, that smog snarls traffic and deteriorates properties, the proposed expenditure is indeed conservative and well within the resources of our Government.

I earnestly request that serious and speedy attention will be given to this measure so that no more time will be lost in searching for data and methods that will bring air pollution under control.

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

The bill (S. 928) to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DUFF) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

#### STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, pertaining to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 930) to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce; to stabilize prices of milk and dairy products; to impose a stabilization fee on the marketing of milk and butterfat; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

The bill I am introducing would enable the more than 2 million dairy farmers of the Nation to pay for their own production, stabilization, and price-control program

through a self-imposed assessment on their own milk production or butterfat production.

If enacted by Congress, the bill would take the Federal Government out of the dairy business, and would return the financing, management, and control of this great industry, which is the largest single segment of the Nation's agriculture, representing 20 percent of the national gross farm income, to the industry itself.

It seems to me that this is an objective which will not be challenged by anyone who believes in the fundamental responsibilities of a free-enterprise system.

Under the provisions of the bill, the milk-producing farmers of the Nation would elect, from their own number, 45 representatives from 15 districts, from whom the President of the United States would name 15 members to a Dairy Stabilization Board, which would administer the provisions of the bill.

The Board would have the power to purchase and hold for resale any amount of dairy products necessary to stabilize an ample dairy production to meet the needs of the Nation and to maintain, without burden to the taxpayers as a whole, an adequate price to the farmers who produce the milk. There would be no control or interference on the part of the Federal Government over the sale of dairy products to the consuming public. The Board would have the authority to push the sale of dairy products by means of education, research, publicity, advertising, and any other legitimate means.

The Board would have authority to acquire capital structure with which to launch the program and would be authorized to borrow up to \$500 million, either from the Commodity Credit Corporation or from private lending agencies. The money would be borrowed at the prevailing rate of interest on such Government financing.

Senators may recall that I sponsored similar legislation (S. 3152) during the last Congress. Two notable changes have been made in the legislation which I am now introducing.

1. Section 45, providing for a review of policies of the Board in connection with its operations, has been added. This section is similar to the provisions of the Capper-Volstead Act and insures that the Board cannot pursue any policies which would unduly enhance the price of milk and other dairy products.

2. Section 27 provides for a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee which would act as sort of a watchdog committee and would have the authority to ask the Secretary of Agriculture for a review of the operations of the Board as provided in section 45 of this legislation.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce, by request, four bills relating to the Armed Services.

Three of these bills are requested by the Department of Defense and one by the Comptroller General and are accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purposes of the bills.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by

request), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 933. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 933 is as follows:)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, January 27, 1955.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,  
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Under date of July 1, 1953, the former Comptroller General transmitted to the then chairman of your committee a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. This bill was designed to simplify the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services and to expedite payment of the amounts found due.

The proposed draft was introduced in the 83d Congress as S. 2311, but failed of enactment. Under date of June 22, 1954, the General Accounting Office, at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, reviewed a proposed report of the Secretary of the Army for the Department of Defense to your committee on the bill. Such report disclosed general agreement with the purposes of the legislation with certain proposed changes of a minor nature, none of which are the subject of serious objection by the General Accounting Office.

There are enclosed a copy of the draft of the bill, a copy of the letter addressed by the former Comptroller General to the then chairman of your committee under date of July 1, 1953, which letter sets forth in detail the nature of the proposed legislation and the purposes sought to be accomplished thereby, and a copy of letter of June 22, 1954, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget expressing the views of the General Accounting Office on the proposed report of the Department of Defense on the bill.

It is believed that the enactment of the legislation proposed will result in an improvement in the manner of the handling of payments of the type involved, that it will facilitate such payments and will result in substantial administrative savings to the Government. Therefore, and since the several departments affected by the bill have indicated their agreement with the purposes sought to be accomplished thereby, it is recommended that the matter be given early consideration by your committee. Representatives of the General Accounting Office will, of course, be available to furnish any additional explanation or information desired by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,  
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF  
THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, July 1, 1953.

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Chairman Committee on Armed Services,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed for your consideration a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, which bill is designed to simplify the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and to expedite payment of the amounts found due.

The proposed legislation is patterned after Public Law 636, 81st Congress, 64 Stat. 395, applicable to civilian officers and employees of the Government, and would authorize members of the uniformed services to designate

a beneficiary or beneficiaries to receive the amount found due from the Government in the settlement of their accounts at the time of death. In the event no beneficiary is designated, payment of the amount due would be made to the member's surviving spouse; his child or children and descendants of deceased children by representation; his parents or their survivor; each class to the exclusion of the latter. If none of these relatives survive, the amount due would be payable to the legal representative of the decedent's estate or, if none, to the person determined to be entitled under the laws of descent and distribution of the decedent's domicile.

The proposed bill provides that amounts payable under the legislation would be paid by the department concerned or upon settlement by the General Accounting Office as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation authorize and direct. This would leave to the Comptroller General the determination by regulation of the types or classes of claims which could be paid by the service involved and those which would be settled by the General Accounting Office. Should the bill be enacted, it is contemplated that regulations would be promptly promulgated extending to the services involved the authority to pay all claims where there exists a designated beneficiary, as is now being done in the case of civilian officers and employees. It is further contemplated that consideration would be given in the future, based upon a study of the percentage of members who designate beneficiaries and of the other factors involved to authorizing the services to make payment to certain of the other classes of beneficiaries named in the bill. Payments of amounts due would be made at the direction of the service, subject to a post audit by the General Accounting Office and subject to settlement by the General Accounting Office of any disputed claims. It is the opinion of this Office that such procedure will adequately protect the interests of the United States as well as the interests of the beneficiaries.

It has been the experience of the General Accounting Office under Public Law 636 that prompt payment has been effected by the administrative office, where a beneficiary to receive compensation has been designated under that act, without the necessity of settlement by the General Accounting Office. It is assumed that the services would by regulations and instructions insure the designation of a beneficiary by practically all service personnel. In these circumstances it is believed that payment of the accounts of practically all deceased service personnel could be promptly effected by the services, that the payments would be expedited and that substantial savings of administrative costs, both to the services and to the General Accounting Office, would result. Also, it is believed that by permitting the amounts to be paid to a designated beneficiary, there would be eliminated to a great extent the troublesome problems faced by the services and by the General Accounting Office in the "multiple widow," "foster parent," "father-desertion," and "illegitimacy," cases.

The bill provides further that designations of beneficiaries under the act and changes therein shall be made under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the services concerned and that such regulations shall be uniform for all services insofar as practicable. However, with certain exceptions, provision is made that any designation of beneficiary made for the purposes of any 6-month death gratuity available to the department before the effective date of the payment provisions of the proposed bill shall be considered as a designation of beneficiary for the purposes of this legislation in the absence of a specific designation of beneficiary thereunder. Since the payment provisions would not be effective until the

sixth month after enactment, there would be adequate time for members so desiring to make a different designation for the purposes of this legislation.

It has been the experience of the General Accounting Office that Public Law 636 has resulted in the more prompt settlement of the accounts of deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government as well as in substantial savings of administrative costs to the agencies and to the General Accounting Office. The enactment of similar legislation for members of the uniformed services, as is here proposed, should result in similar advantages to the survivors of members of the services and to the United States.

The legislation proposed herein has been discussed informally with representatives of the Department of Defense, and it is believed that it meets generally with their approval.

I believe that the enactment of the legislation proposed will result in an improvement in the manner of the handling of payments of the type involved, that it will facilitate such payments, and will result in substantial administrative savings to the Government. I, therefore, recommend that the matter be given early consideration by your committee, and would appreciate an opportunity for representatives of the General Accounting Office to appear to furnish any additional explanation or information desired by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,  
Comptroller General  
of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, June 22, 1954.

HON. ROWLAND R. HUGHES,  
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: Reference is made to letter dated June 4, 1954, from the Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, enclosing for comment a copy of a report dated May 26, 1954, by the Secretary of the Army, for the Department of Defense, to the chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, on S. 2311, 83d Congress, entitled "A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes."

S. 2311 was introduced at the request of this Office for the purpose of simplifying the procedures for closing out the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services and expediting the payment of amounts found due the estates of such deceaseds.

The bill is patterned after Public Law 636, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 395), applicable to civilian officers and employees of the Government, and would authorize members of the uniformed services to designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries to receive the amount found due from the Government at the time of death. In the event no beneficiary is designated, payment of the amount due would be made to the member's surviving spouse; his or her child or children and descendants of deceased children by representation; his or her parents or their survivor; each class to the exclusion of the latter. If none of these relatives survive, the amount due would be payable to the legal representative of the decedent's estate or, if none, to the person determined to be entitled under the laws of descent and distribution of the decedent's domicile. The procedural safeguards, either written into the bill or contemplated to be imposed by regulations, will adequately protect the interests of the United States and the interests of the beneficiaries.

It has been the experience of the General Accounting Office that Public Law 636 has resulted in substantial savings of administrative costs to the agencies and to the General Accounting Office and has been



quite effective in causing prompt payment of balances due in accounts of deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government in cases where a beneficiary has been designated. It is believed that S. 2311, if enacted, will result in similar advantages to the survivors of members of the uniformed services and to the United States. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Public Health Service and the Treasury Department for the Coast Guard have formally advised this Office of their approval of the bill.

Respecting the suggested amendment in section 2 of the bill, it is the view of this office that the meaning of the section will be unchanged by such amendment and that, technically, an amount due a member of the uniformed services in his account as such member is an amount due from the United States Government, as such, and not an amount due from any particular department or agency. However, it is not believed that the suggested amendment is otherwise objectionable and since the amended language will accomplish the purpose of the original language, the suggested amendment in section 2 is acceptable to this Office.

The language of section 3 of the original bill was chosen advisedly to permit flexibility in the administration of the bill by giving the Comptroller General authority to meet changing situations as they arise without the necessity of further legislation. It was contemplated that soon after the enactment of the bill into law, regulations would be issued by this Office extending to the services the authority to pay all claims of the nature involved in cases where there is a designated beneficiary. Doubtless some extension or enlargement of that authority would be feasible in the future. This Office had no thought of suddenly changing procedures or of transferring functions to the Departments concerned without consulting them. Hence, the practical effect of the language of the original bill probably would be substantially the same as the practical effect of any substituted language based on section 3 of the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 396). However, if the Department of Defense is seriously opposed to the original language of section 3, this Office would be willing to accept different language having an effect similar to that of section 3 of the said act of August 3, 1950.

This Office has no serious objection to the deletion of section 6 of the bill since the Department of Defense considers such section superfluous and indicates that appropriate steps will be taken, in any event, to notify members of the uniformed services of the provisions of the bill if and when it is enacted into law.

Sincerely,

FRANK H. WEITZEL,  
Acting Comptroller General  
of the United States.

S. 934. A bill to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.  
(The letter accompanying Senate bill 934 is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D. C., January 13, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposal is in accord with the program of the President. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is the representative of the Depart-

ment of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposal is designed to implement a recommendation of the President contained in his recent message on the state of the Union and a special message submitted to the Congress on January 13, 1955.

This proposed legislation would authorize the Department of Defense to provide medical care for all eligible dependents of military personnel wherever located. Heretofore, medical care has been largely confined to those living near military medical installations. Although those living at a distance have been eligible for such care, as a practical matter adequate medical attention could not be provided them. Additionally, in congested areas, military medical facilities were often inadequate to meet the needs.

On April 1, 1953, the Secretary of Defense established a Citizens Advisory Commission on Medical Care for Dependents of Military Personnel to study this problem. The Chairman of the Commission was Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president emeritus of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. Other members were Thomas I. Parkinson, president of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. of America, New York City; Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, president of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; Mrs. Eugene Meyer, student and writer on social problems, Washington, D. C.; and Dr. George William Bachman, senior staff member in charge of health studies of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C. In June 1953 the Commission submitted its report and recommendation, copies of which were sent to the Armed Services Committee of the House and Senate.

Basic recommendations of the Commission are incorporated into this proposed legislation. Some of the salient features of the program which this proposal would authorize are:

1. The present system of medical care would be supplemented by the use of civilian facilities when military facilities are not available with the Government meeting a substantial part, but not all, of the costs.

2. The medical care provided heretofore has not been complete, and it has differed in extent in the three services. The limiting factor in general has been the availability of facilities; but at the same time certain types of illnesses have been excluded as a practical matter. The Commission recommended uniformity in practice throughout the Armed Forces as well as strict limitations with respect to the illnesses covered.

3. Specifically excluded from the bill are the following: Hospitalization for domiciliary care and chronic diseases, and chronic mental and nervous disorders, the provision of prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles (however, overseas and in remote areas of the United States where if available from military stocks prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear and spectacles may be provided at cost prices to the Government), ambulance service except in acute emergency and home calls except in special cases as determined by the cognizant physician. Dental treatment is restricted to emergency dental care except outside the United States and in remote areas where adequate civilian dental facilities are not available. In such cases dental treatment may be provided from military dental sources but will depend upon the availability of space, facilities, and capabilities of the dental staff. The bill specifically provides that dental treatment is not authorized at Government expense through civilian dental sources, except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

4. Medical care would be provided for the following: Diagnosis; treatment of acute medical and surgical conditions; treatment

of contagious diseases; immunization; and maternity and infant care.

5. The limitations on the type of medical care provided dependents under this bill is an important factor in keeping the costs of the program down; however, the universalization of the program will involve substantial additional costs under present conditions. The Commission pointed out, however, that in the long run, that is, when world tensions are eased, only career personnel would be involved and there would be few who could not be cared for at military medical installations; hence, the cost of the broadened program should progressively decline.

6. The recommendations of the Commission call for uniform regulations pertaining to eligibility. The Commission recommended that all Regular or Reserve and inducted members of the Armed Forces on active duty and certain categories of retired members be eligible for care of their dependents.

7. The proposed legislation incorporates various safeguards and specifically gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to promulgate regulations and to fix such charges as he deems appropriate in order to implement this legislation fairly and to prevent excessive demands for medical care. This legislation is also designed to be flexible enough to provide a basis in law for the needs in this area during peacetime and in times of national emergency.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954 and was introduced in the form of S. 3363. No further action was taken on the bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The following tabulation indicates the estimated fiscal effects of this legislation. It demonstrates the cost of providing dependent care in military hospitals worldwide for fiscal year 1954, together with the estimated costs of implementing this program.

[In millions]

	Cost of providing dependent care in military hospitals, worldwide, fiscal year 1954	Estimated cost of implementing proposed legislation	Total estimated cost
Gross cost.....	\$73.0	\$84.0	\$157.0
In-patient.....	50.0	58.0	108.0
Out-patient.....	23.0	26.0	49.0
Patients' contributions.....	-5.0	-31.0	-36.0
	68.0	53.0	121.0

<sup>1</sup> Excludes \$5.8 million estimated administrative costs.

While such increased costs were not included within the proposed operating budget for fiscal year 1956, funds for this and certain other items will be shown in the budget as proposed for later transmission, contingent upon authorizing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,  
Director, Legislative Programs.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 provides for the short title.

Section 2 provides a declaration of policy by the Congress.

Section 3 defines certain terms used in the bill. It should be noted that section 3 (a) (2) is intended to cover persons of the regu-

lar components who are retired and those of the reserve components who, for all practical purposes, are like those of the regular components. It does not cover those individuals entitled to receive retired or retirement pay pursuant to title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

Section 4 provides for medical care of dependents of the members of the Armed Forces in accordance with the provisions of the act and subject to the regulations of the Secretary of Defense as approved by the President.

Section 5 (a) provides that military medical facilities will be used whenever space and facilities are available.

Section 5 (b) provides that when military medical facilities are not available or capable of providing the authorized type of treatment, dependents are authorized medical care from civilian sources. Schedules of maximum fees and costs for such medical care would be established by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 6 (a) provides that in order to prevent excessive demands for medical care under this act, dependents shall be responsible for contributing to the cost of such care.

Section 6 (b) provides the Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish charges for any subsistence given in connection with medical care.

Section 6 (c) provides that amounts received in payment for subsistence and medical care rendered dependents in military medical facilities shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation supporting the maintenance and operation or subsistence of the military medical facilities furnishing the care.

Section 6 (d) provides that amounts received in payment for medical care rendered dependents by civilian medical sources shall be deposited to the credit of the medical appropriation of the military department of which the sponsor is a member.

Section 7 provides that, if the Secretary of Defense finds it more economical, he may contract for dependent medical care under such private insurance plan as he deems appropriate.

Section 8 provides for the types of medical care authorized.

Section 9 provides for the types of hospitalization not authorized.

Section 10 (a) provides for further limitations on medical care. Prosthetic devices, hearing aids, orthopedic footwear, and spectacles are not authorized. However, outside the United States and in remote stations where adequate civilian facilities are not available these devices, if available from Government stocks, may be provided to dependents at cost prices to the Government.

Section 10 (b) provides for limitations on ambulance service and home calls.

Section 11 provides the extent to which dental treatment may be given to dependents of members of the Armed Forces. It specifically provides that dental treatment is not authorized through civilian medical sources except as a necessary adjunct to medical or surgical treatment.

Section 12 provides that when an individual serving on active duty as a member of the Coast Guard dies while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy, his widow and dependents shall be eligible for medical care, the same as if such individual had been a member of the Navy on active duty.

Section 13 authorizes appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of this act.

Section 14 (a) (1) repeals the act of July 5, 1884 (10 U. S. C. 96), which provides that the medical officers of the Army and contract surgeons shall, whenever practicable, attend the families of the officers and soldiers free of charge.

Section 14 (a) (2) repeals the act of May 10, 1943 (24 U. S. C. 32-36) relating to the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and the limitations with respect to medical, surgical, or hospital services that may be rendered.

Section 14 (a) (3) repeals that part of section 326 (b) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 697), which reads as follows:

"Such cost shall be at such uniform rate as may be prescribed from time to time by the President for the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel at any naval hospital, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 80)."

Section 14 (a) (4) repeals Public Law 108, approved June 20, 1949, to the extent that it authorizes hospital and medical care for dependents of the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Section 14 (b) provides that all laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions of this proposal are hereby repealed.

Section 15 provides that this legislation shall be effective 90 days from the date of its enactment.

S. 935. A bill to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 935 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1955.  
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes," together with a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

#### PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is (a) to establish a basis in law for the exercise of the authority granted the United States by article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, (b) to outline broad policy objectives for the administration of the islands, and (c) to provide that Federal statutes, except those which have force and effect outside the territorial limits of the United States, will not apply to the Ryukyus pending investigation to determine which laws should be made applicable thereto.

The interest of the United States in the Ryukyu Islands is dictated by strategic military considerations of the highest importance. Consequently, the task of administering the islands has been assigned by the President to the Department of Defense, an assignment necessitated by the inextricable linking of civil and military functions there. In the tightly constricted area of the Ryukyus virtually all activities and policies of the native Government directly affect military planning and operations. The proposed legislation would formalize existing arrangements for assuring continued effective performance of the basic military mission and would also establish, in broad outline, United States objectives for the conduct of the civil administration.

Certain Federal statutes are applicable not only to the continental United States but also to its Territories and possessions. There exist varying rules of construction with regard to the application of Federal laws to outlying areas, and there is some confusion, for example, as to the meaning of the term "Territories and possessions." In some in-

stances the designation has been held to apply to any area over which the United States exercises control, whatever the technical status of the area, an application which would embrace the Ryukyu Islands. Since any nonselective application of Federal statutes to the Ryukyu Islands could give rise to problems inimical and injurious to the interests both of the United States and the Ryukyus, it is proposed that no Federal statutes, except those which have force and effect outside the territorial limits of the United States, shall have application in the Ryukyu Islands until the Congress takes appropriate action with respect to the recommendations submitted to it by a three-member Commission appointed by the Secretary of Defense. It is further provided that future legislative enactments must contain specific reference to the Ryukyu Islands if they are to be made applicable thereto.

It is the view of the Department of Defense that continued effective operation of the military installations on the Ryukyu Islands can best be assured by the enactment, as a matter of priority, of legislation granting the President of the United States, acting through the Secretary of Defense, broad authority to administer the islands in such manner as (a) to facilitate performance of the basic United States military mission and (b) to insure proper regard for the interests and requirements of the Ryukyuan people.

#### COST AND BUDGET DATA

The enactment of this proposal will cause an increase of about \$65,000 in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense to cover costs of the three-member Commission to review Federal statutes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,  
Secretary of the Army.

#### SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE RYUKYU ISLANDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 provides for the exercise of all executive, legislative, and judicial authority necessary for the civil administration of the Ryukyu Islands by the Secretary of Defense or his designated representative in such manner as the President may direct or authorize. It further sets out that the objectives and intent of the United States administration is the development of a financially sound, responsible Ryukyuan government based on democratic principles, yet safeguarding their native economic and cultural status. It further provides that relations of these islands with foreign countries and international organizations shall be conducted by the Secretary of State.

Section 2 provides that the representative of the Secretary of Defense administering these islands to be known as the High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands.

Section 3 stipulates that no United States law will, except those which have force and effect outside the territorial limits of the United States, apply to the Ryukyu Islands unless made specifically applicable by act of Congress. It further provides for the appointment of a three-man commission to survey the field of Federal statutes and within 12 months to advise Congress concerning those statutes which should be made applicable to the Ryukyu Islands, either in present form or by amendment as may be necessary.

Section 4 provides for the continuance in force of the laws of the Ryukyu Islands and the laws, proclamations, ordinances, directives and regulations of the United States Civil Administration in the Ryukyu Islands which are not inconsistent with this law but subject to modification or repeal by Congress or by the President of the United States acting through the Secretary of Defense or his designated representative.

Section 5 provides that proceeds of all taxes, assessments, and fees collected in the



Ryukyu Islands shall be expended for governmental purposes and for the general welfare of the people of the islands.

Section 6 authorizes annual appropriations of funds necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this law.

S. 936. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 936 is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT  
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,

Washington, D. C., January 15, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,

President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposal is in accord with the program of the President. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has assumed action responsibility for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This legislation implements the President's recommendations concerning military career incentives contained in the recent state of the Union address and in his special message to the Congress on January 13, 1955.

This proposal is designed to restore the military pay structure to approximately the same relative position in the economy which it held immediately following the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. With regard to basic pay the bill would provide selective increases for personnel who elect to make a career in the uniformed services.

On September 1, 1954, a special committee was established within the Department of Defense to study the military pay and allowance structure and to recommend substantive legislation designed to modernize that structure. The committee observed that there has been a sharp decrease in the number of reenlistments in the Armed Forces; for example, in 1949 the Army had a reenlistment rate of 41.2 percent but in 1954 that rate dropped to 11.6 percent.

At the present low reenlistment rates it will be necessary to replace 800,000 of the 1,000,000 enlisted men who will become eligible for release from the military services during the coming year. The loss of such large numbers of trained men results in the dissipation of a considerable financial investment which the Government has made in the training of such individuals, both basic and specialized training; and necessitates the re-investment of time and money in new personnel in order to bring those individuals to the same level of efficiency possessed by trained military members. If the pattern continues at the current composite reenlistment rate of 20 percent the burden of constantly reinvesting training costs for 80 percent of the personnel will not only result in greatly increased costs to the Armed Forces but will also cause an unhealthy dilution of the trained military force.

The situation is equally acute with regard to young officers whose training in their initial years of service involves a substantial expenditure. For example, in the Navy approximately 4,000 young officers terminated their obligated military service in calendar year 1954. Out of that number only 200 elected to remain in the active service. Additionally of this 200, 141 requested extensions of their active duty for only 6 months. Forty-six requested, and received, active duty agreements varying from 1 to 5 years and 13 expressed an interest in transferring to the Regular Navy. Experience in the

other services is generally the same as that of the Navy. As a result, there is an alarming shortage of officers in the 4- to 10-year experience category. Failure to attract more officers who will serve on a career basis will cause a deterioration in leadership and skill which will endanger our future security.

Field studies of the problem of high military personnel turnover reveal that there are two major factors dissuading personnel who might otherwise reenlist. These are the level of compensation in relation to private industry; and the instability of military life. The rise of widespread supplementary pay and retirement practices and employee's benefits now being granted in private industry has neutralized any advantage the military services had only a few years ago in procurement and retention of career personnel.

Additionally, this legislative proposal would provide for selective increases in incentive-hazardous-duty pay for air and submarine crews and would also increase the hazardous duty pay for demolition work, parachute duty, deep sea diving and certain other specialties.

The Department of Defense is convinced that the military services must offer adequate special pay in order to attract men who are willing to undertake certain unusually hazardous duties involving risks of death or disability in the execution of military functions. It is believed that this legislation will provide a more adequate incentive for men to engage in such hazardous duties than is now provided under current law.

The per diem allowances for temporary travel duty would be raised from \$9, but not to exceed \$12, per day and a dislocation allowance would be provided military personnel with dependents who are ordered to a new permanent duty station. The proposed dislocation allowance is based on the principle that persons who must move to new stations of duty on the orders of their employer should be assisted in absorbing the additional costs of such dislocation. The practice of providing an additional monetary allowance for this purpose is widely used in private industry as well as in the Armed Forces of many other countries. Surveys conducted by the military services reveal that moving costs to the servicemen generally vary in amounts relating to grade and that such costs exceed the amount of the monthly quarters allowance.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

In the event this legislation is enacted it is estimated that the following increased costs will result for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956:

	In millions
Army.....	\$222.4
Navy.....	205.3
Air Force.....	265.6
Marine Corps.....	36.4
Total.....	729.7

While such increased costs were not included within the proposed operating budget for fiscal year 1956, funds for this and certain other items will be shown in the budget as proposed for later transmission, contingent upon authorizing legislation.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,  
Director, Legislative Programs.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE  
INCENTIVES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED  
SERVICES BY INCREASING CERTAIN PAYS AND  
ALLOWANCES

Section 1 is the short title of the bill.

Section 2 amends the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (37 U. S. C. 231 et seq.) in the following respects:

(1) In clause (1), section 201 (a) is amended by striking out the present pay

tables contained therein and inserting a new table providing increased pay for commissioned officers with more than 3 cumulative years of service and warrant officers and enlisted members with more than 2 cumulative years of service.

(2) In clauses (2) and (3), section 201 (c), which was repealed by section 20 (n) of the Warrant Officer Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 167), is replaced by the present subsection 201 (d) which is redesignated as (c), and the present subsection 201 (e) is redesignated as (d). A new subsection is added dealing with the pay of aviation cadets in order to bring provisions dealing with their pay together in section 201 with the pay of other members of the uniformed services. The pay of aviation cadets is raised from \$109.20 per month (including flight pay) to the rate of 50 percent of the basic pay of a commissioned officer in pay grade O-1 with less than 2 cumulative years of service which amounts to \$161.15 (including flight pay). The pay of aviation cadets was formerly covered by section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act and section 4 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942.

(3) In clause (4), three new clauses numbered (10), (11), and (12) are added to section 204 (a) to provide hazardous duty incentive pay for duty as a low-pressure chamber inside observer, duty as a human acceleration or deceleration subject, and duty involving the use of helium-oxygen for a breathing mixture in the execution of deep-sea diving, respectively.

(4) In clause (5), section 204 (b) is amended to provide a new table of hazardous duty incentive pay authorized under subsection (a) (1) and (2). The new rates increase the amounts of incentive pay for hazardous duty on a selective basis to provide more adequate incentives to continue a career in hazardous duties. This method permits payments of incentive pay for hazardous duty more nearly commensurate with experience and responsibility.

(5) In clause (6), section 204 (c) is amended to increase the rate of hazardous duty incentive pay prescribed therein to \$110 and \$55, respectively.

(6) In clause (7), section 204 (e), prohibiting the payment of incentive pay to aviation cadets, is repealed, and subsection (f) is redesignated as subsection (e).

(7) In clause (8), section 205 (a) is amended to increase the monthly minimum and maximum rates of special pay diving duty prescribed in that subsection to \$5.50 and \$33, respectively.

(8) In clause (9), section 205 (b) is amended to increase the hourly special pay diving duty thereunder to \$5.50 per hour.

(9) In clause (10), section 205 (c) is amended to provide that the receipt of incentive pay under section 204 will not prevent the member from being entitled to \$5.50 for each hour or fraction thereof, in addition to basic pay, as authorized by section 205 (b).

(10) In clause (11), the last sentence of section 303 (a) is amended to increase the per diem allowance from \$9 per day to \$12 per day.

(11) In clause (12), a new sentence is inserted after the first sentence of section 303 (c) to provide a dislocation allowance, under such regulations as may be approved by the Secretary concerned, in an amount equal to 1 month's basic allowance for quarters for the member concerned, whenever a member makes a permanent change of station under orders and his dependents are required to move in connection with that change of station. The allowance may not be paid more than one time for any one permanent change of station.

(12) In clause (13), section 411 is amended to extend, for 2 years from the effective date of the Career Incentive Act of 1955, the authority to elect retired pay or retirement

pay under that section or under the methods set forth in section 511 of the act, and to authorize the revocation of any prior election under that section.

(13) In clause (14), section 415 is amended to authorize a member who elected to receive retirement benefits under that section computed under the laws in effect on September 30, 1949, to revoke that election and thereby receive retired pay computed under this section of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. It is further provided that such member is entitled to retroactive pay as a result of this amendment.

(14) In clause (15) section 511 is amended by adding a new subsection authorizing certain members retired before October 1, 1949, and whose retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay is computed under a law enacted before October 1, 1949, to have that pay recomputed under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, if the recomputation provides him a greater amount of pay.

Sections 3 and 4 amend the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 and the Army Aviation Cadet Act, respectively, to delete the present language dealing with the pay of aviation cadets, which will hereafter be covered by section 201 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Aviation cadets are considered to be enlisted members and, therefore, are entitled to the same travel and other necessary expenses as other enlisted members.

Section 5 provides that any person who is entitled to retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 on the effective date of this act is entitled to have his pay computed under the amendments made by this act.

Section 6 is a savings clause to protect active or retired personnel from suffering a decrease in basic or retired pay as a result of enactment of this legislation.

#### OVERTIME WORK FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND SEAMEN ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Michigan, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit officers and seamen engaged in harbor towing on the Great Lakes to work overtime. The present law prohibits an employee on a harbor tug on the Great Lakes from working more than 8 hours a day, even though he is willing to work overtime. The purpose of this bill is to enable these men to have the same working privileges as other American seamen.

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

The bill (S. 940) to provide that the law limiting the hours of labor of certain officers and seamen on certain vessels navigating the Great Lakes and adjacent waters shall not be applicable to such officers and seamen on tugs principally used for harbor towing, introduced by Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. BENDER) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PROHIBITION OF TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN GAMBLING INFORMATION IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Attorney General of the United States, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

This might be termed "perennial" legislation. The first bill on this subject was introduced on April 4, 1950, by Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he introduced it at the request of Attorney General J. Howard McGrath. That bill—S. 3358, 81st Congress—stemmed directly from the Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime which met in Washington on February 15, 1950, and was attended by mayors, State attorneys general, and other local and State law-enforcement officials.

Following the introduction of S. 3358, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly held comprehensive hearings and favorably reported the legislation to the Senate on May 26, 1950. It was objected to on several occasions and died on the Senate Calendar. The hearings held by the Kefauver crime committee confirmed the findings of the Interstate Committee that without the wire services this nefarious traffic would be brought to a virtual standstill.

Coincidental with the introduction of the gambling information bill back in 1950, former Senator Johnson also introduced another proposal requested by Attorney General McGrath, namely, S. 3357, to prohibit the transportation of slot machines in interstate and foreign commerce. That bill was given expeditious consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and on April 12, 1950, it was reported favorably, and passed the Senate on April 19. Following lengthy House committee hearings the bill passed the House, and on January 2, 1951, it was approved by President Truman. The Johnson Slot Machine Act has been of great aid in drying up a big source of revenue for the racketeers and gamblers.

Again, in the 81st, 82d, and 83d Congresses, bills to prohibit the transmission of gambling information were introduced and favorably reported from our committee but they never got off the Senate Calendar.

The bill which I am introducing today at the request of Attorney General Brownell is not so stringent a bill as that recommended by Attorney General McGrath in 1950 and subsequently reported from our committee. The instant bill is restricted in its application to horse and dog racing and is aimed specifically at one aspect of the bookmaking racket—the wire service.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD in connection with the bill Attorney General Brownell's letter of January 25, 1955, requesting this legislation, also an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January

30, 1955, endorsing the principle of the proposed legislation but calling for caution in our consideration thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and editorial, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 950) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the purposes of this act are to assist the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses, and to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term—

(a) "Communication facility" means any and all instrumentalities, personnel, and services (among other things, the receipt, forwarding, and delivery of communications) used or useful in the transmission of writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds of all kinds by wire or radio or other like connection between points of origin and reception of such transmission.

(b) "Gambling information" means bets or wagers or related information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any horse or dog racing event or contest, or transactions, or information facilitating betting or wagering activities on any such horse or dog racing event or contest. In connection with horseracing, gambling information includes among other things entries, scratches, jockeys, jockey changes, weights, probable winners, scheduled starting time of race, actual starting time of race, track conditions, the betting odds, changes in the betting odds, the post positions, the results, and the prices paid.

(c) "Transmission in interstate commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from any place in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia to any place in any other State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(d) "Transmission in foreign commerce" means transmission directly or indirectly from or to any place in the United States to or from a foreign country or ship at sea or in the air.

SEC. 3. (a) The use of, or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of any communication facility which is or will be used for the transmission of gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce is prohibited. When any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility, but no damages, penalty or forfeiture, civil or criminal, shall be found against any common carrier for any act done in compliance with any such notice. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prejudice the right of any person affected thereby



to secure an appropriate determination, as otherwise provided by law, in a Federal court or in a State or local tribunal or agency, that such facility should not be discontinued or removed, or should be restored.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of information in connection with the news reporting of sporting events or contests, which might be gambling information as defined in this act, if such information is intended, transmitted, supplied, delivered, and received only for printed news publication in newspapers, magazines, journals, or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting.

Sec. 4. (a) Any person or persons who shall lease or otherwise obtain from a common carrier or other supplier a private line communication facility to be operated in interstate or foreign commerce for or in connection with the transmission of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests shall file with such carrier or other supplier a statement that the communication facility so obtained is to be used for such purposes. Failure to file such a statement shall create a presumption that such communication facility is being used in violation of the provisions of this act. The statements on file with the carriers or other suppliers shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

(b) Each common carrier or other supplier shall maintain a list of the terminal points and drops (receiving and sending) on any private line communication facility leased or otherwise furnished for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of news or other information pertaining to sporting events or contests, including the address of each such terminal point and drop, and such list shall be open to inspection by appropriate State and Federal law-enforcement agencies.

Sec. 5. (a) The interstate or foreign character of any transmission of gambling information in, or intended for transmission in, interstate or foreign commerce shall not create an immunity in respect of any criminal prosecution under the laws of any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses.

(b) Any remedies afforded by this act are in addition to remedies now existing under State or Federal law, including law applicable within the Territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1955.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal to prohibit the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

The twofold purpose of this legislation is (1) to assist the State, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking and like offenses and (2) to aid in the suppression of organized gambling activities by prohibiting the use of or the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of communication facilities which are or will be used in the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

By its limited definition of "gambling information" the measure is restricted in its application to information relating to horse and dog racing. Specifically, it is aimed at one aspect of the bookmaking racket—the wire service, without which that racket can-

not exist on a national scale. It is recognized, of course, that gambling exists with respect to sporting events other than horse and dog racing, but it is believed that the limited application of the statute will effectively deal with the wire service problem, and that a broader statute is not necessary.

The measure creates no criminal sanctions. Rather, it prescribes that whenever "any common carrier, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission, is notified in writing by a Federal, State, or local law-enforcement agency, acting within its jurisdiction, that any facility furnished by it is being used or will be used for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information in interstate or foreign commerce, it shall discontinue within a reasonable time, or refuse, the leasing, furnishing, or maintaining of such facility." Thus it will accomplish its purpose by establishing a procedure to prevent persons from using communication facilities for transmitting prohibited gambling information beyond State lines.

This legislative proposal would constitute a sensible exercise of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It will assist the States and local governments in the dispatch of their law-enforcement responsibilities insofar as organized gambling and bookmaking are concerned, yet violations of local gambling laws will continue within the sole province of local law-enforcement officials. Incidentally, it should be noted that the measure contains adequate safeguards to protect the operations of legitimate news-gathering and news-disseminating services.

Accordingly, I urge the early introduction and enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,  
Attorney General.

The editorial presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 30, 1955]

#### CUTTING THE RACE WIRES

Attorney General Brownell is on solid ground in asking Congress to forbid the use of interstate wire facilities for the transmission of "gambling information"—meaning bets and related data in regard to horse and dog racing. At present gambling rackets flourish because full details regarding race entries, scratches, track conditions, betting odds, results, and prices paid are carried over a network of leased wires. In the absence of a law, public utilities are in effect contributing to the success of these rackets in direct conflict with the public interest. The Attorney General's bill would deprive the bookmakers of this advantage and thus, it is anticipated, put some of them out of business.

In our view, the objective of this measure is not only legitimate but also laudable. It would apply in interstate commerce a method that has already proved successful in at least one State—California. The fact that gambling is primarily a State concern should not prevent Congress from using its power over interstate commerce to aid law enforcement. The danger that this power might be abused to curb the transmission of legitimate news seems to have been obviated by a specific exemption for information transmitted and received "only for printed news publication in newspapers, magazines, journals or like periodicals, or for radio and television broadcasting."

There is, however, one aspect of the bill that needs further analysis. It would instruct any interstate communications company

to discontinue service to anyone reported by a local, State, or Federal law-enforcement agency to be using such facilities for the purpose of transmitting or receiving gambling information. No criminal penalties are attached, but the person so deprived of telephone service, for example, would have to go to court to regain his right to have a telephone in his home or place of business. This seems to us to overlook due process. A businessman deprived of a telephone would be under a critical handicap. Such punishment should not be applied arbitrarily nor upon a mere order from a police officer. In our opinion, such a step should be taken only after a fair hearing has been held. It is not enough to maintain access to the courts for citizens who may be aggrieved in this respect. They have a right to a hearing before the deprivation is enforced, and the Department of Justice would do well to modify the otherwise praiseworthy bill in this particular.

#### REMOVAL OF BULK COMMODITY EXEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN WATER CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to certain water carriers.

A substantial number of water carriers are interested in this proposed legislation, and it is at their request that I introduce the bill. However, it is controversial, and extensive hearings will be necessary so that all parties in interest may have an opportunity to appear and present their views.

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

The bill (S. 951) to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to remove the bulk commodity exemption with respect to certain water carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### TREATMENT OF CERTAIN CHILDREN AS DEPENDENTS FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat such child as a dependent for Federal income tax purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 957) to permit any taxpayer who provides a home for any foster child placed in his home by a licensed agency to treat such child as a dependent for Federal income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNING, and Mr. LANGER), was re-

ceived, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill designed to meet a serious obstacle in the field of child welfare; namely, the acute shortage of decent homes available for the care of children who lack homes and families of their own. The Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has found during its investigations that this lack is for many children a push toward delinquency and crime.

It is not too hard for our welfare agencies to find homes for infants and very small children in most instances, but the plight of the homeless child from 5 or 6 years of age through his school years is often tragic. And this tragedy particularly befalls to the boy or girl who is evidencing behavior problems. The family taking such a child into their home is undertaking a most difficult, trying, and important task—a task which may save many a youngster from a delinquent career.

This bill which provides certain tax advantages to such families would at least offset a portion of the financial sacrifice they now make. It would not and could not truly reward them for the service which they are rendering in behalf of all of us.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

#### ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL TO PERMIT ANY TAXPAYER WHO PROVIDES A HOME FOR ANY CHILD PLACED IN HIS HOME BY A LICENSED AGENCY TO TREAT SUCH CHILD AS A DEPENDENT FOR FEDERAL INCOME-TAX PURPOSES

Section I amends section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to enable any taxpayer providing foster care for a child for a duly licensed agency to count such child as a dependent for income-tax purposes. The provision of such foster care involves both financial and personal sacrifice on the part of foster parents. This measure should aid immeasurably in meeting the present drastic lack of adequate foster homes.

Section II makes the proposed amendment effective after December 31, 1954.

#### HANDLING OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me and an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 958) relating to the handling of juvenile delinquents, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator

from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill to provide for the more effective waiver to State authorities of juveniles who have also violated Federal law. As members of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, we have become deeply conscious of the waste, both in human welfare and in dollars and cents, which is involved in handling under Federal statutes the majority of juveniles now so handled.

It is virtually impossible for a juvenile to commit a Federal offense, without, at the same time, violating a State or local ordinance in the community where the offense occurs. Welfare and correctional authorities unanimously subscribe to the principle that a delinquent boy or girl is most effectively rehabilitated when he can be kept close to his own home, family, and community. Unlike an adult, a released juvenile offender usually returns to his parental family. His effective rehabilitation, therefore, requires that the family, as well as the juvenile, be worked with to the end of creating a home situation in which the juvenile can eventually find himself.

It is, therefore, inefficient to transport a youngster from a State hundreds of miles away to the National Training School for Boys here in Washington. Such procedure also involves an unnecessary and unproductive expenditure of Federal funds.

Our subcommittee has within the past few days also introduced legislation which would give assistance to States and localities in improving their programs to prevent delinquency and to rehabilitate youngsters in trouble. We believe that this is the proper and the effective way for the Federal Government to give assistance to States and localities in meeting the problem of juvenile delinquency. We do not believe that sound, long-time goals will be achieved through a process which merely relieves States of responsibility for individual delinquent boys and girls.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

#### ANALYSIS OF BILL RELATING TO THE HANDLING OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Section 1 (a) makes the following changes in existing law: It amends title 18, United States Code, section 5032, so as to place in the United States district court the determination as to whether a juvenile, over 16 years of age, who has committed a felony, but one not punishable by death or life imprisonment, shall be proceeded against as a juvenile delinquent or under the criminal statutes. Under the present statutes, the authority is given to the Attorney General to make such a determination "in his discretion" with respect to any child irrespective of age or offense. The bill provides that the United States court is to make these determinations only after an investigation of the juvenile's background and a determination that the juvenile is not treatable in any Federal facility for juvenile delinquents.

Section 1 (b) makes no change in existing provisions of law which provide that if it is decided to proceed against a juvenile as a juvenile delinquent, the proceedings are to be begun by information, rather than criminal prosecution.

Section 1 (b) (1) changes the analysis of chapter 403 of title 18 to conform to the changes made by the bill.

Section 1 (b) (2) removes from the provisions of section 5033 the requirement for obtaining the consent of the juvenile to proceeding with respect to him as a juvenile delinquent.

Section 2 makes the following changes in existing law: It strengthens the present provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 5001, by requiring that when a person under 22 years of age is charged with the commission of a Federal offense, the commis-

sion of which may also subject that person to the jurisdiction of any State juvenile court, the United States attorney is to forego prosecution, turn such person over to the proper authority of the State, and take steps to cause a proceeding to be begun in the State juvenile court with respect to such offense. Under existing statutes, the United States attorney is only required to ascertain whether there is any State that can and will assume such jurisdiction. The present statutory age with respect to this diversion is 21; the bill raises this age to 22, in line with the age limit of the Youth Corrections Act.

Where the person in question may be subject to the criminal laws of a State, the bill retains the provisions of existing statutes; i. e., requiring of the United States attorney only that he ascertain whether any State can and will assume jurisdiction. The bill retains the present provisions of the law with respect to (a) authorizing the marshal to convey such persons upon order of the United States attorney, (b) obtaining the person's consent to return, and (c) paying the expenses for the return out of appropriated funds.

#### PROHIBITION OF TRAVEL BY CERTAIN JUVENILES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with an analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 959) to prohibit juveniles, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from going outside the United States without a permit issued by the Attorney General for such purpose, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

On behalf of myself, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I am introducing a bill to restrict the present free passage of unaccompanied juveniles across our national borders. This bill is designed to combat a very serious problem uncovered by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency during its hearings along the Mexican border.

Despite sincere efforts to curb vice in certain communities along the border, our respected neighbor, Mexico, is still confronted at points with a serious traffic in narcotics, prostitution, and other vices from which juveniles should be protected. The Mexican Government itself has taken laudable steps to achieve this end through legislation prohibiting the entry of unescorted minors into that country. The United States has not yet passed such legislation and, therefore, is severely handicapped in its attempts to cooperate in meeting the problem.

This is not a problem which affects only a small number of youth nor only the youth



of a few border States. Testimony taken in San Diego revealed that the sheriff of that county, operating within the severely limited authority of a local curfew ordinance, turned back 2,326 unescorted juveniles, under 18 years of age, and coming from several States, over a period of 8 short months. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of other juveniles, traveling during the some 19 of the 24 hours each day when the curfew is inoperative, crossed the border at this one point. The imposition of restrictions upon this traffic represents, I believe, an essential safeguard to a significant number of American youth.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

**ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL TO PROHIBIT JUVENILES, UNACCOMPANIED BY A PARENT OR GUARDIAN, FROM GOING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT A PERMIT ISSUED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR SUCH PURPOSE**

Section I provides that no juvenile shall be permitted to go outside the United States unless accompanied by a parent or guardian unless such juvenile presents to the proper authorities a permit issued by the Attorney General of the United States. This section further provides that the Attorney General shall issue such permits if parent or guardian of such juvenile gives consent either in person to the issuing officer or by duly verified written statement to issuing officer.

The problem of unescorted juveniles leaving the United States without restriction constitutes a serious menace in certain border communities where such juveniles are thereby subjected to narcotic traffic and other vices.

Section II excludes persons serving in the armed services from application of this Act.

Section III requires that the Attorney General administer and enforce this Act through existing facilities of the Department of Justice.

Section IV defines "juvenile" as any unmarried person under 18 years of age, and the term "United States" as the continental United States.

**MODIFICATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS FOR GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the construction of improvements on the Great Lakes connecting channels of Lake Erie, so as to make it possible for the States of Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota to receive the full benefits of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is very much interested in this particular bill and in the welfare of Michigan.

Mr. President, the Senate will recall that during the 83d Congress the Committee on Public Works, as a result of a joint resolution which I was privileged to introduce, authorized the making by the Corps of Army engineers of a survey of the channel-deepening project. The survey has been completed and it is my hope that a favorable report on it will soon reach the Congress. As a matter of fact, I understand that the report is now in the hands of Congress, following a meeting of the Army Engineers Review Board, which acted favorably upon the channel-deepening program.

The next step is for the Congress to authorize the construction. In my judgment, it is essential that the authorization be made as quickly as pos-

sible, so that Congress can take action on the making of an appropriation for the project.

Mr. President, an examination of the map of the Great Lakes will indicate that it is essential to deepen to 27 feet the channels of the Detroit River and the St. Clair River and the Sault Ste. Marie, so that oceangoing vessels may travel through the St. Lawrence Seaway project and into the heartland of America. Certainly this project is in the public interest. Therefore, Mr. President, I urge favorable consideration and favorable support of the bill I introduce by the Senate Committee on Public Works and by the entire Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, the economic surveys which have been made by the Corps of Engineers as to the feasibility and economic soundness of the project are most revealing. It is indicated that by means of the construction of the project, there will be decided advancement in the development of trade and commerce in the area affected, and that the cost of the project will be a very small fraction of the benefits which will be available within a period of 10 years, much less the long-term benefits.

I think I can speak for a number of the Members from that Midwestern area when I say that we look with great favor and great hope upon the fulfillment of this proposal. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has spoken to me many times about this matter; and I am sure that when a convenient opportunity presents itself he will wish to make favorable comments regarding the program I have announced.

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

The bill (S. 961) to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

**REDISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED UNDERPLANTED COTTON ALLOTMENTS**

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas], I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities and hardships due to 1955 cotton allotments. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement in explanation of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Texas may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) to utilize underplanted cotton acreage to correct inequities and hardships due to 1955 cotton allotments, introduced by Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this joint resolution provides for the redistribution of estimated underplanted cotton allotments for the purpose of increasing 1955 allotments in individual hardship cases.

This approach would permit us to keep actual planting within the present national cotton allotment figure and at the same time care for individual farmers who have been seriously damaged by drastic cotton allotment reductions this year.

There are over 13,000 cotton farmers in Texas whose acreage allotments have been reduced below 5 acres. These and even larger family-size farms will suffer terrible hardships if something is not done to remedy the situation.

This bill is a combination of bills previously introduced in the House by Representative CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas, and Representative TOM ABERNETHY, of Mississippi. It would provide that individual hardship increases in present cotton allotments would come from an estimate to be made by the Secretary of Agriculture of acreage presently allotted but not expected to be planted. Unplanted allotments usually run into several hundreds of thousands of acres.

This bill provides for all farms to be raised to the 5-acre minimum provided in the basic Agricultural Adjustment Act, and that all remaining acreage would be distributed by county committees to prevent hardships, especially on resident or family-operated farms and in drought areas.

Early consideration and relief must be given to these hardship cases, or there will ensue great losses and further deterioration of our family-sized farms.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law within 15 days after the enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate for each State receiving a State acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton the number of acres of such allotment which, on the basis of previous experience, will probably not be planted to cotton in 1955 and shall apportion to each such State an additional allotment for 1955 equivalent to the underplanting so estimated. The additional acreage required for such apportionment shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. So much of such additional State acreage allotments as may be required therefor shall be apportioned to counties within the respective States for the purposes of effectuating the provisions relating to small farms of section 344 (f) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and any acreage remaining thereafter shall be used to correct inequities in farm allotments and prevent hardship, especially on family-operated farms and in drought areas.*

**EXTENSION AND STRENGTHENING OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on last Tuesday I introduced the bill (S. 890) to extend and strengthen

the Water Pollution Control Act. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] may be added as an additional cosponsor of that bill.

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

#### PROPOSED JOINT COMMISSION ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several days ago I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, a resolution seeking to establish a joint commission to look after the Central Intelligence Agency. Since that time two additional Senators have asked that they be included with the list of 33 cosponsors whose names already appear on the concurrent resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] may be listed as cosponsors, and so shown in any new copies of the concurrent resolution which may be printed.

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

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS"

Mr. JENNER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 20,000 additional copies of parts 21, 22, 24, 25, and 26 of the hearings entitled "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments", held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the 83d Congress.

#### CONTINUATION OF SHALE-TO-OIL EXPERIMENTAL AND RESEARCH PLANT, RIFLE, COLO.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], I submit for appropriate reference, the following concurrent resolution:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government-owned shale-to-oil experimental and research plant at Rifle, Colo., should be continued in operation, without decrease in its present scale of activity, until at least June 30, 1956.

The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to spell out and express specifically the sense and feelings of the Members of the 84th Congress. By adoption of this concurrent resolution, the Congress will go on record in favor of the

continuation of the basic research in the development of new oil reserves within our national boundaries. The oil-shale deposits in the Rocky Mountains constitute the largest presently known source of untapped energy in the world. It is estimated that the proven undeveloped reserve in Colorado alone approaches 464 billion barrels of oil.

In the budget for fiscal year 1956, which is presently before the Congress, there is no provision for the continuation of the experimental shale-to-oil plant of the United States Bureau of Mines located in Rifle, Colo. I emphasize that this is a research and an experimental plant, not a plant designed to produce oil from shale in commercial quantities. It is most necessary to maintain the operation of this plant in order to continue the objective research program in this important energy source, particularly when we in the United States depend to such a large extent upon the importation of foreign crude oil to meet the petroleum needs of our people. If there should occur a national emergency that would threaten the safety of our sea lanes, our domestic petroleum industry would most assuredly be called upon to produce a much greater quantity of crude oil to make up for the possible loss of oil from foreign sources.

It seems only prudent, therefore, that the United States should continue in behalf of the public interest a plant that has been so successful in approaching the economic utilization of this vast domestic energy source.

In submitting this concurrent resolution, we seek the voice of the entire Congress in an appeal to the Appropriations Committees, in both the House and the Senate, to restore to the budget the same amount of money that was appropriated for the 1955 fiscal year so that this 200-man plant may continue, in the interest and welfare of all the people of this country, to develop the very latest methods in the mining and retorting of oil shale. We sincerely and earnestly request our colleagues in both Houses of the Congress to approve this concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government-owned shale-to-oil experimental and research plant at Rifle, Colo., should be continued in operation, without decrease in its present scale of activity, until at least June 30, 1956.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word or two in connection with what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has stated. The subject is of importance not only to the State of Colorado but also to the States of Wyoming and Utah. In those three States, according to expert geologists, there are deposits of oil and shale which contain more oil reserves than all the known reserves in Saudi Arabia. The concurrent resolution should be adopted.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE KOREAN WAR AND RELATED MATTERS"

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved,* That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary 28,000 additional copies of the report entitled "The Korean War and Related Matters," prepared by the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary during the 83d Congress.

#### 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. O'MAHONEY:

Address delivered by him at Roosevelt Day dinner held in New York City on February 2, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

An address delivered by him and an address delivered by Senator GREEN at testimonial dinner in honor of Stephen S. Scopus, supreme president of the Order of Ahepa, in New York City, on January 30, 1955.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Excerpts from the address delivered by him at the seventh annual Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by the Americans for Democratic Action, in New York City, on February 2, 1955.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Program and transcript of proceedings in connection with dedicatory prayer breakfast in Washington, D. C., on the morning of February 3, 1955.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GILBERT H. JERTBERG TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gilbert H. Jertberg, of California, to be United States district judge, southern district of California, vice Campbell E. Beaumont, deceased.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee on or before Friday, February 11, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled later.

Following the receipt of such representations or objections the committee will consider such, and at its next meeting determine whether a hearing will be held.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Curtis Clark, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John M. Moore, retired.



Lama A. DeMunbrun, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky, vice Loomis E. Cranor, retired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Friday, February 11, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled later.

Following the receipt of such representations or objections the committee will consider such, and at its next meeting determine whether hearings will be held.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was received today the nomination of Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1 to be Ambassador of the United States to Colombia, vice Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, resigned. There was received also a list of 59 names of persons for appointments and promotions in the Foreign Service, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD of today. In his capacity as a Senator the Chair gives notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

#### FIRMNESS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE FORMOSA ISSUE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me applaud the firmness of the President on the Formosa issue. And let me utter the hope that there will be no retreat from that stand as diplomats begin bargaining for a cease fire.

The news from London makes it evident that various powers are in a bargaining mood. The reported demand of Red China for the surrender of Formosa is certain to be followed by a face-saving alternative, such as the surrender and evacuation of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands. It is the age-old business of demanding a whole loaf, and then accepting a half loaf rather than no bread at all.

In such a deal, it is we who would lose face. It would be a shameful submission to Red China. And it would be more. It would dim and destroy the hopes of millions of Chinese on Formosa and elsewhere who still look for liberation from the leprosy of communism which was imposed upon them by force.

Despite the comfort and assurance contained in the overwhelming support for the Southeast Asia Treaty, what shall the peoples of southeast Asia believe if, after the evacuation of the Tachen Islands, we then agree to the surrender of Quemoy and the Matsu islands? Could they do other than believe that in good time, we would be prepared to let Asia fall?

To be sure, the pending treaty between the United States and the Nationalist Government of China limits our responsibilities to Formosa and the Pescadores. But by its very terms it is a mutual defense treaty, and to permit such important outposts as Quemoy and the Matsu islands to be bargained away would be disastrous to the strongest force on Formosa, which is the will and morale of the defenders.

Since this piecemeal approach comes from Red China, the words of Lincoln, when he said, "I walk slowly but I never walk backwards," are timely. Once we step backward, no matter what the bargain-hunters in U. N. may devise, we shall have jeopardized the hope and the freedom of all of southeast Asia.

#### PRESIDENT MAGLOIRE, OF HAITI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President and Mrs. Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, are near the end of their visit to the United States, a visit that will be long remembered. I sincerely hope that this marks a new era of continued cooperation and friendship between the island-nation of Haiti and the United States.

President Magloire took office in 1950, facing problems of almost insurmountable dimensions, but he has succeeded where few thought he could. He has bettered relations among his people and he has led a continual and winning battle against fear, suppression, ignorance, and want in his country. Through the United States technical assistance program in Haiti, great advances are being made in improving the standard of living of these island peoples. Continued cooperation between our two nations in matters of defense and mutual assistance can lead to a very harmonious future.

In conclusion I wish to say that it has been an honor for the United States to have as its guest this courageous and gifted leader, a bastion of strength among our Latin American neighbors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a selection of newspaper articles regarding the visit of the Haitian President.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 31, 1955]

#### HAITI CHIEF IMPRESSES UNITED STATES (By Robert M. Hallett)

So far in his public appearances in the United States, the President of Haiti has been conservatively dressed in dark suits. He was seen thus when he addressed a joint session of Congress January 27.

But Paul Magloire at home inclines to ceremonious uniforms with spurred boots, epaulets, and aiguillettes. There is almost a touch of the regal in his actions in Haiti, which occupies the western third of the Caribbean island of Hispaniola.

A six-foot-two Negro with a quiet sort of dignity, the Haitian President has aids stand by him in ceremonial appearances to hand him his gold-headed cane or his plumed hat.

Despite his royal air, or perhaps because of it, Haitians are overwhelmingly behind their "bon papa," who has done much to

unify his people and bring political and economic stability to the island republic.

#### ALL-NEGRO NATION

Although Haiti is proud of its distinction as an all-Negro nation, certain class distinctions exist among its 3,500,000 population. The aristocracy is composed of a mulatto elite (about 2 percent of the population). From this group are traditionally drawn the lawyers, doctors, poets, and government servants.

The mass of Haitians, however, are bare-foot Negroes eking a living from small patches of eroded land.

The history of Haiti is punctuated with the squabbles between these two extremes, the rich and the poor, the mulatto minority and the Negro mass.

#### NO CLASS DOMINATION

When President Magloire took office in 1950, he followed Dumarsais Estimé, who espoused a strong antimulatto line.

President Magloire immediately made it clear that neither Negroes nor mulattoes should dominate Haiti, and he has carefully followed this policy, which has bettered the relations between the two factions.

However, it should be pointed out that Haiti's class divisions are based more on economics than on race. What racial intolerance that does exist can be traced in part to United States occupation of the Republic (1912 to 1934) by the Marine Corps who placed the mulatto elite in key positions.

In his public appearances, President Magloire apparently believes that the pageantry of fancy uniforms and royal trappings are part of his job.

But between ceremonies, the President gets into business clothes and works in the white marble Presidential Palace in Port-au-Prince in a manner that rivals the pace of a New York executive.

He works in a small office conspicuously free of ornamentation, although other suites in the palace are filled with alabaster busts, stuffed cranes, empire clocks, and pictures of Haitian heroes.

In New York, Representative ADAM C. POWELL, JR. (Democrat), of New York, whom President Magloire is now visiting, said the reception accorded the Haitian by President Eisenhower in Washington was "a mighty earth-shaking symbol of an orderly New World."

Mr. POWELL specifically referred to the fact that Mrs. Eisenhower went in to dinner on the arm of President Magloire and was followed by President Eisenhower with Mrs. Magloire.

"The masters of the Kremlin," said Mr. POWELL, "know that such integration on a world basis carries more of an impact than the explosion of any hydrogen bomb."

#### ACTIVE COOPERATION

The lawmaker said that as President Magloire continues his trip throughout the United States, he will be "a visible reminder to people everywhere that the United States of America cannot continue as a first-class power without the active cooperation of the 2 billion colored people of the earth."

On January 28, President Magloire spoke before a joint session of Congress, thanking the United States for its help "which has been intensified since the beginning of the present administration" in combating poverty and fostering the evolution of all the Latin American Republics.

Since 1950, the United States has contributed \$3,581,000 to programs of agricultural and education development in Haiti. Emergency aid following Hurricane Hazel last fall, which brought great devastation to the little country, totaled \$3,740,000.

#### POLICY PRAISED

The Haitian President praised President Eisenhower's continuance of the "good neigh-

bor policy" begun by President Roosevelt. He also said his people "follow with interest President Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts, which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere."

President Magloire declared that he sought to make the people of his country immune to communism by raising standards of living. His government, he said, has "constructed schools, clinics, and workers' housing projects."

Meanwhile in Washington, State Secretary John Foster Dulles and Haitian Foreign Minister Maucclair Zephirin have signed a mutual-assistance agreement. This is the 11th of its kind between the United States and a Latin American country. It provides that the United States will furnish Haiti with military assistance and equipment, and that Haiti will not undertake aggressive action against other countries.

[From the Chicago Daily News of January 27, 1955]

#### HAITI CHIEF LAUDS UNITED STATES AID IN FIGHT AGAINST REDS

WASHINGTON.—President Paul E. Magloire of Haiti said Thursday that aid in raising living standards, such as the United States has been giving his country, is "the most efficient weapon for fighting communism."

Addressing a joint session of Congress, the visiting dignitary said Haiti has taken all possible legal measures to outlaw the "pernicious doctrine" of communism.

Magloire said Haitians are doing what they can "with our limited means" to build schools, clinics, housing projects, and other needed improvements.

He expressed Haiti's gratitude for past United States aid and the hope that the United States will continue this good neighbor policy.

[From the New York Times of January 27, 1955]

#### HAITI'S PRESIDENT IS IN WASHINGTON—GENERAL MAGLOIRE WELCOMED AT AIRPORT BY NIXON—WILL ADDRESS CONGRESS TODAY

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 26.—President Paul Eugene Magloire of Haiti arrived today for a 3-day state visit. It will be devoted to cultivating good neighborly relations between the United States and Latin America.

President Eisenhower sent his private plane, the *Columbine*, to Miami to bring to Washington President Magloire and Mme. Magloire and the principal Haitian Cabinet officials, who accompanied the President.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Mrs. Nixon and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Henry F. Holland, were at the airport here to welcome the Haitian leaders. A guard of honor there stood at attention and a 21-gun salute boomed in the background. Mrs. Dulles represented the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who was unable to be present.

Speaking to the welcoming delegation, General Magloire said:

"To the happiness of meeting old friends and shaking again hands, the warmth of which is familiar to me, is added the happiness which all men of my race feel on being in a country which is making one of the greatest efforts ever undertaken for the true liberty of man."

From the National Airport Mr. NIXON accompanied President Magloire and Mme. Magloire to the White House, where the President and Mrs. Eisenhower met them on the steps of the north portico. The Haitian party was entertained at a state dinner and President Magloire and Mme. Magloire spent the night at the White House. In accordance with protocol, they will stay at Blair House afterward.

On the way to the White House through streets bedecked with crossed United States and Haitian flags, the party halted at the District Building, where the Commissioners of the District of Columbia presented a key to the city to President Magloire.

Tomorrow at noon General Magloire will address a joint meeting of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The only other official business scheduled for the visit is the ceremonious signing of a military assistance agreement between the United States and Haiti.

General Magloire will address the Council of the Organization of American States on Friday and will go to West Point on Saturday. Thereafter he will visit New York for 3 days and will make a week's tour of the United States. On February 9 he will begin an official visit to Canada.

President Magloire is accompanied by Maucclair Zephirin, Haitian Secretary of State for Foreign Relations and Worship; Marcel Fombrun, Secretary of State for the Presidency and Commerce; Brig. Gen. Antoinelevet, Chief of Staff of the Haitian Army, and other leading Haitian officials.

[From the New York Times of January 28, 1955]

#### HAITI'S PRESIDENT EXPLAINS HIS AIMS—TELLS CONGRESS HE WOULD LIFT NATION'S LIVING STANDARD TO EXCLUDE COMMUNISM

WASHINGTON, January 27.—President Paul Eugene Magloire, of Haiti, declared today that he sought to make the people of his country immune to communism by raising standards of living.

He spoke before a joint session of Congress in the House Chamber.

He thanked the United States for its help "which has been intensified since the beginning of the present administration," in combating poverty and fostering the evolution of all the Latin American Republics.

President Magloire said that while the Haitian Government had taken all legal steps to outlaw "not merely the extension but the very manifestation of this pernicious doctrine (communism)," it has also sought "the liberation of Haitians" by introducing "decent living conditions of life." Thus, he added, it has "constructed schools, clinics, and worker's housing projects."

Haiti, the only French-speaking republic in the Americas, occupies the western part of the island of Hispaniola in the Caribbean. The country has 3,100,000 inhabitants.

#### TECHNICAL AID UNDERWAY

The United States launched a joint United States-Haitian technical cooperation program in 1942. Since 1950 the United States has contributed \$3,581,000 to programs of agricultural and educational development in Haiti. Emergency aid following Hurricane Hazel last fall totaled \$2,740,000.

The Haitian President asserted that President Eisenhower had happily continued the good neighbor policy begun by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said his people "follow with interest President Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere."

President Magloire is making a 3-day state visit to Washington at President Eisenhower's invitation.

This afternoon he decorated with the Grand Cross of the Haitian National Order four United States officers who played a prominent part in rushing emergency hurricane relief to Haiti last fall.

They were Rear Adm. G. B. H. Hall, commandant of the 10th Naval District; Brig. Gen. K. S. Sweany, commanding general of United States forces in the Antilles; Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, commandant of the United

States naval station in Cuba, and Capt. D. G. Donahoe, commanding officer of the aircraft carrier *Saipan*, which arrived off the Haitian coast the day after the hurricane. In addition, Captain Donahoe received a unit citation for his entire ship.

#### PRESIDENT TO VISIT HERE

President Magloire will arrive by automobile here from the United States Military Academy at West Point tomorrow afternoon. He will remain here, save for a visit on Tuesday to the Brookhaven, Long Island, Atomic Laboratories, till Thursday, when he will go by plane to Nashville, Tenn.

Many honors will be showered on President Magloire during his visit. At 12:05 p. m. on Monday he will take part in a ticker-tape parade from Bowling Green to city hall, where Mayor Wagner will present to him the city's scroll for distinguished public service and medal of honor.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 28, 1955]

#### HAITI'S PRESIDENT THANKS UNITED STATES IN TALK TO CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, January 27.—President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, said today his Government has taken all possible legal means to stamp out communism but that "decent" living standards are the only sure immunity against its "noxious germs."

Addressing a joint session of the House and Senate, President Magloire thanked the United States for financial aid in setting up projects designed to raise living standards in Haiti. Such projects, he asserted, "represent for us the most efficient weapon for fighting communism."

#### THREE-DAY VISIT

Mr. Magloire, who arrived yesterday for a 3-day official visit as the guest of President Eisenhower, said the people of Haiti "follow with interest General Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere."

He praised General Eisenhower as a great soldier and statesman who "seeks to guarantee the rights of life to those states whose very existence is threatened today."

He said his own administration in Haiti has begun an extensive program of building schools, clinics, and workers' housing. He said the recent hurricane that hit the island republic "forced us to limit our efforts considerably," but he added, "we are determined to continue the task, trusting in the great solidarity which the United States demonstrated on that occasion."

#### NIGHT AT WHITE HOUSE

The Haitian President, accompanied by his wife, stayed over night last night at the White House, the customary honor accorded visiting chiefs of state.

Today, aside from addressing Congress, he toured historic landmarks in the Capital and conferred with Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Although his visit is billed only as a good-will mission, Mr. Magloire is expected to sign a military-aid agreement with this country before departing Saturday to tour the Nation.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 27, 1955]

#### CHIEF OF HAITI GUEST OF IKE IN WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 26.—President Paul Eugene Magloire of Haiti, with his wife and a party of eight, arrived in Washington today for a state visit.

They were met at the National Airport by Vice President Nixon and his wife and escorted to the White House, where they spent



the night as guests of President and Mrs. Eisenhower.

The head of the only Negro Republic in this hemisphere was presented with a key to the city. Six Negro couples were invited to a state dinner in the White House tonight. They included Marian Anderson, the Metropolitan opera contralto and her husband, Orpheus Fisher.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 27, 1955]

#### MAGLOIRE TO CONFER WITH DULLES AFTER ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

President Paul E. Magloire of Haiti, here on a 3-day state visit, went to the Capitol today to address a joint session of the Congress.

Later he planned to see Secretary of State Dulles.

The Caribbean visitor, who arrived late yesterday with Mrs. Magloire and ranking Haitian officials, spent the morning at Arlington Cemetery and Mount Vernon. He placed wreaths in tribute to the Unknown Soldier and the first President of the United States.

His afternoon schedule included a ceremony for decorating members of the American Armed Forces at a reception in the Haitian Embassy.

#### DULLES TO GIVE DINNER

Secretary and Mrs. Dulles are giving a dinner tonight for the Magloires in Anderson House as evidence of the friendship this country holds for his.

President Magloire is the first visiting chief of state received in Washington this year. Arriving yesterday in a special military Air Transport Service plane, he was greeted by Vice President and Mrs. Nixon. Then he was accorded full honors—a 21-gun salute and a formal review of a military guard of honor.

From the airport, the Magloires proceeded by auto to the District Building for a warm reception from the people of Washington.

Commissioner Samuel Spencer and Edgar Morris, chairman of a citizens' committee, expressed the pleasure of the city for his visit.

#### GIVEN STATE DINNER

Then the visitors were escorted to the White House for a welcome by the President and Mrs. Eisenhower. Remaining as overnight guests, they were tendered a state dinner.

In addition to his speech before the Senate and House today, President Magloire plans an address to the Council of the Organization of American States tomorrow. Both he and Mrs. Magloire will be honored at numerous social functions.

Wherever the Magloires have been in Washington, both they and their official greeters have stressed the warm friendship between Haiti and the United States. On his arrival at the White House, Mr. Magloire told President Eisenhower:

"The welcome which has been given me by the authorities at my arrival, and the enthusiasm shown by the citizens of this Capital, who have come in great number to greet me, are a new manifestation of the solidarity which has always existed between the first and the second independent Republics of the New World."

[From the Washington Evening Star, January 27, 1955]

#### PRESIDENT MAGLOIRE VISITS

The democratic government of the Haitian Republic stands today as one of the tangible evidences of the good neighbor policy which has prevailed in our relationship toward the southern parts of this hemisphere for the past 20 years. For almost that many years prior to 1934 United

States troops had been in occupation of that troubled western end of the Caribbean island of Hispaniola but their evacuation that summer has been followed by a period of relative political stability and of recent economic progress.

President Magloire, now on an official visit here, was elected by the National Assembly—a popularly elected branch of the bicameral legislature—in 1950. Intensive development of the little country's agricultural and mineral resources has been under way in the years since and a 5-year program of industrial construction—dams and power-producing plants—is now in operation.

Hispaniola was one of Columbus' discoveries in 1492 and the early history of the island revolves around Spanish colonization. From 1677 to 1804, the colony was French and it is still a French-speaking country. Except for the United States occupation, from 1915 to 1934, forced by disorders in the country, it has been independent since French rule ended. Its tourist attractions have become increasingly popular and profitable in recent years and it is considered today a stable and responsible member of the American community of nations.

[From the Washington Evening Star, January 28, 1955]

#### MAGLOIRE'S SCHEDULE INCLUDES CEREMONIAL VISIT TO OAS TODAY

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti was to pay a ceremonial visit to the Organization of American States today in another round of events in connection with his state visit to Washington.

The visit to the OAS is scheduled to include a formal reception of the stocky, smiling Haitian President by the OAS council at the Pan American Union. At this ceremony, President Magloire will be greeted by Jose A. Mora, of Uruguay, chairman of the council, and will make a reply.

This is scheduled for noon, and is to be followed by a state luncheon in the Hall of the Americas.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Magloire and the other women of the presidential party will be tendered a reception by Senora de Mora and Senora Davila, wife of Carlos Davila, OAS Secretary-General. This will be given in the Secretary-General's house and there will be a luncheon afterward.

#### TO OPEN EXHIBITS

The two luncheon parties will then unite for the opening of an exhibit of Haitian paintings by Mrs. Pierre Noel in the reading room of the Pan American Library.

The first thing on the schedule of the visiting President today was a visit to the American Red Cross. There President Magloire and Mrs. Magloire were greeted by George A. Garrett, staff members and volunteer workers of the District chapter. Mr. Garrett, Washington investment banker, is deputy to Red Cross National Chairman E. Roland Harriman, who is absent from Washington.

President Magloire spoke warmly in appreciation of Red Cross help when Hurricane Hazel devastated the south coast of Haiti last October. About 100,000 persons were left homeless.

#### SEES DULLES TODAY

President Magloire spoke in French, and an interpreter provided an English translation. French is the language of Haiti. While the President understands English, he does not feel his command of it is adequate for formal addresses.

At 3:30 p. m., President Magloire will call on Secretary of State Dulles at the State Department.

Tonight President and Mrs. Magloire will give a state dinner for President and Mrs. Eisenhower in the Sheraton Park Hotel.

It will be the third formal dinner of the visit, beginning with the state dinner at the White House Wednesday night, which was followed by a dinner last night given by the Secretary of State and Mrs. Dulles at Anderson House.

President Magloire addressed a joint session of Congress yesterday. In an address which was warmly received he firmly aligned his country with the United States in opposition to international communism. The President and the Haitian dignitaries with him were then the guests at a luncheon at the Capitol given by Vice President Nixon.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1955]

#### MILITARY AGREEMENT CONCLUDES 3-DAY VISIT OF MAGLOIRE

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, left Washington by air today, after a 3-day state visit which was climaxed by the signing of a military assistance agreement between his country and the United States.

The President and Mrs. Magloire, accompanied by a large suite, emplaned at National Airport for West Point and planned to go later today to New York. His state visit will be continued there until next Thursday morning. Then he will proceed, in unofficial status, to Nashville, Chicago, and Boston.

The military assistance agreement was signed yesterday at the State Department by Secretary Dulles and Foreign Minister Mairclair Zephirin of Haiti, after President Magloire called upon Mr. Dulles. It is the 11th such pact between the United States and Latin American countries.

Secretary Dulles said it is consistent with and conforms to various other inter-American instruments now in effect. The other countries already signatories to such pacts are Cuba, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru.

In the course of a final busy day, Mr. Magloire visited national headquarters of the American Red Cross, addressed the Council of the Organization of American States at the Pan American Union, was honored afterwards at a luncheon there and, with Mrs. Magloire, opened an exhibition of Haitian paintings in the library of the Pan American Union.

Later he held a news conference, and last night he gave a dinner to honor President and Mrs. Eisenhower at the Sheraton Park Hotel. President and Mrs. Magloire had been entertained by the Eisenhowers at the White House Wednesday night.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 27, 1955]

#### PRESIDENT OF HAITI WELCOMED HERE—OVERNIGHT GUEST AT THE WHITE HOUSE—MAGLOIRE GREETED AT AIRPORT WITH FANFARE—RECEIVES KEY TO THE CITY

(By Richard J. Maloy)

Washington rolled out its red carpet yesterday to welcome President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, as he began a 3-day state visit to the Nation's Capital.

The chief executive of the tiny island republic praised America as "a country which is making one of the greatest efforts undertaken for the true liberation of man."

President Magloire, his wife, and official party were met at National Airport by Vice President and Mrs. RICHARD M. NIXON. He received the key to the city at the District Building, and was greeted by President and Mrs. Eisenhower at the White House.

#### TROOPS AND SALUTE

The United States Army Band and crack detachments of troops from the other services were drawn up to salute Magloire at the

airport. A 21-gun salute boomed as he alighted from an Air Force Constellation and reviewed the troops.

Mme. Magloire was presented with a bouquet of roses by Mrs. Nixon. The Vice President told Magloire 50,000 American tourists who visited Haiti last year were warmly received and expressed the hope "that you will find as warm a welcome here."

The Haitian chief executive said his country "is determined more than ever to be beside America in the everyday struggle of the occidental culture, in order to save the hopes of the free world."

Leaving the airport, the motorcade moved along the traditional flag-bedecked parade route. Fourteen bands, 2,300 troops, and crowds estimated at 40,000 by Police Chief Robert V. Murray line the route.

At the District Building Edgar Morris, chairman of a citizens committee, hailed sweeping progress made by Haiti during 4 years of leadership by President Magloire.

Commissioner Samuel Spencer, recalling that America and Haiti were pioneers in the democratic form of government, presented the key to the city. The French-speaking chief executive, whose words were interpreted by an aide, expressed sincere gratitude.

#### GREETED BY PRESIDENT

As the motorcade moved to the White House, President Eisenhower emerged to welcome President Magloire and introduce him to Mrs. Eisenhower. Magloire delighted assembled photographers by kissing Mrs. Eisenhower's hand when he was introduced.

The couple stayed overnight at the White House, and were guests at an 8 p. m. dinner given by President Eisenhower. During the dinner President Magloire raised a toast to this friendly country and thanked Mr. Eisenhower for American aid sent when Hurricane Hazel laid waste parts of Haiti.

Today the Magloires will move to Blair House, and begin a round of official appearances. Today's agenda includes a visit to Arlington Cemetery and Mount Vernon, and a noon speech before a joint session of Congress.

#### MAGLOIRE DYNAMIC BUT GENTLE LEADER

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, is the fifth generation of his family to provide leadership to the small island nation.

Like his ancestors, President Magloire started out as a career military man, but switched over to public life during the post-war years, becoming Haiti's first popularly elected President in 1950.

A husky man of medium height, he finds relaxation as a horseman and in a fast game of tennis. He is dynamic at work, but gentle in dealing with people.

#### HAVE FIVE CHILDREN

Magloire, 47, was married in 1936 to Yvette Leconte, 10 years his junior. The couple have 5 children, ranging in age from 18 to 6.

Two daughters, Elsie, 16, and Mirtha, 14, are students at Oak Grove School in Vassalboro, Me.

Haitians in general are a poor people, with a population of 3,250,000 compressed into 10,714 square miles. But despite this poverty they are intense, happy, proud, and independent. The President shares these traits.

After graduation from school in 1929, the future President taught for a year and then entered the national military academy. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in 1931, and had risen to colonel by 1947.

#### HAITI'S BEST SALESMAN

Mme. Magloire was educated at the St. Joseph de Cluny School, the Institute of Andree Leroy, and the Mme. Maude Turin School in Haiti. She also studied music, painting, and the arts at other institutions.

The Magloires are considered their country's best salesmen and good will ambassa-

dors. They made a state tour of Colombia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama, Puerto Rico, and Venezuela last year.

They also have made frequent unofficial visits to the United States, but the current trip is the first state visit to this country. It will take them to New York, Boston, Chicago, and Nashville, besides Washington.

[From the New York Times of February 2, 1955]

#### COLUMBIA HONORS HAITI'S PRESIDENT—DOCTOR OF LAWS CITATION PRAISES HIS LEADERSHIP—FORDHAM TO CONFER DEGREE TODAY

President Paul E. Magloire, of Haiti, received an honorary degree of doctor of laws from Columbia University yesterday. He will receive another LL.D. today from Fordham University.

Columbia trustees, the university council, and members of the faculty attended yesterday's ceremony in Low Memorial Library.

M. Magloire was presented to Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of the university, by Dr. Phil C. Jessup, Hamilton Fish professor of international law and diplomacy.

"We honor today," Dr. Jessup said, "a staunch soldier in man's eternal fight for freedom from fear, from ignorance, and from want, an imaginative dreamer who makes his dreams for Haiti come true."

In his citation Dr. Kirk described the Haitian President as follows:

"Statesman of long vision; by family tradition a military man whose forebears 15 decades ago fought for the independence of their mountain land; today, by mandate of his nation, its civil servant, sworn to lead the Republic in the ways of security, industrial development, and peace; student of the problems of modern society, who calls to his nation's aid the educator, the medical scientist, the engineer, the agriculturalist; with their help making rich natural resources serve the people, building their economy, enriching their storied culture; firm friend of the United States, devoted admirer of the institutions that have helped us serve freedom's cause; courageous and gifted man of government, whose complex challenge is the achievement of a single purpose—the increasing opportunity of all his fellow citizens to grow in the pursuits of learning, in the arts of living, in the rights of freemen."

Midway in the citation the overhead light in the room failed. A photographer held up his battery-powered floodlight.

In its waning illumination, President Magloire replied, speaking softly in French.

He said the courses taught on "the banks of the Hudson" for 200 years had "encouraged development of the whole personality in that atmosphere of true democracy which is, in general, found only in the United States."

#### M. Magloire continued:

"The eclecticism that has produced philosophers like William James, statesmen like Franklin Delano Roosevelt, scientists like Thomas Edison, or outstanding soldiers like Dwight D. Eisenhower . . . is that which guides the average American performing his task in the community, whether he chooses to be a merchant, a businessman, an industrialist, a lawyer, or a bookkeeper, or simply wants to be a man of letters, an artist, or just a citizen conscious of his rights and duties."

The most prolonged cold spell of the winter continued yesterday to dog President Magloire and his party of 12. A scheduled morning trip to the Brookhaven Atomic Laboratories, Brookhaven, L. I., had to be abandoned at about the halfway point. Snowfall made road traveling slow and it became apparent the trip could not be completed in time for the party to keep a luncheon engagement at the United Nations headquarters.

Today's ceremony at Fordham University will be held at 4 p. m. The Haitian party, which arrived in New York Saturday evening, will leave tomorrow at 8 a. m. for Nashville, Tenn.

#### OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN 37 COUNTRIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday I filed with the Appropriations Committee a report on 37 individual countries which I visited last year. I hold in my hand a summary of my report, relating to our diplomatic functions overseas and also to our Information Service. I ask unanimous consent to have the summary printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER

The following observations and/or recommendations constitute a brief summary of comprehensive surveys embodied in the attached 37 reports made by me to the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

#### DIPLOMATIC FUNCTIONS

1. As a result of my inspection of United States diplomatic missions during 1952 and 1953, I submitted to the Committee and to the applicable departments of the executive branch, detailed recommendations as to ways and means of streamlining the operations of these missions. I was gratified to find that in many instances some of my recommendations have borne fruit. I found examples of reduced reporting demands by Washington agencies; these unnecessary demands had constituted one of the principal sources of staff expansion among our foreign missions. While improved, however, the reporting program is still susceptible to further streamlining.

2. There is room for improvement in other areas, also. Our Treasury is still being drained by proponents of the theory that the United States must "keep up with the Joneses" on a worldwide basis—both as to size of staffs, luxury of buildings, et cetera. I recommend that the Department of State immediately implement a policy of frugality and reasonableness in its various operations. Specifically, I suggest the following:

(a) Termination of all programs which would elevate United States missions to higher status simply because other countries maintain senior missions in that area.

(b) Consolidation of all United States activities in one building or, at least, one specific area of a city whenever possible. The practice of scattering staffs throughout a metropolitan area results in higher transportation costs, higher rents, greater expenses for security, and certainly more inconvenience to our personnel.

(c) Termination of all efforts to greatly increase the size of structures occupied by our missions, or to construct new buildings, unless such can be justified on the basis of future, as well as present, requirements. I found examples of proposed building programs which could perhaps be justified on the basis of present staff sizes, but which would be grossly excessive when our extraordinary efforts (information programs, foreign aid, et cetera) are terminated.

(d) The transfer of our primary mission in Morocco from Tangier to Rabat, the capital of that country. Such a move would



make possible reductions in staffs, as well as facilitate information-gathering.

(e) A further reexamination of administrative reporting requirements by our foreign mission. In numerous instances I was told that unrealistic administrative reports (requested in identical form of small, as well as large, posts) mean unnecessary work and, ultimately, larger staffs in the field and in Washington.

(f) Evaluation of present disposition of special allowances. More emphasis should be placed upon individual responsibility, with a reduction in vouchering requirements for authorized purchases, and the elimination of complex forms covering the disposition of other personal allowances. The redtape presently involved in such practices is staggering; it results in much unnecessary work.

(g) Examination of present disparities in pay scales for regular and nonregular Foreign Service officers. I heard some complaint as to the requirement that regular officers must accept favorable retirement credits, rather than the cash pay differential that is presently given nonregulars.

(h) Greater emphasis upon political reporting to be performed by the chief of mission and his immediate deputy, thus making possible reductions in the mushrooming political reporting sections presently assigned to practically all of our missions. Much trivial political reporting would be eliminated if dependence for reporting were placed upon the shoulders of the chief of mission.

(i) A more stringent policy with respect to physical examination of dependents before permitting them to join our Embassy families abroad. I was told of several instances where newly arrived dependents had to be returned to the United States because of physical defects or diseases which a thorough medical examination prior to their departure would have disclosed. Since these trips are costly, and since they are at Government expense, tightened physical requirements should result in financial savings.

(j) Increased recreational advantages in remote posts. Our Department of State employees in many areas of the world are assigned to posts that are practically devoid of companionship and bare of recreational opportunities. The Department of State should provide as much in the way of entertainment as is reasonable under the circumstances.

(k) Government-owned housing, plus Government-owned furniture, should be provided for all State Department employees abroad. Such a course would be much cheaper in the long run. As the situation now stands, the cost to the Government for transporting and storing the furniture of Foreign Service personnel is tremendous; it results in waste of funds. Pending the adoption of the above recommendation, rent allowances provided so as to assure the recipient of sufficient funds to maintain a fitting place of abode, should be spent by the employee without his having to account for each item of expenditure. A statement from the head of the mission to the effect that the allowances had been properly spent should be sufficient. The cumbersome accounting procedure now involved could thus be eliminated.

3. I call the committee's attention to the fact that in many areas of the world no effort is being made to terminate special programs, even though their objectives have been accomplished. On the contrary, there is a definite tendency to perpetuate jobs, increase programs, and maintain spending, without any regard to the impact their continuance may have on our own economy. The western European nations offer ample ground for committee attention in this respect.

4. I wish to state that despite the recommendations of the committee in its report

on the fiscal year 1955 Defense appropriation bill to the effect that the Department of Defense should "effectuate Senator ELLENOR's recommendation with a view to the accomplishment of substantial economies" in the conduct of its military attaché functions (see S. Rept. 1582, 83d Cong., p. 2), there not only has apparently been no effort made to do so, but, on the contrary, I found every indication that there is a continued emphasis on swelling attaché staffs and maintaining the emoluments that accompany these positions overseas. The waste involved in duplication of staffs, vehicles, office space, housing, etc., which the maintenance of separate, distinct offices for each branch requires, is inconceivable. I reaffirm my observation that in many instances the operation of the majority of United States military attaché offices abroad is shockingly extravagant and wasteful. There is no reason for maintaining separate staffs, separate administrative functions, and separate motor pools for each of the three branches of the military service. The Department of Defense should immediately implement the Armed Forces Unification Act in its attaché operations abroad. There should be no difficulty in unifying our attaché services abroad. Further, I recommend that the Department of Defense examine the feasibility of assigning essentially attaché tasks to other military groups in foreign lands—particularly military advisory groups, where such exist—thus eliminating the attaché staffs and their attendant expenses wherever possible.

#### UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

1. I am pleased to report to the committee that, in many instances, my recommendation submitted last year that Embassy and USIA vehicles be pooled has been implemented. Unfortunately, there still remains much room for improvement and I must reemphasize my prior comments.

2. This year, as last, I recommend that USIA again reevaluate its efforts on a country-by-country basis, with a view toward adapting its program to the objectives it seeks to accomplish. I found extensive library programs in operation in nations where the literacy rate touches rockbottom. In many instances these libraries were used almost exclusively by the members of the local legislature as a reference source or by students. In instances such as these the same results could obtain if the books were placed in local libraries.

I also recommend that, in countries where the host country already maintains libraries (such as in England, France, and Italy), we discontinue separate USIA libraries. If need be, we could supplement local libraries with American books.

3. I recommend that the maintenance of large press units in countries whose press is heavily censored be discontinued. I recommend that, instead, a member of the embassy staff act as the official United States spokesman in these countries rather than our maintaining a full-fledged and separate information press unit for that purpose.

4. The exchange program cries for reexamination. While I am in full accord with the tenets of that program, it should not be permitted to devolve into simply a means of spending local currency balances. Merely because funds for exchange student purposes are available is not of itself reason why those funds must be spent. If a need exists, and good can be accomplished by an exchange grant, then, and only then, should the program be effected. I recommend also that the practice of sending nonnatives to the United States under the Fulbright or similar programs be halted. In Tunisia I found that the beneficiary of the only grant available was a Frenchman, not a Tunisian. This practice both violates the spirit of the Exchange Student Act, and leaves the United

States wide open to the oft-used Red propaganda line that our country favors colonialism. It should be the purpose of the United States information effort abroad to counteract the effect of Communist propaganda, not to provide it with fuel to feed its fire.

5. I recommend that USIA take steps to inform its officials abroad of our own fiscal picture with respect to budgetary prospects in this country. Many of our programs have become popular, and the local people should be informed that in order for us to continue them they should induce their respective governments to assist us in defraying the expenses involved.

6. I recommend that USIA bear in mind the fact that one operation, well planned and well executed, is much more effective than several haphazard programs. As I warned last year, too many of our planners seem to believe that we are bound to operate a library, a press program, a film program, an exchange program, as well as others, in each and every nation which is host to the Agency. This has resulted in much wasted effort. The programs maintained in each country should be tailored to local educational levels and needs, and should be administered in accord with the fiscal capabilities of our own country.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

1. Again, this year as last, I discovered that the United States foreign assistance program is misinterpreted in that it does not mean the same thing to all who administer it. Technical assistance, as generally understood by the Congress and the American people is definitely not the same brand of technical assistance I found in operation in many of the areas I visited.

Even though Congress, as the result of criticisms offered by me, took steps last year to separate the funds spent for technical aid from those spent for development purposes the situation has not been remedied. Technical aid is being operated more or less in the nature of an economic aid program. The fact is that the technical assistance program, as I saw it practiced, is a combination of two entirely different concepts of assistance and the sharing of American know-how. The legislative divorce of the 2 phases has been a divorce in name only. Technical aid and economic assistance are combined on the operational level. The result is that we are still supplying not only the technicians but also the funds to construct many of the capital improvements such as schools, hospitals, fertilizer plants, and the like.

I cannot make too emphatic my recommendation that the process of developing these long-dormant nations be a gradual one. We must not seek overnight miracles. In too many instances our technical assistance programs are much too advanced for efficient utilization by native populations. If continued, this practice will ultimately lead to our Nation maintaining at least standby programs in these lands for indeterminate periods. Otherwise our investments will be lost, for there are ample indications that native populations will not be able to pull the whole load alone.

In short, the technical-aid programs should be geared to the mental capacity of those we are trying to assist, and under no condition should we advocate programs beyond the financial means of the countries we attempt to help.

2. I recommend that the Foreign Operations Administration reexamine and reevaluate each and every instance where the United States is contributing to mammoth land reclamation schemes and the like. While these are doubtless worthwhile efforts, they should be made by local governments on their own. Our contributions should be relegated to supplying technical know-how.

3. The Agency should immediately terminate the practice whereby foreign nations match United States contributions for technical assistance projects with local currency funds derived from the sale of United States-donated commodities. I found that local contributions to joint projects were obtained by selling surplus food stuffs which had been donated by the United States. In essence, the local contributions were but token ones; the joint fund was a sham. Practices such as these will ultimately defeat the technical assistance program in the eyes of the Congress.

4. While I am in full accord with efforts to increase available cropland in the arid areas of the world, such undertakings must be sensibly conducted. In one country I found "desert reclamation experts" who had never before seen a desert. Many projects they advocate are not suitable for desert areas. Needless to say, this practice is wasteful.

The scope of this program should also be made to conform to the amount of water available for irrigation and similar purposes. I found attempts being made to put into cultivation more land than potential water supplies will support. In at least one instance we are attempting to increase dairy production by increasing herds, when there is not enough land to raise foodstuffs, much less graze larger numbers of dairy cattle.

5. I believe that the increasing of food supplies in many areas of the world offers the key to victory in the cold war. Efforts in that direction can bear fruit, but they must be practical. Unrealistic programs are wasteful and should be terminated. For example, the scheme to increase fish production by providing more ponds in Egypt does not appear sensible; the money involved could be put to better use in other areas.

6. I recommend immediate termination of such obvious capital-investment schemes as aerial-photography surveys, hospital- and school-building programs, the construction of fertilizer plants, et cetera, which could not be classified as developmental projects as I understand the term. In this connection, I recommend that the Congress reexamine the use to which development-assistance funds are being put. The definition of development assistance should be spelled out in detail.

7. I recommend a reevaluation of the practice of contracting out technical-assistance programs to colleges, universities, and private firms. While in some instances this practice may be beneficial, I found several examples which are extremely costly. Specific reference is made to them in the attached country reports. In this connection I must warn FOA that I saw indications of the rise of fly-by-night institutions which seek to feed upon the contract program. In one country I was told that technical-assistance contracts were held by an institution which bears all the earmarks of the thousands of schools which sprang up overnight as a result of weaknesses in the original GI bill of rights.

8. I recommend a termination of all assistance to countries which do not at least meet us halfway in providing financial contributions to improvement programs. In Lebanon the United States is carrying the total burden because the Lebanese do not wish to operate their Government "in the red"; hence, our planners have magnanimously saddled the debt-ridden United States Government with the full load. No attempt is made to obtain local aid. A similar situation obtains in Jordan. Examples such as these, few though they may be, should shock the conscience of the responsible FOA leaders.

Personnel responsible for the diversion of Indian program funds from their originally understood purposes should be severely chas-

tised by FOA. The situation there was ably summed up in a staff report to the committee in April of 1954:

"On the basis of the FOA program presented for India for fiscal year 1954, Congress approved in July 1953 an appropriation which enabled an allocation of \$89,100,000. According to the presentation to Congress FOA intended to pursue, in general, a further development of programs already in existence from fiscal years 1952 and 1953. On this basis the appropriation was voted and approved. No mention was made during the presentation of a railroad-rehabilitation program. Four months later, without advice to the Appropriations Committee, FOA committed itself to a \$20-million railroad-rehabilitation program (almost a quarter of the total funds available for the year)."

Such action borders on gross misrepresentation and should not be sanctioned, much less repeated.

I recommend that all economic aid to Western European nations be terminated. My experience in Europe convinced me that the economies of the Western European nations allied with us are in sound condition. Industrial production ranges from 130-180 percent of prewar; corresponding increases are found in agricultural production.

I recommend further that we take steps to obtain increased European contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and other Western defense groups on the continent. The economies of these lands are well able to bear an increased portion of their rearmament burden; American arms aid should be reevaluated with a view toward immediately increasing European shares, by further allied budgetary contributions, if necessary.

10. I recommend that the FOA be permitted to expire on June 30 as now provided by law. All remaining counterpart funds should be spent under the direction of those who will administer our technical aid program.

#### GENERAL

This summary would be incomplete without a reference to the explosive situation which obtains with respect to Israeli-Arab relations in the Near East, and the threat it poses to the maintenance of peace and freedom, as well as United States alliances in that vitally-important area. We should immediately press for a solution of the problem posed by the smoldering conflict between the Jews and the Arabs. It should be realized that both parties blame the United States for their present difficulties; it must be understood that both factions have imposing arguments to advance in favor of their respective causes. I shall not offer specific recommendations concerning a settlement of this issue, but I would be derelict in my responsibility as a United States Senator if I did not warn the committee that unless the sources of friction between the Arab world and the infant State of Israel are promptly recognized, and an active effort made to resolve them, world war III may find its origin at this crossroads of Asia. The said plight of Arab refugees is indescribable. It is not possible to settle the problems in that area of the world through financial assistance made available by us to both sides. My findings as to the situation obtaining in the Arab countries I visited, as well as the situation in Israel, are outlined in the applicable country reports.

#### TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD T. MILLER, OF MARYLAND

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who is unavoidably absent from the session at this time, I

read the following remarks prepared by him:

Mr. President, we in Maryland are particularly proud of Representative EDWARD T. MILLER, of Easton, representing the first Maryland district, who was presented a certificate of appreciation Tuesday, February 1, 1955, by Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens in recognition of his 37 years' service to the Army.

Representative MILLER, a member of the Infantry, United States Army Reserve, who served on active duty during both World Wars I and II, is being transferred to the Retired Reserve.

In a letter presented to Mr. MILLER on Tuesday, Secretary Stevens noted the outstanding performance by the Congressman while serving as Chief of the Troop Movements Section in the China theater during World War II.

Mr. President, also on behalf of the junior Senator from Maryland, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of today's RECORD the text of the certificate of appreciation, signed by Secretary Stevens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

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

EDWARD T. MILLER

Throughout his military career of more than 37 years' service in World Wars I and II and in peacetime, Colonel MILLER contributed immeasurably to the accomplishments of the Army's vital mission and to the prestige and effectiveness of the Army's Reserve forces. His long and distinguished record of achievement, both as a combat commander and as an administrator, is indicative of his supreme patriotism, unswerving devotion to duty, and the high order of his professional competence. Colonel MILLER's courage and outstanding leadership, his capability, enthusiasm, initiative, and resourcefulness under all circumstances, have earned him richly deserved honor, and reflect great credit on the service.

#### COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, on the subject of the college housing program under his agency, addressed to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by me, and the letter from Mr. Cole, with attachments to the letter.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Albert M. Cole, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, has advised me that in its Federal program for student and faculty housing HHFA has made commitments to 117 colleges and universities in 36 States for loans out of the Federal debt totaling over \$110,500,000, and that it has approved, pending final commitments, 14 additional loans totaling \$8,800,000.

These colleges and universities are both State and private, and to qualify for the loans under the law they had to show that they were "unable to secure the necessary funds for such housing from other sources



upon terms and conditions generally comparable to terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title" of the National Housing Act.

Under the act, these direct loans from the Federal Government, to be financed out of the Federal debt, bypassing appropriation procedure, may be for terms up to 40 years, putting their maturity virtually at the eve of the 21st century. This Federal housing program appears to be encouraging 40-year debts for both private and State colleges and universities to the Federal Government.

Under the law, colleges and universities, through this Federal housing program, may borrow in the Federal debt up to \$300 million. To date the loans on which final commitments have been made to colleges and universities under this program are shown in the tabular attachment to Mr. Cole's letter of December 23, 1954, to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In addition to the commitments finally made the Housing and Home Finance Agency has approved, pending final commitment, colleges and universities for the loans which are listed in the text of the attachments to Mr. Cole's letter.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,  
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1954.  
Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in further reference to your letter received here on November 1, 1954, requesting certain information in regard to the college housing program.

Enclosed are statements or listings covering the 10 points set forth in your letter.

Please note that two listings have been submitted in order to make a complete reply to item 3. One includes approved loans and sets forth the information requested in points (a) through (h). The second listing covers applications which are pending or which have been disapproved, rescinded, withdrawn, or deferred.

I would have no objection to the first listing being made public; in fact, each of these loans has already been announced by a press release at the time of its approval. I believe you will agree, however, that the second listing should not be made public as the rejection of a loan could conceivably have an adverse effect on the financial standing of an institution of higher learning. This is particularly true as many loans have been rejected due to conditions of eligibility or need which are no reflection on the financial stability of the institutions in question.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,  
Administrator.

ITEM 1. TOTAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO DATE, INDICATING AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR DIRECT LOANS, INSURED LOANS, GUARANTEED LOANS, GRANTS, ETC., AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, ETC., WITH CITATIONS TO AUTHORITY

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, a copy of which is attached, authorized borrowings from the Treasury in the amount of \$300 million.

The Bureau of the Budget has authorized periodic releases within this borrowing authority which now total \$200 million. These releases by fiscal years have been in the following amounts:

Fiscal year:	Amount
1951-52-----	\$40,000,000
1953-----	60,000,000
1954-----	50,000,000
1955-----	50,000,000
Total-----	200,000,000

Administrative expenses in the 1952 and 1953 fiscal years were provided from the consolidated appropriation for such expenses for the Office of the Administrator. The amounts expended for this program from the consolidated appropriation are as follows:

Fiscal year:	Amount
1952-----	\$239,250
1953-----	317,066
Total-----	556,316

No appropriations for the administration of this program were requested for the 1954 and 1955 fiscal years, but authority was granted for the use of program funds for this purpose. The amount expended in fiscal 1954 was \$316,625, and the estimate for the current fiscal year is \$375,000.

Citations of legislative authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1952, Public Law 137, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 268) and Public Law 375, 82d Congress (66 Stat. 101).

Fiscal year 1953, Public Law 455, 82d Congress (66 Stat. 393).

Fiscal year 1954, Public Law 176, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 298, 305).

The cost of inspection and audit of college housing projects by agency personnel is borne by the applicant and is paid from loan funds.

Title IV authorizes only direct loans, and no insured loans, guaranteed loans or grants can be made under the college housing program.

As you will note from the legislation, Congress provided a differential between the interest cost of funds borrowed from the Treasury and the interest rate to be charged on college housing loans which would be sufficient for the program to operate without eventual cost to the Federal Government. At the present time, borrowings from the Treasury are at interest rates averaging 2.22845 percent, while the average rate on commitments to colleges and universities

is 3.0775 percent, thus providing a spread of 0.84905 percent. As disbursements increase, this differential will cover all costs of administration and the establishment of substantial reserves.

ITEM 2. LIMITATIONS ON LOANS, GRANTS, ETC., SUCH AS PERCENTAGE OF COST, VALUE, ETC., IF ANY

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 provides that "A loan may be made in an amount not exceeding the development cost of the housing, as determined by the Administrator \* \* \*". The same legislation defines development cost as "costs of construction of the housing and the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvements to permit its use for housing purposes."

For your information, most college housing projects have been erected on land already owned by the applicant and in only a few instances have the loans included funds to purchase land.

The legislation also provided that not more than 10 percent of the funds shall be made available to educational institutions within any one State.

In all instances the institutions have been required to defray from other than loan funds the cost of moveable furnishings within the project.

ITEM 3. COMPLETE LIST OF INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE APPLIED FOR FUNDS

Showing:

- (a) name of institution;
- (b) its location;
- (c) whether it is State, city, private or other;
- (d) amount applied for in each application;
- (e) status of each application, with reasons for any rejection;
- (f) interest rate on each loan granted;
- (g) duration of each loan granted;
- (h) amount of interest paid on each loan, and amount of principal repaid.

Attached are two listings, one including all approved loans and covering points (a) through (h), and one including all loans which have been withdrawn, disapproved or deferred and loans which are presently under review in the regional or central offices.<sup>1</sup> The latter listing, of course, covers only points (a) through (e).

Rescinded projects, i. e., those which were cancelled after approval of the loan agreement between both the applicant and the Government are carried on both lists because advances were made in some instances from which interest income was derived.

The following applications have been approved for college housing loans but loan agreements have not yet been executed by the applicant:

<sup>1</sup> Attachment 2, listing disapproved loans, omitted pursuant to paragraph 4 of covering letter.

Project number	Institution and location	Type	Amount	Interest rate	Project number	Institution and location	Type	Amount	Interest rate
Fla. 8-CH-10-----	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	State-----	\$600,000	Percent 3 3/4	N. Y. 30-CH-16----	Yeshiva University, New York, N. Y.	Private-----	\$1,225,000	Percent 3 3/4
Ill. 11-CH-7-----	Lewis College of Science and Technology, Lockport, Ill.	Private-----	310,000	3 3/4	Ohio 33-CH-15----	Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio	-----do-----	700,000	3 3/4
Ill. 11-CH-17-----	Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.	-----do-----	680,000	3 3/4	R. I. 37-CH-1-----	University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.	State-----	950,000	3 3/4
Kans. 14-CH-2-----	Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.	State-----	1,000,000	3 3/4	Tex. 41-CH-23-----	Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville, Tex.	-----do-----	750,000	3 3/4
Md. 18-CH-5-----	Washington College, Chestertown, Md.	Private-----	380,000	3 3/4	Tex. 41-CH-24-----	Huston-Tillotson College, Austin, Tex.	Private-----	450,000	3 3/4
Mo. 23-CH-5-----	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.	-----do-----	875,000	3 3/4	W. Va. 46-CH-4-----	Potomac State College of West Virginia University, Keyser, W. Va.	State-----	370,000	3 3/4
N. Y. 30-CH-14----	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.	Private and State-----	370,000	3 3/4					
N. Y. 30-CH-15----	Cazenovia Junior College, Cazenovia, N. Y.	Private-----	140,000	3 3/4					

The above listing is current through Oct. 26, 1954.

## Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954

Project No.	Institution and location	Type	Loan commitments	Canceled commitments	Construction advances			Advance interest repayments
					Disbursements	Repayments	Balance	
ALABAMA								
Ala. 1-CH-1	Marion Institute, Marion, Ala.	Private	\$150,000					
Ala. 1-CH-5	Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Ala.	do	525,000 75,000		\$300,000.00	\$300,000.00		\$3,754.11
ARIZONA								
Ariz. 2-CH-1	Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz.	do	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		2,280.17
Ariz. 2-CH-2	University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.	do	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		2,280.18
ARKANSAS								
Ark. 3-CH-8	Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Ark.	do	375,000		175,000.00	175,000.00		856.65
Ark. 3-CH-1	Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia, Ark.	do	143,000	\$68,000	36,000.00	36,000.00		475.00
Ark. 3-CH-10	Hendrix College, Conway, Ark.	do	350,000					
Ark. 3-CH-6	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.	State	352,000	352,000	88,000.00	88,000.00		1,092.47
Ark. 3-CH-7	Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Ark.	do	460,000	460,000	115,000.00	115,000.00		876.28
Ark. 3-CH-3	State Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Ark.	do	581,000		243,000.00	243,000.00		2,455.99
CALIFORNIA								
Calif. 4-CH-1	Menlo College, Atherton, Calif.	Private	50,000 470,000		390,000.00	390,000.00		7,731.10
Calif. 4-CH-2	University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.	do	1,500,000		750,000.00		\$750,000	
Calif. 4-CH-4	Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.	do	350,000					
COLORADO								
Colo. 5-CH-3	University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.	State	350,000		85,000.00	85,000.00		7,395.85
Colo. 5-CH-6	do	do	2,200,000		800,000.00	800,000.00		
Colo. 5-CH-5	Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.	Private	600,000		150,000.00	150,000.00		1,385.42
Colo. 5-CH-10	do	do	800,000					
Colo. 5-CH-4	Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Fort Collins, Colo.	State	1,320,000		200,000.00	200,000.00		2,193.59
Colo. 5-CH-7	do	do	1,320,000					
Colo. 5-CH-1	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.	do	200,000					
Colo. 5-CH-9	Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo.	do	575,000	181,000	110,000.00	110,000.00		1,983.01
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
D. C. 49-CH-2	American University, Washington, D. C.	Private	400,000					
D. C. 49-CH-1	Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.	do	1,188,000					
FLORIDA								
Fla. 8-CH-3	University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	do	1,508,000		750,000.00	750,000.00		6,463.25
Fla. 8-CH-6	John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla.	do	600,000		450,000.00		450,000	
Fla. 8-CH-11	do	do	420,000					
Fla. 8-CH-1	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	State	1,998,000	200,000	400,000.00	400,000.00		5,364.40
Fla. 8-CH-4	do	do	1,000,000					
Fla. 8-CH-2	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, Tallahassee, Fla.	do	900,000		225,000.00	225,000.00		2,059.58
GEORGIA								
Ga. 9-CH-1	Emory University, Emory University, Ga.	Private	650,000		162,500.00	162,500.00		2,036.90
Ga. 9-CH-3	do	do	990,000		494,000.00	494,000.00		2,362.80
IDAHO								
Idaho 10-CH-2	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	State	1,150,000		500,000.00		500,000	
Idaho 10-CH-1	Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho	do	425,000					
ILLINOIS								
Ill. 11-CH-5	Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.	do	1,100,000		275,000.00	275,000.00		1,859.60
Ill. 11-CH-2	Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.	Private	1,045,000					
Ill. 11-CH-4	do	do	2,280,000					
Ill. 11-CH-11	Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.	do	1,200,000					
Ill. 11-CH-1	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.	do	426,000		85,000.00	85,000.00		659.62
Ill. 11-CH-6	Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.	do	200,000					
Ill. 11-CH-8	North Central College, Naperville, Ill.	do	350,000					
INDIANA								
Ind. 12-CH-3	Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson, Ind.	do	550,000					
Ind. 12-CH-4	Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.	State	2,024,000					
Ind. 12-CH-8	St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind.	Private	460,000					
Ind. 12-CH-2	Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.	do	890,000					
Ind. 12-CH-7	do	do	70,000					
IOWA								
Iowa 13-CH-6	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa	do	504,000					
Iowa 13-CH-1	Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa	do	1,000,000		750,000.00	750,000.00		21,058.23
Iowa 13-CH-5	Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa	do	175,000					
Iowa 13-CH-7	Waldorf Lutheran College, Forest City, Iowa	do	150,000					
Iowa 13-CH-4	Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa	do	225,000		75,000.00	75,000.00		346.36
Iowa 13-CH-3	Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa	do	330,000		247,500.00	247,500.00		6,123.08
Iowa 13-CH-2	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa	do	475,000		403,750.00	403,750.00		5,353.62
KANSAS								
Kans. 14-CH-4	Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.	do	240,000					
Kans. 14-CH-1	Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans.	City	741,000		185,250.00	185,250.00		1,577.16
KENTUCKY								
Ky. 15-CH-2	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	State	1,400,000					
Ky. 15-CH-4	do	do	722,000	447,000				
Ky. 15-CH-5	Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Ky.	Private	350,000					



## Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Type	Loan commitments	Canceled commitments	Construction advances			Advance interest repayments
					Disbursements	Repayments	Balance	
LOUISIANA								
La. 16-CH-2.....	Tulane University, New Orleans, La.....	do.....	\$1,755,000					
La. 16-CH-3.....	Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La.....	do.....	175,000		\$44,000.00	\$44,000.00		\$380.99
MARYLAND								
Md. 18-CH-1.....	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.....	do.....	1,632,000		816,000.00	816,000.00		8,209.63
Md. 18-CH-4.....	University of Maryland, College Park, Md.....	State.....	2,350,000		1,762,000.00		\$1,762,000	
MASSACHUSETTS								
Mass. 19-CH-2.....	Tufts College, Medford, Mass.....	Private.....	1,065,000					
Mass. 19-CH-3.....	Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.....	do.....	620,000		155,000.00		155,000	
MICHIGAN								
Mich. 20-CH-2.....	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.....	do.....	900,000					
MINNESOTA								
Minn. 21-CH-1.....	Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.....	do.....	600,000					
MISSOURI								
Mo. 23-CH-1.....	University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo.....	do.....	1,515,000	\$515,000				
Mo. 23-CH-2.....	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.....	do.....	875,000	163,000	218,750.00	218,750.00		1,153.68
Mo. 23-CH-3.....	Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Mo.....	State.....	900,000					
MONTANA								
Mont. 24-CH-2.....	Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.....	State.....	750,000	750,000	562,250.00	562,250.00		11,818.11
Mont. 24-CH-1.....	Montana State University, Missoula, Mont.....	do.....	375,000	375,000				
Mont. 24-CH-3.....	do.....	do.....	750,000		375,000.00	375,000.00		4,351.03
			500,000	169,000	82,750.00	82,750.00		651.80
NEBRASKA								
Neb. 25-CH-4.....	Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr.....	Private.....	250,000					
NEW YORK								
N. Y. 30-CH-8.....	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.....	do.....	550,000		294,000.00		294,000	
N. Y. 30-CH-11.....	Briarcliff Junior College, Briarcliff Manor, N. Y.....	do.....	40,000					
N. Y. 30-CH-3.....	St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.....	do.....	340,000					
N. Y. 30-CH-10.....	New York University, New York, N. Y.....	do.....	800,000		397,000.00	397,000.00		3,106.24
N. Y. 30-CH-5.....	Thomas S. Clarkson Memorial College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y.....	do.....	900,000					
			1,150,000		862,000.00		862,000	
N. Y. 30-CH-7.....	St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.....	do.....	1,725,000	475,000				
N. Y. 30-CH-2.....	Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.....	do.....	2,750,000	200,000	937,000.00	937,000.00		10,542.16
N. Y. 30-CH-12.....	do.....	do.....	2,200,000					
N. Y. 30-CH-1.....	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y.....	do.....	2,880,000		720,000.00	720,000.00		8,733.70
NORTH CAROLINA								
N. C. 31-CH-3.....	Campbell College, Buie's Creek, N. C.....	do.....	200,000		150,000.00		150,000	
OHIO								
Ohio 33-CH-18.....	Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.....	do.....	450,000					
Ohio 33-CH-8.....	Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.....	do.....	600,000					
Ohio 33-CH-19.....	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio.....	do.....	750,000					
Ohio 33-CH-5.....	University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio.....	do.....	1,320,000					
Ohio 33-CH-11.....	Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.....	do.....	485,000					
Ohio 33-CH-13.....	Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio.....	do.....	250,000					
Ohio 33-CH-17.....	Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.....	do.....	240,000		60,000.00		60,000	
Ohio 33-CH-6.....	Antioch College of Yellow Springs, Yellow Springs, Ohio.....	do.....	430,000					
Ohio 33-CH-20.....	Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.....	do.....	1,160,000					
OREGON								
Oreg. 35-CH-3.....	Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.....	do.....	465,000		348,750.00	348,750.00		4,765.27
Oreg. 35-CH-4.....	Reed Institute, Portland, Oreg.....	do.....	230,000		172,500.00		172,500	
Oreg. 35-CH-5.....	do.....	do.....	390,000					
PENNSYLVANIA								
Pa. 36-CH-10.....	Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.....	do.....	400,000		300,000.00		300,000	
Pa. 36-CH-8.....	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.....	do.....	355,000					
Pa. 36-CH-17.....	St. Francis College of Loretto, Loretto, Pa.....	do.....	457,000					
Pa. 36-CH-1.....	LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.....	do.....	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		3,277.40
Pa. 36-CH-4.....	Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.....	do.....	600,000					
Pa. 36-CH-7.....	Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.....	do.....	1,000,000	100,000				
Pa. 36-CH-6.....	Augustinian College of Villanova, Villanova, Pa.....	do.....	1,218,000		912,000.00		912,000	
SOUTH CAROLINA								
S. C. 38-CH-2.....	Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C.....	State.....	1,000,000		250,000.00	250,000.00		1,406.04
SOUTH DAKOTA								
S. D. 39-CH-2.....	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.....	Private.....	675,000					
TEXAS								
Tex. 41-CH-29.....	Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex.....	do.....	1,575,000					
Tex. 41-CH-14.....	Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex.....	do.....	926,000		528,000.00	528,000.00		4,967.37
			386,000					
			3,000,000	3,000,000	525,000.00	525,000.00		5,219.16
Tex. 41-CH-12.....	University of Texas, Austin, Tex.....	State.....	402,000	402,000				
Tex. 41-CH-15.....	Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Tex.....	do.....	400,000		100,000.00	100,000.00		1,039.07
Tex. 41-CH-20.....	do.....	do.....	750,000					
Tex. 41-CH-5.....	Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex.....	Private.....	900,000		225,000.00		225,000	
Tex. 41-CH-11.....	University of Texas—Medical, Galveston, Tex.....	State.....	1,167,000		725,000.00		725,000	

## Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Type	Loan commitments	Canceled commitments	Construction advances			Advance interest repayments
					Disbursements	Repayments	Balance	
TEXAS—CON.								
Tex. 41-CH-2.....	St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio, Tex.....	Private.....	{ \$400,000 480,000		\$150,000.00 175,000.00	\$150,000.00 175,000.00		\$1,227.33 2,123.48
Tex. 41-CH-8.....	Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex.....	do.....	220,000					
Tex. 41-CH-4.....	Baylor University, Waco, Tex.....	do.....	1,250,000		312,500.00	312,500.00		3,289.36
Tex. 41-CH-6.....	do.....	do.....	700,000		175,000.00	175,000.00		284.67
UTAH								
Utah 42-CH-2.....	Branch Agricultural College of Utah, Cedar City, Utah.....	State.....	250,000		125,000.00	125,000.00		1,707.54
Utah 42-CH-3.....	Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.....	do.....	600,000					
Utah 42-CH-1.....	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.....	do.....	1,000,000					
VERMONT								
Vt. 43-CH-1.....	Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.....	Private.....	340,000		135,000.00	135,000.00		1,397.98
VIRGINIA								
Va. 44-CH-1.....	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.....	do.....	775,000		386,000.00	386,000.00		5,234.79
WASHINGTON								
Wash. 45-CH-12.....	Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Wash.....	do.....	{ 370,000 475,000		475,000.00		\$475,000	
Wash. 45-CH-9.....	Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.....	do.....	{ 425,000 100,000		275,000.00		275,000	
Wash. 45-CH-8.....	Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash.....	do.....	400,000		300,000.00	300,000.00		6,102.28
Wash. 45-CH-4.....	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash.....	do.....	1,320,000		990,000.00	990,000.00		25,994.61
Wash. 45-CH-10.....	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash.....	Private.....	1,190,000					
Wash. 45-CH-1.....	University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.....	State.....	1,500,000		1,125,000.00	1,125,000.00		19,268.83
Wash. 45-CH-7.....	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.....	Private.....	{ 800,000 85,000		598,738.66	598,738.66		9,257.62
Wash. 45-CH-6.....	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash.....	do.....	385,000		288,750.00	288,750.00		5,167.20
Wash. 45-CH-2.....	College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash.....	do.....	300,000		150,000.00	150,000.00		1,310.54
WEST VIRGINIA								
W. Va. 46-CH-3.....	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.....	do.....	350,000					
W. Va. 46-CH-2.....	Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va.....	do.....	300,000					
WISCONSIN								
Wis. 47-CH-1.....	Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.....	do.....	1,000,000		250,000.00	250,000.00		3,183.22
Wis. 47-CH-2.....	do.....	do.....	1,180,000					
Wis. 47-CH-3.....	St. Norbert College, West DePere, Wis.....	do.....	600,000					
Wis. 47-CH-8.....	Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.....	do.....	525,000					
Total.....			110,560,000	\$7,857,000	26,777,988.66	18,710,488.66	8,067,500	245,195.52

Project No.	Institution and location	Bond purchases			Undisbursed commitments	Interest rate	Duration of loans	Bond interest repayments
		Disbursements	Repayments	Balance				
ALABAMA								
Ala. 1-CH-1.....	Marion Institute, Marion, Ala.....	\$150,000		\$150,000		2.75	1992	\$5,740.62
Ala. 1-CH-5.....	Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Ala.....	525,000		525,000		3.125	1993	
		75,000		75,000		3.5	1993	
ARIZONA								
Ariz. 2-CH-1.....	Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz.....	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	
Ariz. 2-CH-2.....	University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.....	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	
ARKANSAS								
Ark. 3-CH-8.....	Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia, Ark.....	350,000		350,000	\$25,000	3.01	1994	
Ark. 3-CH-1.....	Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia, Ark.....	75,000		75,000		3.01	1993	1,260.44
Ark. 3-CH-10.....	Hendrix College, Conway, Ark.....				350,000	3.25	1995	
Ark. 3-CH-6.....	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.....					3.125	1993	
Ark. 3-CH-7.....	Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Ark.....					3.125	1993	
Ark. 3-CH-3.....	State Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College, Pine Bluff, Ark.....	581,000		581,000		3.01	1993	8,876.32
CALIFORNIA								
Calif. 4-CH-1.....	Menlo College, Atherton, Calif.....	50,000		50,000		3.5	1993	
Calif. 4-CH-2.....	University of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.....	470,000		470,000		3.01	1993	
Calif. 4-CH-4.....	Whittier College, Whittier, Calif.....				750,000	3.01	1993	
					350,000	3.25	1994	
COLORADO								
Colo. 5-CH-3.....	University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.....	350,000		350,000		2.75	1992	4,438.21
Colo. 5-CH-6.....	do.....	2,000,000		2,000,000	200,000	3.01	1993	25,392.52
Colo. 5-CH-5.....	Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.....	600,000	\$24,000	576,000		3.01	1993	7,749.08
Colo. 5-CH-10.....	do.....				800,000	3.25	1995	
Colo. 5-CH-4.....	Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Fort Collins, Colo.....	1,320,000		1,320,000		3.01	1992	18,416.18
Colo. 5-CH-7.....	do.....				1,320,000	3.125	1993	
Colo. 5-CH-1.....	Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colo.....	200,000		200,000		3.01	1993	2,943.11
Colo. 5-CH-9.....	Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison, Colo.....	394,000		394,000		3.5	1993	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA								
D. C. 49-CH-2.....	American University, Washington, D. C.....	400,000		400,000		3.5	1993	
D. C. 49-CH-1.....	Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.....				1,188,000	3.125	1993	



## Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Bond purchases			Undisbursed commitments	Interest rate	Duration of loans	Bond interest repayments
		Disbursements	Repayments	Balance				
FLORIDA								
Fla. 8-CH-3	University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.	\$1,508,000		\$1,508,000		3.01	1993	
Fla. 8-CH-6	John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla.				\$150,000	3.5	1994	
Fla. 8-CH-11	do				420,000	3.25	1995	
Fla. 8-CH-1	University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	1,798,000		1,798,000		2.75	1992	\$60,586.32
Fla. 8-CH-4	do	550,000		550,000	450,000	3.01	1994	1,128.75
Fla. 8-CH-2	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, Tallahassee, Fla.	800,000		800,000	100,000	3.01	1992	6,103.61
GEORGIA								
Ga. 9-CH-1	Emory University, Emory University, Ga.	650,000		650,000		3.01	1992	5,978.19
Ga. 9-CH-3	do	990,000		990,000		3.01	1993	
IDAHO								
Idaho 10-CH-2	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho				650,000	3.01	1993	
Idaho 10-CH-1	Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho				425,000	3.01	1983	
ILLINOIS								
Ill. 11-CH-5	Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.	1,100,000	\$6,000	1,094,000		3.01	1992	58,034.48
Ill. 11-CH-2	Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.	1,045,000		1,045,000		2.75	1992	34,358.58
Ill. 11-CH-4	do	600,000		600,000	1,680,000	3.125	1993	7,809.50
Ill. 11-CH-11	Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.	600,000		600,000	600,000	3.125	1993	1,404.77
Ill. 11-CH-1	Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.	425,000	6,000	420,000		2.75	1991	25,903.19
Ill. 11-CH-6	Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.	200,000		200,000		3.01	1993	861.15
Ill. 11-CH-8	North Central College, Naperville, Ill.	350,000		350,000		3.01	1993	731.60
INDIANA								
Ind. 12-CH-3	Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson, Ind.	539,000		539,000	11,000	3.01	1991	8,401.91
Ind. 12-CH-4	Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.				2,024,000	3.125	1993	
Ind. 12-CH-8	St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind.				460,000	3.5	1994	
Ind. 12-CH-2	Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.	890,000		890,000		3.01	1992	10,236.27
Ind. 12-CH-7	do				700,000	3.25	1994	
IOWA								
Iowa 13-CH-6	Luther College, Decorah, Iowa				504,000	3.5	1994	
Iowa 13-CH-1	Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa	1,000,000		1,000,000		2.75	1992	9,930.56
Iowa 13-CH-5	Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa				175,000	3.25	1994	
Iowa 13-CH-7	Waldorf Lutheran College, Forest City, Iowa				150,000	3.5	1994	
Iowa 13-CH-4	Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa	225,000		225,000		3.01	1993	
Iowa 13-CH-3	Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa	330,000		330,000		3.01	1993	3,890.43
Iowa 13-CH-2	Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa	475,000	16,000	459,000		2.75	1992	10,776.56
KANSAS								
Kans. 14-CH-4	Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.				240,000	3.5	1993	
Kans. 14-CH-1	Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans.	741,000		741,000		2.75	1992	26,610.53
KENTUCKY								
Ky. 15-CH-2	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	900,000		900,000	500,000	3.01	1992	5,585.22
Ky. 15-CH-4	do				275,000	3.01	1994	
Ky. 15-CH-5	Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro, Ky.				350,000	3.5	1994	
LOUISIANA								
La. 16-CH-2	Tulane University, New Orleans, La.	1,755,000		1,755,000		3.01	1992	17,056.67
La. 16-CH-3	Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport, La.	175,000		175,000		3.01	1993	3,233.66
MARYLAND								
Md. 18-CH-1	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.	1,632,000		1,632,000		3.01	1993	21,286.72
Md. 18-CH-4	University of Maryland, College Park, Md.				588,000	3.125	1983	
MASSACHUSETTS								
Mass. 19-CH-2	Tufts College, Medford, Mass.	1,065,000		1,065,000		2.75	1992	32,785.73
Mass. 19-CH-3	Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.				465,000	3.25	1994	
MICHIGAN								
Mich. 20-CH-2	University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.	225,000		225,000	675,000	3.125	1993	
MINNESOTA								
Minn. 21-CH-1	Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.				600,000	3.25	1994	
MISSOURI								
Mo. 23-CH-1	University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo.				1,000,000	3.01	1994	
Mo. 23-CH-2	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.	712,000	13,000	699,000		2.75	1991	27,277.71
Mo. 23-CH-3	Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Mo.	900,000		900,000		2.75	1972	25,308.09
MONTANA								
Mont. 24-CH-2	Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.					2.75	1993	
Mont. 24-CH-1	Montana State University, Missoula, Mont.	750,000	21,000	729,000		2.75	1992	35,204.82
Mont. 24-CH-3	do	331,000		331,000		3.125	1993	
NEBRASKA								
Neb. 25-CH-4	Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr.				250,000	3.5	1994	
NEW YORK								
N. Y. 30-CH-8	Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y.				256,000	3.01	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-11	Briarcliff Junior College, Briarcliff Manor, N. Y.				40,000	3.5	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-3	St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y.				340,000	3.5	1994	
N. Y. 30-CH-10	New York University, New York, N. Y.	800,000		800,000		3.01	1992	3,010.00
N. Y. 30-CH-5	Thomas S. Clarkson Memorial College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y.				900,000	3.5	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-1	do				288,000	3.01	1993	

## Housing loans to educational institutions, status of loans, 1951 through Oct. 31, 1954—Continued

Project No.	Institution and location	Bond purchases			Undis- bursed commit- ments	Interest rate	Duration of loans	Bond interest repayments
		Disburse- ments	Repay- ments	Balance				
NEW YORK—CON.								
N. Y. 30-CH-7	St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.				\$1,250,000	3.125	1993	
N. Y. 30-CH-2	Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.	\$2,550,000		\$2,550,000		3.00	1992	\$41,800.75
N. Y. 30-CH-12	do				2,200,000	3.25	1994	
N. Y. 30-CH-1	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y.	2,880,000		2,880,000		2.75	1992	67,087.40
NORTH CAROLINA								
N. C. 31-CH-3	Campbell College, Buile's Creek, N. C.				50,000	3.5	1974	
OHIO								
Ohio 33-CH-18	Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio				450,000	3.25	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-8	Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio	200,000		200,000	400,000	3.01	1993	719.06
Ohio 33-CH-19	John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio				750,000	3.5	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-5	University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio	1,147,000		1,147,000	173,000	3.01	1992	29,595.83
Ohio 33-CH-11	Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio	485,000		485,000		3.5	1993	
Ohio 33-CH-13	Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio				250,000	3.25	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-17	Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio				180,000	3.5	1994	
Ohio 33-CH-6	Antioch College of Yellow Springs, Yellow Springs, Ohio				430,000	3.125	1993	
Ohio 33-CH-20	Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio				1,160,000	3.25	1994	
OREGON								
Oreg. 35-CH-3	Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oreg.	465,000		465,000		3.01	1993	
Oreg. 35-CH-4	Reed Institute, Portland, Oreg.				57,500	3.01	1993	
Oreg. 35-CH-5	do				390,000	3.25	1994	
PENNSYLVANIA								
Pa. 36-CH-10	Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.				100,000	3.5	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-8	Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.				355,000	3.125	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-17	St. Francis College of Loretto, Loretto, Pa.				457,000	3.5	1994	
Pa. 36-CH-1	LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.	400,000		400,000		2.75	1977	16,133.33
Pa. 36-CH-4	Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia, Pa.				600,000	3.5	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-7	Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa.				900,000	3.125	1993	
Pa. 36-CH-6	Augustinian College of Villanova, Villanova, Pa.				306,000	3.01	1993	
SOUTH CAROLINA								
S. C. 38-CH-2	Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C.	1,000,000		1,000,000		3.01	1992	25,668.61
SOUTH DAKOTA								
S. D. 39-CH-2	Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.				675,000	3.5	1994	
TEXAS								
Tex. 41-CH-29	Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Tex.	{ 926,000 386,000		{ 926,000 386,000	1,575,000	3.25 3.01 3.125	1995 1993 1993	 16,646.39 7,207.46
Tex. 41-CH-14	Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex.					3.01	1993	
Tex. 41-CH-12	University of Texas, Austin, Tex.					3.125	1993	
Tex. 41-CH-15	Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont, Tex.	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	4,824.37
Tex. 41-CH-20	do				750,000	3.5	1995	
Tex. 41-CH-5	Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex.				675,000	3.5	1994	
Tex. 41-CH-11	University of Texas—Medical, Galveston, Tex.				442,000	3.01	1993	
Tex. 41-CH-2	St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio, Tex.	400,000	\$2,000	398,000		2.75	1992	17,358.62
		480,000		480,000		3.01	1993	4,795.93
Tex. 41-CH-8	Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex.	195,000		195,000	25,000	3.125	1993	2,311.45
Tex. 41-CH-4	Baylor University, Waco, Tex.	1,250,000		1,250,000		3.01	1993	20,146.09
Tex. 41-CH-6	do	700,000		700,000		3.125	1993	10,058.18
UTAH								
Utah 42-CH-2	Branch Agricultural College of Utah, Cedar City, Utah	250,000		250,000		3.01	1992	1,191.46
Utah 42-CH-3	Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah				600,000	3.5	1993	
Utah 42-CH-1	University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah				1,000,000	2.75	1994	
VERMONT								
Vt. 43-CH-1	Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.	340,000	30,000	310,000		2.75	1976	20,524.18
VIRGINIA								
Va. 44-CH-1	Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.	775,000	150,000	625,000		2.75	1973	23,369.27
WASHINGTON								
Wash. 45-CH-12	Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham, Wash.	{		{	370,000	3.5 3.01	1994 1993	
Wash. 45-CH-9	Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.				150,000	3.125	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-8	Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Wash.				100,000	3.5	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-4	Seattle University, Seattle, Wash.	400,000		400,000		3.01	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-10	do	1,320,000		1,320,000		3.01	1992	4,304.30
Wash. 45-CH-1	University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.	1,500,000		1,477,000	1,190,000	3.25	1994	
Wash. 45-CH-7	Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.	800,000	23,000	800,000		2.75	1991	27,183.75
		85,000		85,000		3.01	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-6	Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash.	385,000		385,000		3.5	1993	
Wash. 45-CH-2	College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Wash.	300,000		300,000		3.01	1992	6,502.44
WEST VIRGINIA								
W. Va. 46-CH-3	Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va.				350,000	3.5	1994	
W. Va. 46-CH-2	Morris Harvey College, Charleston, W. Va.				300,000	3.5	1994	
WISCONSIN								
Wis. 47-CH-1	Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.	1,000,000	15,000	985,000		2.75	1991	47,995.14
Wis. 47-CH-2	do				1,180,000	3.125	1993	
Wis. 47-CH-3	St. Norbert College, West DePere, Wis.				600,000	3.5	1994	
Wis. 47-CH-8	Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis.				525,000	3.25	1994	
	Total	53,421,000	306,000	53,115,000	41,214,500			913,735.51



**ITEM 4. STATEMENT OF HHFA PREREQUISITES FOR GRANTING LOANS, SUCH AS LEGAL AUTHORIZATION AND APPROVAL BY STATE AND CITY AUTHORITIES FOR STATE AND CITY INSTITUTIONS, ETC.**

An educational institution making application for a college housing loan is required to evidence that (1) it is either a public corporate body or a nonprofit private corporation legally capable of constructing, financing, and maintaining and operating the desired student or faculty housing for which the need is certified by the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education; (2) the approvals as to local zoning, building codes, and land uses, or specific covenants regarding such housing project sites, are secured and complied with; (3) the education institution owns fee-simple title in the land comprising such sites; and (4) recognized bond counsel render and furnish to the HHFA an approving opinion as to the validity and legally binding character of the bonds to be delivered under the terms of the loan.

Municipal and State institutions must secure the approval of municipal and State authorities if these are required under their charter.

**ITEM 5. STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED WITH LOANS UNDER THIS PROGRAM MAY BE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ASSISTANCE UNDER ONE OR MORE OTHER PROGRAMS UNDER GENERAL JURISDICTION OF THE HHFA—FOR EXAMPLE, CAN COLLEGE HOUSING PROJECTS BE ERECTED IN A SLUM-CLEARANCE AREA, IN COMBINATION WITH ANY OTHER HOUSING PROGRAM?—IF SO, INDICATE POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS AND LIST ALL ACTUAL COMBINATION PROJECTS APPROVED TO DATE AND ALL OTHER APPLICATIONS INVOLVING COMBINATION OF PROGRAMS**

Loans for college housing are not made in conjunction with assistance from other programs under the general jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

An educational institution requesting a loan is usually one of long standing and is located on a well-established campus with its improvements developed over a long period of time. Consequently, the projects constructed with loans under this program are within a highly specialized field of planning and are not combined with community-wide or overall regional planning. It is conceivable that where a college or university is located in a congested area or section of a large city its housing construction program could be coordinated with local community planning. So far there have been no situations presented which might feasibly be combined with any other housing program, including the overall slum-clearance program.

In reply to your specific question, "Can college housing projects be erected in a slum-clearance area?" a university can purchase land in such an area and undertake to erect a dormitory there with a Federal or private loan. Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago, Ill., has been purchasing and clearing land in the neighborhood of its campus and has erected three buildings with the assistance of college housing loans. Johns Hopkins University Medical School has a pending application in which it proposes to erect a building on a site adjacent to the University Hospital, which would be purchased from the city of Baltimore at a cost of \$100,000. Title to such land has been or is being acquired by the city by purchase or condemnation proceedings in connection with the redevelopment of this area and adjacent blocks by the Baltimore Redevelopment Commission. The use of this site for university purposes has been contemplated since the area was declared a redevelopment area in 1949.

These two projects, which are in no sense combination projects, are the only projects approved or pending which involve the con-

struction of college housing in slum-clearance areas.

**ITEM 6. A STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER IT IS POSSIBLE TO MORTGAGE OUT OR BORROW IN EXCESS OF COST UNDER THIS PROGRAM; AND IF SO WHAT PRECAUTIONS HHFA HAS TAKEN AGAINST THESE PRACTICES**

There is no possibility of mortgaging out or borrowing in excess of cost under this program because (1) the loans are direct; (2) the proceeds of the loan are required to be deposited as trust funds in construction accounts; (3) the contract is awarded on the basis of competitive advertised bid; (4) the loan agreement specifically limits the amount of the loan to the costs of construction; and (5) a Government inspection and audit are made on each project with expense thereof paid by the borrower. Such protective provisions are included in all loan agreements under the program.

In the event of an overrun following competitive bidding, the applicant is obligated to furnish the additional funds. In some instances it has been possible to bring the project costs within the loan amount by the use of deductive alternates. In another instance it was necessary to redesign the facility to keep within the loan amount. In a few instances it has been necessary to increase the loan amount because of overrun in cost after competitive bids had been taken.

**ITEM 7. A STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER HHFA CONTROLS TO ANY DEGREE THE RENTALS OR FEES CHARGED FOR OCCUPANCY OR OTHERWISE OF THESE PROJECTS**

It is clear that the intent of the legislation was to make it possible for colleges and universities to construct housing for their students without excessive increases in their dormitory rates. Therefore, the Agency has not undertaken to dictate the rentals to be charged in the facilities constructed under these loans. In making its application, the applicant submits its plan for the operation of the facility, including proposed rentals to be charged the students. It is generally the rate which already obtains in other dormitories operated on its campus.

A financial analysis is made of the application in which the net income to be derived from the operation of the facility is one of the most important considerations. It is frequently necessary for the applicant to make some adjustments in rentals before an economically sound project can be worked out.

A condition which is a part of the loan agreement between the Government and the applicant states:

"The borrower shall establish and maintain, throughout the life of the loan hereunder, such parietal rules, rental rates, and charges for the occupancy and use of the project as are necessary (1) to assure maximum occupancy and use of the project, (2) to provide debt service on the bonds, and (3) to provide a debt service reserve required under condition (a) above."

As holder of the bonds delivered under the program, the Government has the legal right to enforce such provision by court action if necessary.

Many loans have been rejected because they were not economically feasible, i. e., the projects could not be amortized from the rentals proposed, an increase in rentals was not believed possible, and other sources of funds to supplement the net income from rentals were not available.

**ITEM 8. A LIST (IDENTIFIED) OF ANY PROJECTS IN THIS PROGRAM WHICH WE HAVE DEFAULTED**

Of the 144 loans approved under this program from its inception to date there have been no defaults in either principal or interest.

The historical record of dormitory bond financing is excellent. During the depression of the 1930's there were some 440 dormi-

tory issues extant of which 10 went into temporary default, all of which were later refunded without loss of principal. The cause of default in nearly every case was the cumulative effect of the depression, resulting in small enrollments and competition from residents of the community who, under extremely depressed economic conditions, offered rooms at substantially below the moderate dormitory rates.

A number of safeguards against default are implicit in or have been incorporated into the program and are listed below:

1. Estimated net income from the dormitory is generally depreciated by a 10-percent vacancy factor.

2. Revenue type issues have a coverage over debt service of at least 1.35 times debt service.

3. Reserves are established to cover 2 years' debt service.

4. Loans to private institutions are secured by the full faith and credit of the institution, a mortgage on the project and its site, and a pledge of specific income from the project or otherwise sufficient to assure payment of debt service and to create the 2 years' reserve.

5. Use and occupancy insurance is maintained to provide continued revenue in the event of fire or other disaster.

6. Parietal rules are established under which the project dormitories must be occupied before other dormitories are occupied.

7. Housing constructed under the program provides only a small fraction of total enrollment.

8. Enrollments have increased for the third successive year to an all-time high this fall of 2,472,000 students and are expected to increase to more than 3 million students by 1960.

9. As disbursements increase under the program, the differential between the cost of funds from the Treasury and interest on loans will provide substantial reserves against the possibility of defaults under the program.

**ITEM 9. A LIST OF ALL IRREGULARITIES, OR ILLEGALITIES, FOUND TO DATE IN THIS PROGRAM, IF ANY, AND ACTIONS TAKEN IN EACH CASE**

No irregularities or illegalities have been found to date in this program, and every precaution possible is taken, in the field offices and in the central office, at all stages of processing and construction to avoid such conditions.

**ITEM 10. A STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER THIS PROGRAM IS BEING EMPHASIZED AT THIS TIME MORE THAN IN THE PAST, AND IF SO, THE MEANS OF PROMOTION**

This program is not conducted on a promotional basis. The passage of the initial legislation put the educational institutions on notice of the availability of funds. Applications are not solicited and application forms are furnished only in response to specific requests from institutions of higher learning. The inception of the program was delayed for more than a year due to the outbreak in Korea, and until the summer of 1953 it was severely restricted by requirements that the projects have defense-connected aspects such as the training of ROTC students.

The number of applications received under the program has increased each year since its inception, as shown by the following table:

*Number of applications received*

Fiscal year:	
1952	95
1953	119
1954	125

The increasing number of applications appears to reflect the need for housing resulting from increased college enrollments. These enrollments have fluctuated rather widely in the last 15 years. From a prewar

normal of 1,365,000 in 1939, enrollments dropped to a wartime low of 733,000 in 1943. In 1947 the enrollment of 1,081,000 GI's brought total enrollments to 2,078,000. In 1949, although the enrollment of GI's had dropped to 860,000, the enrollments of non-veterans had risen to 1,597,000, making a postwar peak of 2,457,000 students. As GI entitlements ran out, total enrollments dropped slightly in 1950 and 1951, but have risen steadily through 1952, 1953, and 1954, until they have now passed the postwar peak. Estimates by the Office of Education indicate that this trend will continue, reaching 3,000,000 or more students by 1960.

The need for housing during this period has been intensified by the deterioration of temporary barracks which had been erected on the campuses to accommodate the in-

flux of veterans. Many of these must now be removed because they are fire hazards, uneconomical to maintain, and because the special permits under which they were erected have expired.

The number of applications approved in each fiscal year follows:

Number of applications approved	
Fiscal year:	
1952	25
1953	71
1954	41
1955 (to 11-15-54)	25

<sup>1</sup> Includes 3 rescissions.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 7 rescissions.

<sup>3</sup> Includes 4 rescissions.

Since March of 1953, the major emphasis on this program has been in the direction of

developing the maximum degree of private participation. New procedures were developed to provide that before the bonds were purchased by the Government they must be advertised in the Bond Buyer and that bids for the whole or parts of issues must be accepted if the bids were at interest rates comparable to the Government rate. Meetings were held with representatives of the Investment Bankers Association in an effort to develop a wider market for this type of security. In the last 9 months, some \$17 million in loans which would otherwise have been direct Federal loans have been purchased by private investment firms. A listing of these loans is attached. Since the inception of the program more than \$60 million in college housing loans have been withdrawn or rescinded in favor of private investment.

#### Recent bond sales to private investment houses

Date of sale or report	Institution and location	Amount	Years	Interest rate	HHFA action
Mar. 1, 1954	Western State College, Gunnison, Colo.	\$181,000	20	3.60	Do.
Mar. 22, 1954	Western Illinois State College, Macomb, Ill.	700,000	30	3.394	Do.
Apr. 15, 1954	Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Wash.	310,000	20	3.15	Do.
Apr. 19, 1954	Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio	2,250,000	40	3.368	Do.
Do.	Southern State College, Magnolia, Ark.	450,000	20	3.5	Do.
May 13, 1954	Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.	2,856,000	40	3.48	Do.
June 2, 1954	Montana State University, Missoula, Mont.	169,000	20	3.195	Do.
June 15, 1954	Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville, Ark.	790,000	40	3.40	Do.
Do.	University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.	450,000	30	3.125	Do.
June 29, 1954	Arkansas State College, Jonesboro, Ark.	460,000	30	3.19	Do.
July 12, 1954	Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond, Ky.	465,000	25	3.05	Do.
July 14, 1954	Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.	1,125,000	40	3.45	Do.
July 21, 1954	New Mexico College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts, State College, N. Mex.	700,000 300,000	30	3.5686	Do.
Aug. 18, 1954	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.	1,700,000	40	2.25 3.25	Do.
Sept. 14, 1954	University of Texas (Main), Austin, Tex.	3,402,000	40	2.985	Do.
Sept. 20, 1954	University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho	395,000	20	3.106	Do.
Sept. 22, 1954	University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	447,000	30	2.936	Do.
Oct. 11, 1954	Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah	600,000	40	3.45	Do.
Total		17,750,000			

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is concluded.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 (Mr. HILL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CITATION OF DIANTHA D. HOAG FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, Senate Resolution 31.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 31) citing Diantha D. Hoag for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Diantha D. Hoag to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with

all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Diantha D. Hoag may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], who reported the resolution to the Senate, is absent, and he asked me to pursue it for him. However, I am sure there is no need for any speech on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 31) was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) to extend the times by which the Committee on the Judiciary may conduct studies and investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the times in which the Committee on the Judiciary may expend

funds under authority of Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954; Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 187, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 188, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 190, agreed to January 27, 1954; and Senate Resolution 227, agreed to April 28, 1954, are hereby extended through February 28, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have stated how much money remains available to the committee from last year?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot give the Senator from Louisiana the exact information on that point. However, there is sufficient money on hand to carry on the work of the committee for the remainder of this month. I am sure the Senator will understand that the main difficulty is that the chairman of the committee has not yet arranged for the selection of the subcommittees and has not yet determined what their functions will be. However, there is sufficient money on hand to take care of the needs of the committee for this month.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, no new money is being asked for?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that before the Committee on the Judiciary requests additional money of the Senate, it will try to curtail the expenditures of the committee. Last year I pointed out that the Committee on the Judiciary received from the Senate a little more than \$750,000



with which to perform the functions of that committee.

My hope is that the new chairman will look into the subject, in an effort to curtail the expenditures of the committee.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, one reason for asking that the resolution be agreed to is to give me, as chairman of the committee, ample time to look into the question of expenditures. There are sufficient funds on hand with which to conduct the functions of the committee during this month, and in the interim opportunity will be afforded to conduct a proper study of the subject in order to decide what should be done. We are asking for permission to spend money now available to enable the subcommittees to function for an additional month, which will give us time to determine the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I again express the hope that the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the committee, will be able to curtail the expenditures of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary during the last Congress, I should like to say that I do not know of so much as \$1 being wasted by any subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. As a matter of fact, every subcommittee did a first-class job. Although \$700,000 may look like a large sum of money, the amount is very modest when we consider the many bills which are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary every year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate many times, most of the bills reported by the Committee on the Judiciary are claims bills. I served as chairman of the Committee on Claims before the Reorganization Act went into effect. At that time the Claims Committee employed 2 clerks to do the work which now requires the services of 3 or 4 attorneys and quite a number of additional workers in the Department of Justice.

It is my hope that some of the expenditures will be curtailed. There are working on these committees entirely too many persons who, in my humble judgment, are professionals at being able to maintain themselves in jobs.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished colleague that he is entirely mistaken. Last year the committee considered more than 2,000 claims. No politics are involved in that committee. We kept on the committee every attorney and member of the staff who had been hired by the former chairman of the committee, the late Senator from Nevada, Mr. McCarran.

To indicate the vast volume of work and the great amount of money involved, let me say that we had before us one bill, introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], involving more than \$500 million. Certainly, as a member of that committee, I do not propose to consider lightly a bill involving that amount of money. Such a bill requires thorough investigation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to correct the distinguished former chairman of the committee. The bill involved \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I was chairman of the old Claims Committee, many bills involving large sums were referred to that committee. The difference is that the work is now being conducted by a group of attorneys, whereas formerly the Senators did the work themselves. That is the difference.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to reply to my distinguished colleague by saying that, of course, the committee does have the assistance of attorneys. They go over each bill in order to determine the legal aspects involved. They must look up decisions of the Supreme Court on a variety of matters. As a matter of fact, however, not one bill went through the committee which was not thoroughly considered by the committee, and a report was made on every one of the bills.

I do not believe the committee has sufficient help at the present time, and I sincerely hope the new chairman of the committee will ask for additional counsel. I certainly do not want to vote for a bill involving \$100,000 or \$200,000, or a bill of the size introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], involving \$1,500,000,000, without knowing what I am doing. Each year the committee passes upon bills calling for the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars. I am confident that under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] the committee will not pass favorably upon any of these claims unless the members of the committee know exactly what is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 28, Calendar No. 21.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 28) extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 4, after the word "thereof", to strike out "March 31" and insert "February 28", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That Senate Resolution 185, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1955", wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "February 28, 1955."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this resolution provides for the extension of the authority of the Senate Committee on Armed Services to use the funds which have heretofore been made available to carry on investigations relating to the preparedness program. The resolution was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and it provided that the period within which the funds might be utilized would be until March 31. The committee proposed to amend the resolution by substituting the date of February 28. By reason of the fact that some of the key personnel of the committee have not been present, we have not been able to organize the preparedness investigations. The resolution does not involve any increased funds. It would really be in the interest of economy to extend the authority for 2 months rather than for 1 month. In view of the circumstances which obtain, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and extend the authority to use the funds for 2 months.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was the one who made the motion in the Committee on Rules and Administration to shorten the time, on the assumption that 30 days would be ample. I did not realize that some members of the Committee on Armed Services were necessarily absent. Furthermore, I have great confidence in the committee, and I know it never has expended the amount of money which has been appropriated to it. Last year, for example, it was allowed \$150,000, and it has an unexpended balance of \$63,647. So the committee is not a wasteful committee.

For that reason, Mr. President, I have no objection to the rejection of the amendment, and the adoption of the resolution as originally submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 28) was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should not like the record to be closed without expressing my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for his kind comments. The Committee on Armed Services has recently been under the jurisdiction of a New England Yankee. New England Yankees are very prudent people, and I hope that in the years which lie ahead the committee as now organized may be equally saving in its operations.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 13, Calendar No. 16.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 13) to investigate certain prob-

lems relating to interstate and foreign commerce.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 13) which was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as set forth in section (1) (j) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and especially all matters pertaining to—

(1) maritime matters generally, including a continuation of the study of the maritime subsidy program;

(2) communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television;

(3) domestic surface transportation;

(4) civil aeronautics; and

(5) fisheries and wildlife, including research, restoration, refuges, and conservation.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$200,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce requested that certain funds for a continuing study be provided. The study has been going on in the committee during the past session of the Congress. We submitted a very rigid budget covering the many aspects of the jurisdiction of the committee. As the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] pointed out with reference to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because of conditions beyond its control, did not spend all the money appropriated for it last year. It turned back a considerable sum.

The committee has many important problems, including a continuing study of the American merchant marine and fisheries. I see my good friend from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], who has done yeoman work on surface transportation, is present. The committee also has a railroad and trucking problem, a radio problem, and other problems. The committee has jurisdiction over many of these problems covering the entire Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money was appropriated last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Last year \$115,000 was appropriated. I think that figure is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, of that amount the committee is returning to the Treasury, according to the record which I have before me, \$60,564.42.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it necessary to authorize \$200,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because the studies were started late in the session, and they must continue. The committee did not have the opportunity to prepare and submit final reports. Some of the members of the staff are still busy on these matters which cover the whole field of transportation. We felt we could complete the job by asking for the additional amount of money. We could have spent the amount allowed, but we felt the timing was such that we could not complete these very important studies and investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the staff which was hired in order to perform these duties to which the Senator has referred is no longer on the payroll?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I sent notices to the members of the staff that as of January 31 they were all to be dismissed; but we shall have to rehire some in order to proceed with these studies.

Mr. ELLENDER. What becomes of the work which had been previously done by the staff members who have been discharged?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is all there.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what form?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are available many hearings; there are supplemental reports to be considered; there are documents and files, and all the things that are included in an inquiry which is not yet completed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration facts or evidence to show that additional funds will be needed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have information which I should like to put into the Record. As I have said, the committee submitted a very rigid budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not be possible for the committee to do this work for \$50,000 less? Why not try to save a little money?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that if we do not need this amount of money, we shall do what we have always done in the past—turn it back into the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would rather see the Senator come before the Senate and request more money, than to take that chance.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amount of money requested is comparatively small compared with the problems which are before the committee for solution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the chairmanship of the late Senator Tobey some years ago the committee started out with an appropriation of \$50,000. Then the amount was increased to \$75,000, and, later, to \$115,000. Now almost twice that amount is being requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that I think when my late friend from New Hamp-

shire was its chairman the committee did not have the great burden of matters which are now confronting it.

I have appointed a number of major subcommittees. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana will appreciate the fact that their work is very important. It involves the whole problem of surface transportation, the question of railroad mergers, and the question of the conflict of freight rates involving truck and bus lines.

In the field of the merchant marine, an almost continuous study has been in progress, which has saved the Government more than 100 times the small amount asked for in the resolution.

The distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation. I think he will bear out my statement that the problems in the aviation field are multiplying rather than diminishing.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished Senator from Washington knows, each standing committee is provided with \$90,000 with which to carry on its work. The committee is permitted to have four experts. An additional \$200,000 would give the Senator's committee almost \$300,000 with which to operate. I do not see why the work cannot be done with much less money than the amount which is asked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Louisiana will bear with me, I assure him that we shall do the work just as economically as possible. Last year the committee turned back the amount which was not used, and we shall be glad to do so again this year. We are not trying to promote the creation of staffs. The money is not really being sought for investigations; it is needed for the continuation of studies of matters which are so important to the entire United States, including the State of Louisiana, that I think it would be very desirable for the committee to complete the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that on line 16 the figure "\$200,000" be stricken, and that "\$150,000" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$200,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I notice on page 6 of the report language indicating that the committee intends to investigate the electric-utility field. Is it the intention of the Senator from Washington to have the committee investigate, for example, the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under the jurisdiction of the committee is the Federal Power Commission. The entire field of power, in which the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota did such marvelous work in the last session, is to be explored. I believe the Senator from



North Dakota understands my interest in respect to such matters and my views with reference to how far the committee should go in its investigations.

I plan to offer a resolution relating to the Dixon-Yates contract after the Senate has disposed of the pending resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator plan to have his committee make an investigation of the proposed Hells Canyon project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And also of electric light and power rates in New Hampshire, Vermont, and the other New England States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Another thing which I wish to point out to the Senate, particularly to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], is that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has under its jurisdiction, first, the Federal Power Commission; second, the Federal Communications Commission; third, the Interstate Commerce Commission; fourth, the Federal Maritime Board; fifth, the Federal Trade Commission; and also the Coast Guard, the Weather Bureau, and similar agencies.

The basic legislation relating to these commissions established them as arms of Congress and not as independent executive agencies. Therefore, it is felt that Congress should keep in close touch with what the commissions are doing because, in effect, they are really working for Congress.

If there is one important thing which can be done with this amount of money it is to reimpress upon these agencies that they were established as arms of Congress and not as independent executive agencies.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that an amendment has been offered which may be of some importance to all the Members of the Senate, I wonder if the Senator from Washington, without losing his right to the floor, will yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was hopeful that we might have a vote without having a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since an amendment has been offered, I think it would be preferable to have a quorum call, so that Members may be advised of the action which is proposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to complete my statement, which I expect will take only about a minute, and then I shall yield the floor.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I refer to page 6 of the report, in which there is reference to electric-utility industries. Is it the intent of the Senator from Washington to go into the monopoly situation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is the intention to make studies and to enter upon investigations, or inquiries, only of matters over which the Federal Power Commission has control, and perhaps into some specific situations, such as certain power dams in the West. However, I wish to make it clear that in the study now being conducted and continued regarding radio, television, and the Dixon-Yates contract, if any evidence of monopoly in those fields should be developed, it is my intention to send such evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary, which I think has jurisdiction over monopoly questions. However, the committee had jurisdiction over the original Holding Company Act, and the Federal Power Commission, as an arm of Congress, comes particularly under the committee. On the question of monopoly, if evidence of monopolistic practices should be developed during the inquiry, I would surely wish to send that evidence to the Committee on the Judiciary. As the Senator may know, I have for a long time been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I appreciate that subject would technically come under the purview of that committee.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the committee intend to investigate TVA?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, in no respect. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I should like to have the question of the TVA looked into. I might do that in another capacity, as chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations; but that subject has nothing to do with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not be agreed to, because I know the importance of the field which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will investigate. It is of vital interest to our people. The facts involved are complex and difficult to develop. It will take much hard work to get the evidence. I wish to have it made clear by the Senator from Washington that, insofar as the questions of monopoly, concentration of economic influence, and antitrust activities are concerned, matters of which the Judiciary Committee has always had jurisdiction, it is not the intention of the Senator from Washington to have any conflict

with the Committee on the Judiciary on those matters. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There will be no conflict whatsoever. It may be that in the course of the hearings matters relating to antitrust activities will be brought out in the testimony. So far as any corrective legislation in that regard is concerned, the Senator from Washington will give his wholehearted support to the consideration of those matters being handled by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I call to the attention of the Senator from Washington the language appearing on page 6 of the report, which reads:

There have been complaints of the practices and activities of commercial companies engaged in the production, distribution, and sale of electrical energy, and particularly that they have engaged in large-scale endeavors to influence the election of State and Federal officials, and that they have attempted to oppose and discredit municipal, State, Federal, and cooperative production and distribution of electrical power.

Those are monopoly and antitrust questions which a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has already been investigating, and on which a report has now been filed. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. At one time the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee directed the Federal Power Commission to make an investigation. The Senator from Tennessee was one of the cosponsors, with me, of a request for such an inquiry. The investigation had to do with the Pacific Northwest area. I assure the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from North Dakota that there will be no conflict between the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee over matters which technically belong to the Judiciary Committee, because, having served on both committees for a long time, I think I understand the problems involved.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I forgot to ask the Senator about the power development on the Niagara River, in New York State. Does the Senator from Washington intend to investigate that matter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know nothing about that except what I have read.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was interested in that question some months ago, and I think that considerable work has been done by the committee on that matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has so much work to do on other matters besides those embraced in the justification for the pending resolution, that I hope it will not shock the Senator from Louisiana if I come back later for further funds and justify the request.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Louisiana does not object if a Senator can justify requests. That is what I am trying to have done. The reason I asked that the appropriation be cut to \$150,000

is that a large sum of money was requested and provided last year, much of which was not used.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but that request was justified when it was made.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood there was work done in the crime and racketeering field. What does the Senator expect to do in that field?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the committee may want to do, but all the files of the Kefauver subcommittee, all the jurisdiction, and all the bills suggested by the special subcommittee were turned over to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There are boxes of files in its possession.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say in that connection that at the time the special subcommittee was dissolved by resolution, it was provided that all the rights, jurisdiction, and powers of the special subcommittee should go to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There is a big field involved in that matter. I think it is very important, from the public viewpoint, that at least some consideration be given to the new techniques of racketeering and other unlawful activities. A number of bills still are pending, and a number of recommendations by the Department of Justice have been made.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to say that, as a matter of fact, I am today introducing a departmental bill on a phase of the Senator's investigation; it deals with the question of bookmaking. Our committee has jurisdiction over that matter. I do not know how deeply the committee will go into it; but if the committee goes into it to the same extent that the Senator from Tennessee did so vigorously in his approach to the problem, probably the committee will have to request additional funds from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Right now we are dealing with problems relating to communications, the merchant marine, surface transportation, and fisheries. Those problems are very important to the entire country. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] has done yeoman work, as I have said, in connection with surface transportation. So far as the other matters are concerned, the committee will have to decide what it wishes to do about them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is why I question the necessity of providing funds for investigations as to auto bootlegging and crime racketeering. Do they not come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not in the case of investigation of auto bootlegging. A resolution dealing with an investigation of auto bootlegging has been before our committee since the last session. The matter was not resolved. Some members of the committee would like to pursue it, and I believe that the public as a whole would like to have the matter pursued, because of its importance to the purchasers of automobiles. That problem comes within the jurisdiction of our committee.

However, the matter dealt with by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]

was referred to our committee by Senate resolution.

I wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that I do not wish to be a policeman.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Washington, apparently, is headed in that direction.

I notice in the report, on page 5:

More recently, Senator KEFAUVER and others have suggested that we look into complaints of racketeering in amateur and professional sports.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should they be studied?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely point out to the Senate that the Senator from Tennessee made the suggestion. What the committee will do about it, I do not know.

Mr. ELLENDER. In making up the committee's budget, I assume that allowance was made for an investigation by the committee of automobile bootlegging and crime racketeering. Those subjects, in my judgment, should be handled by the Judiciary Committee, not the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But automobile bootlegging is a matter relating to commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. It relates primarily, however, to crime.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no; the word "bootlegging" is used advisedly in this case. The problem relates to contracts between automobile manufacturers and their dealers.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that matter deals with a crime.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it relates to trade practices. Insofar as crime is dealt with in that case, let me say that matter was referred to our committee by means of a Senate resolution for which the Senator from Louisiana probably voted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from Washington also inquire into the rates charged by steamship companies for transportation to Alaska? I understand the companies engaged in that traffic have charged very high rates. Does the Senator from Washington or does his committee intend to study that problem?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes. That problem is almost perennial. Of course, we shall have to look into that matter. Passenger service by steamer to Alaska is virtually suspended now, and at this time there is no way to get to Alaska except by airplane. So of course we wish to look into those matters.

If the Senator from Louisiana will examine the committee's proposed budget, he will see that the amount we have suggested includes allocations as to these particular matters, which it has been suggested that the committee study. What the committee will do with them,

I do not know. But the jurisdiction of the committee is rather broad.

If the Senate desires to take away some of the committee's jurisdiction, I am sure that some of the hard-working members of the committee would not be too perturbed about it. Nevertheless, these problems come before us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder what the work of the full-time professional staff employed by the committee is. Do they not study these problems? Is it not contemplated by the Reorganization Act that they will study them? Is that not the reason why the employment of such professionals was provided for?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and they work all the time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the decision of the Supreme Court that professional boxing comes within the antitrust laws, and in view of the demand of the people of the United States, particularly those interested in sports, to have steps taken so as to see to it that boxing is kept clean and that racketeering and frame-ups do not exist in connection with boxing, it seems to me that it is of great importance to have some congressional committee look into the many allegations which have been made in regard to the "fixing" of fights and the entrance of improper influences into professional sports, as well as amateur sports. When such complaints have come to me, I have sent them to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And properly so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Because I thought they were matters in which that committee primarily would be interested.

On the other hand, insofar as violation of statutes involved in sports racketeering is concerned, I believe that problem might come before the Judiciary Committee. I am sure there will be no difficulty in regard to jurisdiction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, section 1 of the resolution reported last year by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. It sets forth the jurisdiction given at that time to the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with antitrust and monopoly matters. I also ask that an excerpt from the report on the resolution be printed in the RECORD. I make this request in order that all matters relating to the discussion may appear at one point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the resolution (S. Res. 14, 83d Cong., 1st sess.) and the excerpts from the report (No. 37) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete and comprehensive study and investigation of the antitrust laws of the



United States and their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect and to determine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable to—

(a) clarify existing statutory enactments, and eliminate any conflicts which may exist among the several statutes comprising such laws;

(b) rectify any misapplications and misinterpretations of such laws which may have developed in the administration thereof;

(c) supplement such statutes to provide any additional substantive, procedural or organizational legislations which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of such statutes; and

(d) improve the administration and enforcement of such statutes.

#### STATEMENT

The Committee on the Judiciary under the Legislative Reorganization Act has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the "protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

This resolution, as amended, proposes that a complete and comprehensive investigation be made of the Federal antitrust laws. It should be noted that the basic law, the Sherman Act, is now 63 years old, the Clayton Act is almost 40 years old, and the Robinson-Patman Act is 17 years old. During this 60-year period, no attempt has yet been made by the Congress to survey the entire field of antitrust laws with a view toward a comprehensive revision and coordination of these basic laws. During past years controversy has arisen as to whether these basic policies may have become outdated. Because of the many differences of opinion about the objectives of these antitrust statutes, suggestions have been made in many sources that now is the time for a study of our antitrust policy.

Criticism has been raised regarding the procedures and remedies of the antitrust laws. The overlapping of jurisdiction of Federal antitrust agencies, highlighted especially by the overlap in jurisdiction of the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, has generated demands for congressional action to centralize antitrust administration and enforcement in one source of authority, or at least to coordinate through a central agency the concurrent jurisdiction of the several Federal agencies. Questions have been raised as to whether the legislative policies embodied in these laws are intrinsically sound in approach, and whether the separate provisions of these statutes and their relationship to one another are sufficiently consistent and coordinated to effectuate a united Federal policy of maintaining competition.

Because of the tremendous technological progress of the past 60 years in American industry, it is necessary that a thorough review be made of the entire antitrust field in order to achieve such realignment of the antitrust laws as may be shown necessary by such review.

If the committee is to discharge its responsibility as imposed by the Legislative Reorganization Act, it is the view of the committee that the resolution, as amended, be approved by the Senate, in order to provide the necessary funds for the proposed study and investigation of the antitrust laws, as outlined in Senate Resolution 14.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe it should be clear that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is primarily concerned with what are termed regulated industries, not the question of monopoly when considered as a violation of the antitrust laws. There are various regulated industries, such as the telephone companies, the power com-

panies, the transportation companies, the railroads, and the bus lines. So the committee is primarily concerned with questions relating to such regulated industries, and is not concerned with the broad question of monopoly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question apropos the point raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]: What was the total amount allowed to the committee last year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One hundred and fifteen thousand dollars for the last session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much was turned back by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Approximately \$50,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Fifty thousand dollars over and above the \$115,000?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have given the figures to the Senator from Louisiana. For the entire 83d Congress, \$230,000, approximately, was given to the committee, for the purpose of making these studies; and there was turned back, unspent, a total of \$80,000, for both sessions of the 83d Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, actually, insofar as the spending experience of the committee is concerned, the \$150,000 suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would give the committee, in the 84th Congress, approximately the same sum of money it had in the 83d Congress. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but I am trying to point out to the Senator from Louisiana—and let me also say to the Senator from California—that many of these studies, which should have been continued, were stopped during the last session; and all this money would have been spent if those studies had run their normal course. So this is the money the committee needed. Of course, Senator Tobey, of New Hampshire, died. As a result, one investigation, in particular—that relating to activities along the New Jersey waterfront—was stopped. The study of surface transportation, which involves the entire railroad industry, did not continue because we decided we would wait until this session; we thought the matter so important, and regarded it as involving so many complex problems, that we decided to wait until this session. However, a great deal of the preliminary work was done by us during the last session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator from Washington that I wish to see the committee of which the Senator from Washington is chairman, and the other committees of the Senate, have ample funds with which to carry out their legislative responsibilities and also the investigative responsibilities they have under the Reorganization Act.

On the other hand, I think there is considerable merit in the position taken by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], namely, that if, in fact, the amendment he submitted will allow the

committee what it had during the 83d Congress, that should suffice.

Of course, I am sure that if it should not suffice, the Senate would be found to be reasonably receptive and in an open frame of mind. If the committee ascertained that sum of money did not take care of the situation, and thus found it necessary to make a further request of the Senate and to have the Senate consider the committee's case, I believe the Senate would be entirely reasonable.

As a matter of general practice, I do not like to see funds appropriated over and above what reasonably might be expected to be expended, and considerably over and above what actually was used during the prior Congress. I wonder if the distinguished Senator would not be agreeable to acceptance of the amendment, which would give the committee the amount which it had in the 83d Congress. Then if the committee and its staff are able to conduct the proposed investigations, and find that they will need \$10,000, \$15,000, or some other amount in addition to complete their work, they would have an opportunity to come to the Senate and make their presentation at that time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am trying to point out to the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana that this estimate was carefully calculated. We hope that it was calculated very conservatively and wisely. The fact that we spent a certain amount last year does not necessarily mean that we shall require more or less this year. We are trying to calculate and project the expenditures on what we think is a reasonable basis. The record of the committee shows that if the money is not spent, it is returned to the Treasury.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. This committee does have a good record for turning money back. Two years ago it turned back \$30,000, and last year, \$50,000.

I listened to the presentation made by the other members of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the scope of the committee's authority and the work to be done. I think the Committee on Rules and Administration wisely approved the request for money, and I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will receive the full amount requested. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to the Senate that the figure of \$230,000 referred to by my friend from Washington was for the two sessions of the 83d Congress. The amount which is being asked today is \$200,000 for the 1st session of the 84th Congress. As the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has stated, if the committee needs more money and can justify its request for additional funds, I am sure the Senate will grant it. All I am trying to do is to bring the appropriation into line with what was spent in the entire 83d Congress.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the last Congress the committee had a total of \$230,000. As has been shown, in the first year the committee spent \$85,000 and turned back \$30,000. In the second year it turned back \$50,000, which indicates to me that the committee is not a wastrel committee, and that it could be trusted to make this expenditure in a proper manner. I think it should be allowed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the reason a portion of the appropriation was turned back the first year was that the distinguished late Senator from New Hampshire, Senator Tobey, did not use the money for the studies we desired to continue. He was diverted to a waterfront study. All the other investigations were at a standstill. That does not mean that the money requested is not needed during the coming session.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is a rather strange situation to find that, because the committee conserved its money and was frugal, when it asks for a budget which it thinks necessary, the fact that it was frugal enough to return large sums of money to the Treasury is used as a basis for denying its request for the funds which it believes will be needed.

There is before the Aviation Subcommittee a complete study on the recodification of all our aviation laws. We were stymied on that program last year. We did not complete it.

We have before us the problem of rebuilding, with some Federal aid, all the commercial airports of the country in order to get ready for the jet transports. Yet the budget of the administration recommends only \$11 million in Federal aid for all the airport work in the country.

If we want an obsolete and antiquated Federal program in connection with civilian airports let us chop down the committee funds so that it will not be able to make an adequate study, which, if properly made, would save 100 or 1,000 times the amount the committee has requested.

There is needed a study which has been demanded by almost every independent automobile dealer throughout the country, because of unstable conditions in the industry, because of phantom freight, and because of bootlegging practices which prevail. The automobile dealers are entitled to be heard. They are entitled to have an intelligent study made of the problem. What could be more important than a sound distribution policy which would protect small business in the vast automotive field? If we do not want these studies made, let us reduce the appropriations.

Members of the Senate know the burden of work on every Senator who serves on 2 or 3 subcommittees of a major committee such as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Unless some of these studies are made, the committee will have to rely on the executive departments for information—departments which we are supposed to regulate, and with respect to which we are supposed to legislate. If Senators desire to compel the committee to rely on spoon-fed information handed to us by

the departments, let them cut the appropriation and help to render the arm of the Senate impotent to do anything about it. I think the proposed amendment is an example of being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the amendment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that from my State hogs and cattle can be shipped all the way to New York at lower rates than those which prevail when such shipments are made through Montana and into the State of Washington, or to packing plants in California. Something is radically wrong when it costs more to ship livestock and grain west than to ship it east. The rates certainly ought to be the same. I hope a complete study will be made of that question, because the condition to which I have referred is hurting the development of the Northwest.

Mr. MONRONEY. It could mean hundreds of millions of dollars in savings to various areas if we could bring some rationalization out of the crazy-quilt pattern of freight rates.

We are continuing a study dealing with the proper transportation of seasonal agricultural commodities. Every farm organization in the United States has been knocking at the door of Congress and asking for help. We could not get any legislation through last year. We must resume hearings on that study.

Certainly, in view of the broad jurisdiction of the committee and the complex questions before the committee and its subcommittees, the cut of \$50,000, on the ground that we did not use all that was given us last year, is not justified. That does not hold water as a reason for denying us enough money to get started on a program which the chairman and other members of the committee feel to be necessary in the fulfillment of our duty.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of Senators who oppose the proposed reduction. It will be my privilege this year to serve as chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has already pointed out, one of the great abuses of our entire transportation system thus far has been the evil of discriminatory freight rates. It has been the consensus of the committee that possibly we should look into that question to determine why it is, for example, that in the Southern or Western States the rate on a particular commodity may be 10 cents a mile, whereas the same commodity can be shipped for 1 cent a mile in other States. Such a study is needed throughout the country, to determine why we cannot have fair and equitable freight rates for everyone. Such a study, of course, would require a great deal of money.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has pointed out that trip leasing is something the farmers have been wanting for some time. There should be hearings on that question. There should be a committee investigation of the facts in the case. That, of

course, would require some money. The conduct of proper hearings on that particular question would require a sizable staff.

The other day someone pointed out to me a newspaper article to the effect that the income of the Pennsylvania Railroad was down 50 percent as compared with the previous year. I do not mean to say that we hold any particular brief for the Pennsylvania Railroad; but, if the railroads are getting into such a situation that their income is dropping off by such proportions, it indicates that there is a sick industry, and that perhaps Congress ought to do something to equalize the benefits among various transportation media. The maritime industry and the aviation industry enjoy the benefits of certain subsidies which the railroads do not have. No doubt that is a subject which the committee ought to explore.

A few days ago I read a statement to the effect that the President had authorized the appointment of a transportation committee, to investigate and make a report on what should be done about the overall transportation problem. From a preview it would seem that the committee will recommend a basic change in the whole subsidy program, and a basic change in the law. The questions involved present a serious problem, and when the report comes from the committee, no doubt the Senate will have to consider it and go into it thoroughly.

Only a week ago the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made a wonderful speech in New York on the whole subject. It was referred to in Tom Stokes' column last evening. In his speech the Senator referred to the regulatory agencies which, in effect, through their personnel, were destroying small business in the United States. In fact, it may have come to the point where the agencies may be taking their orders directly from certain businesses, rather than recognizing the fact that they are creatures of Congress.

All of that is very important to the economy of the United States. We have an opportunity to save billions of dollars through investigations, and to strengthen the whole economy of the United States. It will mean much in dollars and cents to the whole country.

For the reasons I have stated, I join the other Senators in hoping that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not be agreed to.

The committee has a fine record of returning money which it does not spend. I am confident that the chairman of our committee this year will continue to follow that precedent and return money which is not used by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.



## DELINQUENT TAXES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, several weeks ago I became very much concerned over the rumor that the delinquent taxes in many of our collection districts were at an all-time high. In order to check the accuracy of this report I directed an inquiry to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and on December 28, 1954, I received a reply thereto. Both letters I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Washington, D. C., November 15, 1954.  
Mr. T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,  
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,  
Department of the Treasury,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is being rumored that the outstanding delinquent taxes are at an all-time high.

In order to check this report will you please advise me the total number of delinquencies and the total dollar volume as of the most recent date. I would also appreciate receiving the same information regarding delinquent accounts as of January 1, 1953.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
Washington, December 28, 1954.  
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We have been giving careful consideration to your letter of November 15, relating to the matter of delinquent taxes. Commissioner Andrews had hoped that he might be able to send an answer to you before leaving for a short vacation but found at the last minute that he was unable to do so.

As you know, we have been engaged in the installation of a new accounting system which will provide a great deal more information than we have previously had with respect to delinquent accounts. The installation of the system has resulted in the issuance of a great many warrants which were not being issued under the methods previously in effect. We expect to obtain much more complete information as to our delinquent-account position as of December 31, 1954, than we have previously been able to obtain, and we are hopeful that this information will permit us to improve our collection procedures so that we may reduce the number and the amount of delinquent accounts outstanding.

We feel sure that you would not wish us to furnish you with figures which are not strictly comparable and we believe that a comparison of outstanding warrants as of a current date with those at January 1, 1953, might convey a misleading impression. We recognize that the number and amount of outstanding warrants are currently at a very high level, but we believe that a substantial part of the recent increase is the result of the conditions indicated in the preceding paragraph. On the other hand, we find that the total amount of our outstanding open accounts (including the delinquent accounts) has been going down and at September 30, 1954, was approximately \$500 million below the corresponding amount a year earlier. This information is not too conclusive, however, as the decrease in open accounts may be caused, in part, by changes in the payment schedule for corporation income taxes.

Please be assured that we are making every effort to obtain more complete information

as to the nature of our accounts receivable and to provide more adequate methods of collecting delinquent accounts.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,  
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I still do not have an answer to my question, apparently for the reason that such information has never been tabulated up to this time.

It is hard to understand why in previous years no effort was made to assemble such information at a central point; however, I am glad to note that a new accounting system is now being installed to correct this condition.

The Bureau admits that the number of outstanding warrants are currently at a very high level, but it gives as a possible explanation that it could be the result of a more accurate tabulation under the new accounting system.

Since the Department has given assurance that complete information on this question is being tabulated—as of December 31, 1954—and that within the near future a detailed report will be submitted to the Congress, I am not pressing them for an estimate of these delinquent accounts at this moment. However, I shall with interest await this report, which will show, first, the total amount of outstanding delinquencies of all types of Federal taxes in the United States; second, a breakdown of these delinquencies by type of tax, that is, income, corporation, excise, stamp, and so forth; third, a breakdown by districts.

This absence of any centralized control over delinquent taxes was criticized 3 years ago when a report was made on the third collection district in New York. In that district we found over 600 delinquent accounts in excess of \$25,000 each, aggregating in that 1 district over \$130 million.

A substantial number of those accounts were found to be so old that it was impossible to locate the present addresses of the taxpayers. Unquestionably failure to have served warrants or to have taken prompt action resulted in the loss of millions of dollars in that one office.

Even now as this overall inventory is being taken under the new accounting system we are advised that many instances are being found where delinquent notices have never been mailed to the taxpayers involved. One particular case was noted where a deputy collector had pigeonholed delinquent notices to a taxpayer for 5 consecutive years, and it was discovered only after the man died and then during an appraisal of his estate.

Such conditions could not have gone so long undetected had there been proper control over the accounts. The installation of the new accounting system by the Treasury Department, along with an accurate tabulation as to the existing conditions, should bring this long neglected problem under control.

Likewise, when this report is completed it should be carefully examined by both the Treasury Department and the appropriate committees of the Congress to see whether or not these lax conditions resulted from undue negligence, and if so, who the responsible officials were.

## EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 25, Calendar No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 25) authorizing the employment of an additional clerical assistant by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 2, after the word "from", to strike out "January 31" and insert "February 1", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), as amended, was agreed to.

## EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY CLERICAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 34, Calendar No. 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 34) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ four additional temporary clerical assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 34).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is it the purpose of the resolution to authorize the employment of four persons who have been on the payroll during the past session of the Congress?

Mr. HILL. To continue in service four positions which existed during the first and second sessions of the last Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 34) was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

#### INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AND MOBILIZATION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 23, Calendar No. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 23) to investigate problems relating to economic stabilization and mobilization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, instead of allowing the use of an unexpended balance and providing an additional sum, the committee has recommended a new appropriation and wiped out the old unexpended balance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that done in the case of the resolution which the Senate adopted a moment ago, relating to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but there is an explanation in the committee report on this resolution, and I think it would be proper to have the explanation printed

in the RECORD. The report states as follows:

The amendment offered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, in the nature of a substitute, seeks to eliminate the practice formerly adhered to by many committees of using unobligated funds from past investigations for new or continuing studies. This has resulted in increased bookkeeping for the Disbursing Office and also has resulted in the hidden growth of many investigative funds.

In requiring each committee to ask for separate amounts at the beginning of each session, this committee can, by such procedure, give the Senate from year to year a factual presentation of how much its investigations will cost. In this way, also, each committee, coming in January to the Senate for additional sums to continue investigations already begun, will be impelled to report to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for the information of the Senate, how much of its old budget it was returning to the Senate, less any obligation accrued but not met.

Thus, each committee, desiring extra funds for studies and investigations, will be limited to a certain allotment for 1 year, and must stay within that allotment during that year unless it receives an additional sum by a supplemental resolution. This method also will give more importance and effect to the budgets now submitted by committees for proposed investigations.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will be the total amount appropriated if the resolution is agreed to?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I think I can answer that question. The amount will be \$100,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I shall be glad to discuss the resolution. The chairman asked me to explain it if there were any questions.

The regular appropriation has been \$50,000, and the committee is now asking for \$100,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. For what was the \$50,000 used?

Mr. BUSH. For the ordinary expenses of the committee. The committee has never used it all. Some of it has been turned back to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the money used to employ extra help, or merely to carry on investigations?

Mr. BUSH. It has been employed for both purposes. The money has never all been used. The resolution requests an additional \$50,000 to be used in connection with the proposed investigation of the stock exchanges and a study of the Securities Act of 1934, which the committee unanimously agreed to undertake.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the Senator in support of this resolution.

Is it not true that last year our committee returned \$17,000 out of the \$50,000 appropriated? At our meeting this year we unanimously approved of a general outline of a program which would, we think, require the expenditure, with every dollar well spent, of the usual amount of \$50,000 that goes to the committee. Is not that correct?

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his absolutely correct comments.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that we were unanimously of the opinion that a study—not an investigation, but a study—of the operations of the stock exchange and the whole problem of the stock-exchange question should be undertaken, and that the action of the committee was taken with the support of the president of the stock exchange, who came to Washington and stated to the chairman of the committee that he would be very happy to have such a study continue and that he would cooperate fully? We were unanimously of the opinion that it would be very settling and helpful to our whole economic system and to the peace of mind of the American people to have such a study made, rather than to let their fears be fed, as they are now being fed by some propagandists operating on the stock exchanges?

Mr. BUSH. Again I thank the Senator from Oregon. I think he has very correctly stated the sentiments of the committee in connection with the investigation.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that the committee was unanimously of the opinion that \$50,000 would be an exceedingly economical, reasonable amount of money for such a study, and that if it were not needed, or if the committee did not use the money, based upon past proof which the committee has presented, we would not attempt to spend it uselessly, but would let it revert to the contingent fund?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I sincerely hope the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. I, too, hope that the resolution will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 36) extending the time for a study by the Committee on Foreign Relations on technical assistance and related programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on



page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved", and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to—

(A) studies of technical assistance and other related foreign programs (in connection with S. Res. 214, 83d Cong., 2d sess., agreed to July 6, 1954); and

(B) studies of proposals to amend or otherwise modifying existing international peace and security organizations, including the United Nations (in connection with S. Res. 126, 83d Cong., 1st sess., agreed to July 28, 1953, and S. Res. 193, 83d Cong., 2d sess., agreed to Jan. 26, 1954),

the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$52,000, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate in amounts of no more than \$24,000 for the purposes defined in subsection (A) nor more than \$28,000 for the purposes defined in subsection (B) upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution as originally submitted simply authorized a study of the subject matter, and made the unexpended balance available, without asking for any new money. The amendment provides that the study shall be made, the money for it is actually appropriated, and the unexpended balance is wiped out.

Mr. ELLENDER. What was the amount of the unexpended balance?

Mr. HAYDEN. Fifty-two thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the amount of the unexpended funds from last year, was it?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly the sum, and what is now sought is a new, clean appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 36), as amended, was agreed to.

consideration of Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 37) providing additional funds for the study of strategic and critical materials by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved", and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to proposed and continuing studies of strategic and critical materials, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$70,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the subcommittee has been studying this problem for some time. I am wondering if we might have a report on the progress it has made. What has the subcommittee been doing?

Mr. MURRAY. The committee has been carrying on very extensive investigations, and a partial report has been made. But the committee intends to go forward with other investigations connected with the same matter, namely, all investigation of stockpiling and the need for stockpiles in connection with the national defense.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is that necessary? Why should the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be concerned with such a study?

Mr. MURRAY. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction of mines and mining, and therefore has jurisdiction of this subject, which has previously been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the committee jurisdiction over stockpiling?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the committee had jurisdiction over mining.

Mr. MURRAY. The committee has jurisdiction of the stockpiling of strategic minerals, metals, and similar materials.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the study connected with mining in the United States only?

Mr. MURRAY. It relates also to mining in foreign countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. In foreign countries?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. It is engaged in locating sources of supplies of scarce strategic metals and minerals which might be needed for the national defense. The committee has conducted hearings in South America. The Government itself is already carrying on studies in other countries of the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is any portion of this study being made by specialists now with the committee, for whom provision is made in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are any of the studies being made by the four professional staff members whom the committee is permitted to employ under the Reorganization Act?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. Some of the investigations have been in progress for a considerable time. They are very important.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money is being requested? The resolution does not seem to state the amount.

Mr. MURRAY. Seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money was spent last year?

Mr. MURRAY. The committee retained a certain amount.

Mr. BARRETT. I believe it was \$30,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the committee asking for as much money as was granted last year, or is it requesting more?

Mr. MURRAY. For about the same amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 37), as amended, was agreed to.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 39) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to employ temporary additional assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Adminis-

#### ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR STUDY OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the

tration with an amendment, on page 1, line 1, to strike out all after the word "Resolved," and insert:

That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdictions under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of this committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$60,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the resolution provides for the employment of additional assistants?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are these to be professional assistants?

Mr. MURRAY. The resolution provides for both professional and clerical assistants.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why are they necessary?

Mr. MURRAY. Because of the work which is required to be done. The task to be performed is very difficult and important, and without the necessary assistants it could not be accomplished very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has just been given \$70,000 for some special work related to mining. Why is it necessary to employ additional professional help?

As I pointed out a while ago, under the Reorganization Act each standing committee is allowed \$90,000 with which to operate the committee. With that amount, the committee usually employs 4 professional and 6 clerical employees.

The committee has just obtained \$70,000 to conduct special studies. With that amount I presume professional assistants will be employed. Does the Senator propose in the resolution now under consideration to employ more professional assistants?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I have been appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and because in my previous service in the Senate I was chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I presume to make a remark or two in response to the question of the Senator from Louisiana.

When this committee was organized by reason of the Legislative Reorganiza-

tion Act, it became a combination of five standing committees; namely, the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Mines and Mining, and the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

I have no hesitation in saying that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs extends farther around the world than that of any other committee of the Senate, with the exception of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations, the latter committee providing money for all the activities of the Government.

It is utterly impossible for the members of the committee to give their personal attention to all the research work which must be done if the various tasks imposed on the committee are to be undertaken. I can say that without any hesitation, because I also am guilty, and have been in the past, of some failures along this line. With respect to Indian affairs, for example, they have been honored by neglect rather than by performance during the history of the Government.

If the Senators are to be able to perform their work, it is necessary that they have the assistance of qualified experts to carry on the essential research in order that the Senate may legislate intelligently.

We are now facing a condition in which it is necessary to continue to develop the water resources of the United States. This is not only a matter of dealing with irrigation and reclamation in the Far West, but also with the problem of the falling water table throughout the United States. It is not understood, Mr. President, but the fact is clear, that industry uses more water than it was dreamed, even 20 years ago, it would. Water is being used and consumed in industry to a very great extent. Such studies must be undertaken by men of the highest quality of efficiency.

While it is true that the subcommittee to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred, the Subcommittee on Strategic Minerals, has been awarded an appropriation of \$70,000 for that particular study, there is additional work to be done upon minerals and natural resources of another type.

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] a few moments ago submitted a resolution calling upon the Committee on Appropriations to restore an appropriation for investigation and experimentation in the case of oil shale. That is merely one instance. Another instance I can give relates to coal. How many people realize that the deposits of coal in the United States are greater than those in any other country in the world? How many of us realize that unemployment in the coal-mining industry has been mounting, not only in the West, but in the East? I speak with knowledge about it, because the State of Wyoming has larger coal deposits than has any other State in the Union. As I have said, although the United States has

larger deposits of coal than has any other country in the world, there is serious unemployment in the coal-mining industry.

It is necessary for us to have men who can cooperate with the experts in the Department of the Interior and report to us. The resolution which the junior Senator from Colorado has offered is an illustration in point. That resolution was required because the budget which was submitted by the President contained no appropriation to carry on the experimentation work in the oil-shale demonstration plant at Rifle, Colo. Yet that is of the greatest importance, because in the last world war, World War II, our oil resources abroad were cut off by German submarines. We had to depend upon a stimulation of oil production in the United States. The Congress has just passed a joint resolution dealing with the defense of Formosa, and the 7th Fleet may shortly be called into greater activity than we had hoped would be necessary. Those activities will be motivated by oil.

The studies I have referred to should be continued. The point I am making now is that there is reason to believe, as indicated by the resolution offered by the junior Senator from Colorado, that the action of an executive department—the Interior Department—is not what is desirable in the public interest.

I hope that the Senator from Louisiana will recognize that there is a great demand in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the sort of expert assistance provided for, because the work of the committee is of such a character that it cannot all be done by the members of the committee individually.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say, as the ranking Republican member of the committee, that I have been very much interested in the remarks of the chairman of the committee, and his request, namely, for increased funds for the employment of experts by the committee. Upon both the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], when he was chairman, and the present chairman, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], there have been heaped very burdensome problems, with which they ought not to be expected to contend without a sufficient number of qualified technical assistants, and such assistants are not now available to the committee.

It happens that the subcommittees will cover fields which, as pointed out by the Senator from Wyoming, were, prior to the Reorganization Act, covered by different committees, and the fields are separate and not related. An expert in public lands cannot be used as an expert in irrigation, reclamation, Indian affairs, or mineral matters. Separate experts have to be selected for such tasks. I think there is a great need for such experts in the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to refer to a matter which was just mentioned by the Senator from Colorado. The committee has jurisdiction over such a great diversity of subjects that it is necessary for it to operate through five



standing subcommittees. The committee otherwise would not be able to accomplish the work before it. For instance, in the last session of the Congress the committee considered 511 different bills. On those measures, 264 days of hearings were held. Two hundred and fifty-eight bills were reported to the Senate, of which 171 were enacted into public law and 35 into private law. However, these statistics, impressive as they are, do not by any means give a complete picture of the workload of the committee. There is no question about the need for the funds.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not privileged to serve as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but I wish to bring to the attention of the chairman, who has made a request for additional funds and authorization for the employment of additional assistants on a temporary basis, that for a long period of time there has been in the State which I am privileged in part to represent in the Senate, a desire for a full-scale study by the Interior Department of the peat resources of the State. The matter has been kicked around a long time by the Congress, I may say to the chairman of the committee, but we now have from certain administrative offices an expression of a desire for the Congress to take a good look at these valuable resources of peat. I hope—and I say this only as a suggestion and as a word of admonition, I might add—that the chairman of the committee and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, will look into the possibility of the development of peat and peat resources.

I know that the committee needs the manpower to do the job. This morning, in a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of which I am the acting chairman, we were discussing the General Services Administration and its stockpiling program. For a considerable time it was the duty of the Committee on Government Operations to audit and investigate the stockpiling program. That duty has been taken over by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It places on that committee, and upon its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the additional burden of a full review of the stockpiling program. The committees have to be properly staffed, and the sooner that is done, the better we will be able to do our work.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct, and he may be assured we shall pursue the study to which he has referred.

Mr. President, I submit the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that if the resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee is adopted, the committee will be empowered to employ four additional members on its technical staff. Under the Reorganization Act, the committee now has the right to appoint four specialists. Under the budget presented to the Committee on Rules and Adminis-

tration by the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, the latter committee will employ four technical staff members; in other words, it will double the size of its present technical staff.

Although this change is proposed to be made on a temporary basis, my guess is that the increased staff, if authorized, will remain for an indefinite time in the future. Of course, similar action has been taken by too many other committees; and at every session of Congress we are confronted with resolutions calling for an extension of the same force or, in many cases, an addition to the existing staff.

For the past 9 years the committee has been doing very good work with the staff it now has. Therefore, I do not think it proper, in one swoop, so to speak, to double the size of the staff.

I was very hopeful that the resolution might go over, so that we could look further into the matter. If the resolution as proposed to be amended by the committee is adopted, then, Mr. President, believe me, every standing committee of the Senate will make similar requests.

As I have said, the committee has been doing good work with its present staff. Therefore, to double the size of its staff at this time would be improper, in my opinion, and would merely result in additional expense, whereas we should curtail the expenses of the Senate.

As I expect to point out when similar requests are made by the larger committees, vast sums of money, spent for hearings, are in many cases, spent uselessly. As I have often said, there are on Capitol Hill a large number of professional job hunters who somehow, when once successful in their quest, are very apt to have their jobs perpetuated.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana has gone far afield when he has spoken about job hunters. We are the ones who require the services of technical experts. The Senator from Louisiana cannot be very well informed about the great load of work the committee has to carry. If he were well informed about it, he would not talk so idly about the money being spent in this case. This is a very insignificant amount of money, when we consider the diverse matters and problems which must be considered by the committee.

As I have said, in the last session the committee had 511 bills before it. Already at this session the committee has before it the 68 bills I now have on my desk. Without the requested assistance, we might just as well close up the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that many of the bills before the committee concern the transfer of land titles and therefore are very insignificant?

Mr. MURRAY. Some of them do, but most of them are so important that we have to have expert advice.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such as what?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana thinks the com-

mittee could operate properly in the way he suggests, without proper expert assistance, he is badly mistaken. I now have on my desk printed copies of some of the hearings the committee is conducting. The committee has jurisdiction of some of the most important problems. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has pointed out, no other Senate committee has such far-reaching jurisdiction. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is outstanding in that respect.

So it seems to me that the amount requested is a very insignificant one; and the Senator from Louisiana cannot possibly be well informed regarding this matter, or else he would not talk about it so idly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to remind my good friend the Senator from Montana that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] rose—I am sure the Senator from Montana was here at the time—and said that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the Senate committee which has the most to do.

Furthermore, let me point out that I am chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I, myself, do quite a bit of work on that committee. During the Congress in which I was chairman of the committee—namely, the 82d Congress—I believe my committee did a great deal of work and investigated many matters. I am proud to say that, as chairman of that committee during the 82d Congress, I was able to operate the committee on \$39,050, instead of the \$90,000 which was appropriated for that purpose.

I am hopeful that other committees will follow that example.

The Senate is spending entirely too much money for its operations. It strikes me that something should be done—and done soon—in order to curtail these expenditures. We cannot in good faith ask other branches of the Government to curtail expenses unless we ourselves are willing to take the lead in doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 39), as amended, was agreed to.

#### FELICITATIONS TO MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 61, extending felicitations to Michigan State College on the 100th anniversary of its founding. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 61) was read, as follows:

Whereas February 12, 1955, marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of Michigan State College, the first agricultural college in the United States and the model for the land-grant college system; and

Whereas Michigan State College and other land-grant colleges subsequently established

have improved the American standard of living, helped bring real economic prosperity to the American people, and played an important role in the evolution and development of the American way of life to its present position of world leadership: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the Congress hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to Michigan State College on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding, and joins with the people of the United States in expressing its recognition and appreciation of the role which Michigan State College has played in the establishment of a democratic type of education under which the benefits of higher education and related services have been made available to Americans in every walk of life.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair invites the attention of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be immediately considered.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, as Senators will note, this is a concurrent resolution which has been adopted by the House. The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, who is now occupying the chair, and I planned to submit a similar resolution in this body, conveying felicitations to Michigan State College, one of the great universities of our State, in its celebration on February 12.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and myself, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Civil Defense, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) to provide for a Joint Committee on Civil Defense, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

##### Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Civil Defense to be composed of seven Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four members shall be members of the same political party.

SEC. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and of

problems relating to civil defense. The Federal Civil Defense Administration shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Federal Civil Defense Administration or to civil defense shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to (a) hold such hearings, (b) sit and act at such places and times, (c) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, (d) administer such oaths, (e) take such testimony, (f) procure such printing and binding, and (g) make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me discuss for a few moments the purpose of the concurrent resolution and what it proposes to do.

The concurrent resolution proposes that the joint committee be composed of 7 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 7 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance, not more than four Members shall be members of the same political party.

Our Government has a responsibility to the people of the United States to provide means for their safety and welfare. That responsibility calls for us to prepare our Nation for every eventuality. Our policy as a people is to search for peace and avert war, but we must never allow ourselves in that search to ignore the planning and the preparation in the event of war and in the event of attack.

There is no more vital function being performed by our Government today than that of civil defense. Yet, I must

say that very few subjects of such great importance receive as little attention by the Congress. This is nobody's fault, Mr. President. It is more the reflection of our organization. There is no committee of the Congress with the clear authority or with the staff and primary responsibility to help guide and lead the Congress on this problem.

I point out that civil-defense activities cut across Federal, State, and local jurisdictions. It seems to me that this is one of the most important intergovernmental relations problems we have. Strange as it may seem, in view of the tremendous outlay of funds for national defense and the constant concern which our military authorities express as to the possibility of aerial attacks upon our mainland, the Congress has not as yet taken any forward step in terms of co-operating with or coordinating its efforts with those of the executive branch of the Government on civil-defense programs and development.

We spend billions of dollars to build up our security forces, for research and development of weapons, and to provide our defense forces with mobility and resources, but proper defense means more than a resort to arms. It also means a well-planned program to minimize the effects of destruction in order to save lives and property.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that in my judgment the present Civil Defense Administrator, Mr. Val Peterson, is doing a most commendable job. His seriousness, his energy, and his dedication to his responsibilities have been amply demonstrated to the American people. Working with him there are hundreds of people applying themselves unselfishly and devotedly to the task of civil defense. The agency, however, operates with inadequate appropriations and inadequate guidance from the Congress.

To date we have acted on the assumption that the primary responsibility for civil defense is in our State and local governments. This emphasis should be changed so that it becomes a joint responsibility with the National Government on the one hand and the States and their political divisions on the other. The National Government must be responsible for overall planning, for the development of civil-defense policy and technical guidance, for coordination and leadership of State activities, State facilities, of interstate cooperation, and the sharing of preparedness costs. On the other hand, State and local governments must be responsible for day-to-day planning operations, for the adaptation of national policies to local problems, and for sharing of preparedness costs.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I am privileged to serve as a member, is now giving serious consideration to the whole problem for civil defense and the reduction of urban vulnerability, particularly to aerial attack. I do not know what the Commission will recommend, but I do know once it makes its recommendations Congress should be prepared to study and act upon them seriously and



carefully. There is serious doubt in my mind that the Congress is so organized in its committee system so as to accomplish that objective at this time. I refer to the fact, for example, that in early 1953 Project East River, a broad study of civil defense conducted under the sponsorship of our Government, made more than 200 specific recommendations pertaining to civil defense. So far as I know, the Congress has still not acted on them or given them serious consideration.

Yet the problem remains serious and grows more serious every day as the Soviet Union strengthens itself with bigger and more terrible atomic and hydrogen weapons.

At the present time, more than 71 percent of our Nation's industrial capacity and 54 percent of the workers engaged in manufacturing are located in 50 metropolitan areas. These are areas which are probable targets for attack, and there are many other such areas considered vulnerable.

As a means of reducing the vulnerability of essential industry, a national industrial dispersion policy was promulgated in 1951. This policy directed that applications for tax amortization and for the expansion of defense plants as well as for the allocation of critical materials be reviewed so that new defense plants would be dispersed anywhere from 10 to 20 miles from the target areas. This calls for a cooperative effort by the Department of Defense in awarding contracts and by the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Department of Commerce in issuance of certificates of necessity, allowing an accelerated amortization.

This is a necessary policy. Yet, whatever investigating I have done indicates that the departments and agencies responsible for carrying out this policy have not adhered to it. As a result, our defense plant construction has continued with only the minimum regard to the reduction of vulnerability by dispersion.

There is a serious problem of population density. More than one-fourth of the people live in the 12 largest urban areas. Urban vulnerability to enemy attack is actually increasing at this very moment in spite of the rapid growth of suburban areas, and an attack upon our cities would create casualties of staggering proportions. This problem would, of course, be partially resolved with an effective program of industrial dispersion, but it cannot be ultimately resolved in that manner. We, therefore, face the need in time of crisis to disperse the great numbers of people who will continue to live in the central city areas of the metropolitan centers. Suggestions have been made calling for interspersal of parks and other recreational areas, and, of course, slum clearance is very useful, as well as the development of new suburban residential areas and the dispersal of public housing developments and apartment buildings. Here again is an area which has not yet been acted upon, though the policy is already on its way to formulation.

These are vital questions which are the business of all Americans for the survival

of millions of American people depend on the solution to these questions. These are problems that concern the people's government—the National Government.

The civil defense problem does not arise out of domestic conditions over which the States have control, but as a direct outgrowth of international relations between the United States and other nations. Civil defense is an integral part of our national defense. It is largely interstate in character. Its nature, scope, and severity need national planning, leadership, and direction.

Furthermore, an effective civil defense effort requires financial resources which are beyond the capacities of State and local governments. Were any one State to fail to act, this would in turn do serious damage to other States and to the Nation as a whole.

These are all reasons why the American people have a right to expect leadership from their National Government. They have a right to expect from Congress concerted and careful attention to this problem. They know and we know that a strong civil defense program may cut casualties in half in case of an attack—Gordon Dean, Report on the Atom, 1953, page 129.

Let me bring to the attention of the Senate a statement of an eminent psychologist, Dwight W. Chapman, who said:

The Federal Government has a unique role in providing authoritative information. Whether an individual will act wisely or foolishly during an attack will depend on what he knows. . . . If no proper precautions are made, the already certain casualties and physical damage will be compounded by foolish actions verging on panic.

An effective program means evacuation, and it means an early warning system. It means a dissemination of information so that we develop an informed public.

There is another whole series of problems connected with a possible atomic attack that has scarcely been touched by the Federal Government. The Washington Post and Times Herald reporting on an article by Dr. Hornell Hart, said a Soviet attack on the Nation's Capital would paralyze the Federal Government by obliterating Washington, D. C., as far south as Alexandria, as far north as Chevy Chase, and beyond the city limits to the east.

The Supreme Court, most of the Congress, the President and perhaps all of his successors, all destroyed. Who would carry on? Who would constitute the new Government? Who would be the new commander in chief? What would happen to the records of revenue collection or of Selective Service? Or picture the explosion of an atomic bomb over the financial heart of New York City. The stock exchange would be closed and with it the exchanges across the whole country. New York's banks, the greatest clearing houses of the Nation would be in ruins. What would happen to America's whole credit structure? How would the vast number of bankruptcies caused by the bomb be handled? If we can devise the solutions to some of these prob-

lems now, it will literally be money in the bank when and if the awful eventuality should ever arise.

Mr. President, our problem is not the printing of ration books ahead of time; that is no problem. Our problem is figuring out what would happen if our great, complex industrial society, with great areas of communication, transportation, and industrial production, were disrupted or laid low by atomic attack. The whole Nation depends upon our credit structure. No other nation is so integrated as is ours. All means of communication, whether it be by rail, highway, telephone, telegraph, radio, television, are vital to the efficient functioning of the American economic system. We have done little or nothing to plan ahead as to how we would protect ourselves and protect this lifeline of the vitality of our national well-being.

Prof. David F. Cavers, writing in the excellent periodical, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, has proposed several measures which would help extricate us from the nightmare of business confusion that would follow an atomic attack. Professor Cavers writes:

A plan of protection should start with the banking system. Provision should be made for a bank holiday (probably on a nationwide basis). Advantage should be taken of this to transfer accounts from bombed-out banks to untouched banks by prearranged plan. The microfilm account records that are now going daily to holes in the ground would have been sent to banks chosen for this purpose. . . . Arrangements could be made to initiate a system of emergency loans to be administered by the banks, using Government funds; . . . preservation of a functioning civilian economy would be the objective . . . prompt substitution of drastically revised bankruptcy laws for the cumbersome machinery we worry along with in peacetime . . . the system would have to be free to allocate cases without regard to State lines . . . (authorize) a court to rewrite (long-term) contract terms to conform equitably to the new conditions.

These are just a few of the many proposals made by Professor Cavers and others. The adoption of foresighted measures like these, or the examination of equivalent alternatives, is a step toward the elimination of atomic havoc which must not be forestalled by complacency or preuranium mentality. When the bombs fall, it will be too late for planning. That is my plea.

Mr. President, it is nothing short of shocking to see a nation which spends, on national defense, as this Nation does, as much as \$40 billion or \$50 billion a year, almost totally ignore the protection of the civilian economy.

I submit that no civil defense planning is being carried out in terms of our industrial expansion, in terms of new plants, and in terms of new highways and new rail systems. We are continuing to plan as if the world was still in the Victorian age.

Yet every day of our lives we hear about new atomic tests. As recently as last week we heard of new hydrogen tests in the Soviet Union. Every American from the age of 5 years on knows that the Soviet Union has bombers capable of carrying a destructive attack to

American cities. However, we close our eyes to the realities of protecting our cities. All we do is say that at least 80 percent of the planes would get through and that a maximum of 20 percent of the planes might be stopped. Then we say that we hope somehow or other we will survive. I say that is not the attitude for a responsible government to take.

Industrial and urban dispersion, evacuation rehearsals, provisions for emergency Government credit facilities, duplication of vital Government and business records, succession to office, emergency bankruptcy procedures—these are all matters which must be taken care of now. Of course, it is my prayerful hope that they will never be needed; but one can never be sure. In view of the tense international situation it would appear to me that we should be a little more concerned about our national defense and our civil defense than about our blood banks, even though I believe that blood banks are important.

Yet, Mr. President, I am sorry to say the initiative for such action seems to have been largely lacking in Congress—and I say this without partisanship. Preceding administrations did not do very much in this area, either. However, Mr. President, as we consider the full portent of a problem we have largely ignored, we recognize the fact that this is a condition we cannot allow to persist.

We, therefore, have proposed the creation of a special Joint Committee on Civil Defense. This committee would have the responsibility of drafting and introducing legislation to take care of America's civil-defense needs. Its activities would focus the public's attention on this vital problem and would bring to light the full information which is necessary for an intelligent public response. Moreover, such a committee would soon constitute itself the spokesman for America's civil-defense needs. Having become aware of the terrifying portent of the problem, no such committee would allow Congress to shunt aside the urgent requests for civil defense and offer appropriations which put such an insignificant price on the safety of the American public.

I fully realize that the suggestion for the creation of such a Joint Committee on Civil Defense is not one to be made lightly. There are already many demands being made on Congress' time. For a while I thought that possibly the establishment of a Special Commission on Civil Defense might suffice. I proposed such a commission some 3 years ago. Then I considered the manifest task of Congress is to provide for the present welfare of the Nation and to promote the future. But to what avail is our concern for the farmer's, the worker's, the businessman's prosperity if we do not exert every effort in insuring their security in the face of the greatest threat that has ever menaced our civilization?

This will cost money. Of course, it will, but I want to point out to the Senate the recent study sponsored by the National Planning Association, which demonstrates that the United States

could appreciably add to its defense budget without sapping its economic strength—Gerhard Colm, Can We Afford Additional Programs for National Security? October 1953. Defense spending, rising gradually above current levels at a rate of \$10 billion a year by 1956 would—given a normal growth of the economy—neither interfere with further economic expansion nor prevent a continuing rise of civilian consumption. It would, in fact, even permit tax reductions without any direct controls over spending. A larger increase by \$20 billion per year would still permit per-capita consumption to rise moderately and net investments to increase, provided the labor force were somewhat expanded and the average work week somewhat lengthened—and this could be achieved by only continuing 1953 rates of taxation or their equivalent.

Mr. President, I make note of the fact in the RECORD that these observations were made by distinguished economists. They are not my personal observations, and I cite them to show the problem of defense and its cost.

It is in this spirit of urgency and deep concern that I have addressed myself to a topic which apparently has no political appeal and which is of little or no national interest. But I want to be on the record now, as a Member of the United States Senate, as saying that the Government has been derelict in its responsibility for the protection of the people. A defense structure has been planned which provides a defense in conventional military terms without any thinking having been done to provide an appropriate organization for the protection of the civilian population.

In an age of intercontinental bombers, guided missiles, and hydrogen bombs, I submit that Congress is, in effect, back in the horse-and-buggy days with respect to civil defense. We appropriate money for modern warfare, for thermonuclear weapons, for guided missiles, and for bacteriological warfare, but we persist in conducting our civil defense program as if we were in the age of William Tell, or were dealing with the oldest cannon of pre-Revolutionary days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing in the November 29, 1953, issue of the New Leader, entitled "Safety From Atomic Attack," by Richard Bolling and Lewis Anthony Dexter; also, an article, Is United States Civil Defense Adequate? from the Congressional Quarterly of June 18, 1954.

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

[From the New Leader of November 29, 1953]

#### SAFETY FROM ATOMIC ATTACK

(By Richard Bolling and Lewis Anthony Dexter)

American military defense policy may be thought of as a chair with two legs which reach the ground, a third which is viciously foreshortened, and a fourth which is a mere stub. This article deals with the fourth leg—safety against attack, ways and means of making it less effective for an enemy to attack with A-bombs and H-bombs. Since the significance of this fourth leg lies in

its relationship to the other three, let us first identify them.

The first leg may be seen as representing hardware, the weapons of massive retaliation. Obviously, without such weapons we would be naked in a world of power politics; but, it should be emphasized, the very notion of retaliation presupposes that the enemy first attacks us.

The second leg stands for the military aspects of defense—radar screens, continental air defense and the rest, which may permit us to detect and knock out some attacking enemy bombers. However, the situation here seems to be still generally the same as when the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, then Air Chief of Staff, wrote: "Should war come, we can be expected to destroy no more than 30 percent of the planes making an attack in strength on the United States before their bombing missions are accomplished." (Saturday Evening Post, February 19, 1951.) In other words, this system of continental defense presupposes an attack—and an attack which will be successful in damaging and perhaps ruining many of our big cities.

The third, foreshortened leg stands for immediate pre- and post-attack civilian defense. Civilian defense concentrates on mass evacuation before an attack, putting out fires, rebuilding telephone lines, rescuing the wounded, etc. All these things presuppose that the enemy successfully completes a most unpleasant attack—or at least threatens to do so. An effective program of civilian defense could mean the difference between a rapid resumption of military production and public services in many areas and a situation so catastrophic that we could not continue fighting. Consequently, one of our pressing needs at present is to rescue the Federal civil defense program from the no-man's land of buck passing to which an unrealistic notion of States' rights has condemned it.

But the fourth leg—safety from attack—still remains to be considered. A group of scientists and scholars over the last 8 years have pointed out that the basic reason why we must fear the atomic bomb is that we are all bunched up together like lambs in a slaughterhouse. The 67 critical target areas contain most of our productive resources—including defense factories and a lot of skilled people. We must, these scholars have pointed out, spread out, or in the event of a war we shall surely perish, individually and perhaps nationally.

For instance, an editorial in the September 1951 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists said: "Dispersal is the only measure which could make an atomic super-Pearl Harbor impossible . . . . The most exhaustive preparations for (civilian defense), while they can promise a considerable reduction in the number of casualties, could do little to protect the production facilities of an attacked city—facilities whose incapacitation is likely to be the prime aim of the attack."

The reasons why this is so have been cogently, patiently, carefully, scientifically, and persuasively presented in a series of publications, the most notable of which is probably Project East River, part V (published by Associated Universities, New York, 1952). This report should have set off wide discussion, but, in fact, it has been almost completely ignored; as of July 1951 neither Harvard nor MIT even had library copies.

These arguments were cogent, careful, scientific, and persuasive to those who read them. But they were and are largely, though not entirely, ineffective; the national industrial-dispersion policy, announced by the President in the summer of 1951, has never been broadly implemented, and, by and large, since then, target cities have kept on growing faster than the rest of the country. For example, there is every reason to suppose that about 30 percent of all investment in plants in metropolitan areas during



the last 3 years has been in the central target areas. (The city manager of Cambridge, Mass., was quoted in July 1954 as urging that Cambridge, which is right in the heart of a high-priority area, start to build skyscrapers.)

It is only fair to say that the use of certificates of necessity sometimes has encouraged new construction outside rather than inside target areas. But what has been done has been only a drop in the bucket compared with what could be done.

To be sure, a number of communities, under some prodding from Federal authorities, have formed industrial-dispersion committees. The chairman of the New Haven committee said in the spring of 1954: "Industrial dispersion is not accepted as practical. Most people recognize the sense of it but don't want to face up to its implications." In San Diego, the assistant city manager says: "There have been no cases of [industrial dispersion] in the last 2 years." A member of the industrial-dispersion committee in a New England area says: "As a matter of fact, there is a conflict between the idea of industrial dispersion from a defense and security point of view and the attitudes of our local civil organizations with respect to holding industry within the city." Dudley Harmon of Boston says: "Our committee [on industrial dispersion] seems destined for complete inactivity."

Basically, the Federal Government has merely given undramatically presented advice on industrial dispersion and on some means of making cities less attractive targets. It has then chiefly left things up to the individual manufacturer, institution or worker. That is what Senator Norris used to call the "lazy fairy" notion of government run mad.

It is about as sensible as it would be for the Federal Government to proclaim that in order to defend ourselves we need battle-ships, tanks, airplanes, guns, uniforms, trained officers, etc., and then to leave it up to the manufacturers or the cities to produce them. If the Federal Government wants weapons or officers, it has to supply incentives for producing or training them; otherwise, since what is everybody's business is nobody's business, we would all be left defenseless. Similarly, if we want safety, we have to provide incentives for those who can secure it.

A coauthor of this article, Representative BOLLING, has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives which is directed toward finding out how we can most effectively and inexpensively purchase safety by using space. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, introduced a similar resolution in the Senate last July and, in his remarks explaining the meaning of the resolution, discussed the possible establishment of an urban decentralization authority. Like any proposal for a legislative investigation, the Bolling proposal is not altogether new and has numerous ancestors and antecedents. But it goes well beyond any previous proposal in that it assumes that it is and should be national policy to use all the economic powers of the Federal Government to encourage industrial dispersion wherever such use will increase the safety of the country.

How can and should this be done?

At present, nobody knows very clearly; and, consequently, the gist of the Bolling proposal is the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Economics of Atomic Defense, which would "conduct a special study of the ways in which existing and proposed Federal economic powers and programs can make their greatest contribution to defense against modern atomic attack."

The resolution declares that "it is the purpose of this resolution to bring before the Congress and the American people the best

judgments of scientists, lay leaders and congressional experts on the effect of the H-bomb or its successors on existing concentrations of population and industry; the possibilities for defense measures within those areas; the degree to which industrial dispersion and urban decentralization can be expected to reduce the dangers of present-day atomic warfare; the length of time and the scale of action necessary to arrange for dispersion and relocation of population and industry now in target areas; and the ways in which the Federal Government in cooperation with State and local governments can, within our free-enterprise system, contribute to such dispersal or relocation policies through its monetary, credit and fiscal policies and through purchases and construction, aids to education, health and welfare, the regulation of transportation, and other programs or policies affecting the pattern of the Nation's economic development." Congress has, of course, adjourned since the Bolling and Humphrey resolutions were introduced, but they will be reintroduced next year.

We hope that investigation and analysis by such a committee will lead to the invention of better ways of making us safer from attack than anything we now propose. Indeed, one of the biggest arguments for such a committee is simply that it may focus attention and discussion on the question: How can we best preserve our lives and our civilization against atomic attack?

But, in any case, the first, obvious task of such an investigation would be to find out how and where the H-bomb and other developments of the last 3 years affect the conclusions of Project East River about how far we must spread out to be safe. This, in itself, is a question on which we must rely upon scientific judgment; but it seems probable that the area of great danger is considerably smaller than most people (or chambers of commerce) now fear. If so, this is of considerable importance; it means that industries can remain at their present locations.

However, whatever the facts are, they should be established, and the first function of the committee will be to summarize and interpret them so that the people can understand what decisions must be made.

Having done this, we are inclined to believe that the committee will decide to explore and make recommendations on the following points:

1. New building: The major target cities add new buildings each year which altogether is the equivalent of four Bostons. That is, we make the target cities more attractive to attack—and less safe to live in—by something like this amount.

Through mortgage insurance, housing loans, and taxes, the Federal Government can influence who builds what where. It could shut off new building almost entirely in obvious target areas by refusing to give the same tax and loan considerations to building there as elsewhere. If a firm knows that it can deduct all expenses from gross—from the top—if it builds in Brunswick, Md., for instance, but not if it builds in Baltimore, it is likely to build in Brunswick; if, at the same time, Federal loan and mortgage policy makes it less profitable to build new houses or new department stores in Baltimore than in Brunswick, new buildings of this sort will take place in Brunswick and not in Baltimore.

So stated, the problem seems simple. But it isn't. Only a few firms should be encouraged to build in Brunswick; otherwise, Brunswick itself would become a new target area. And under what circumstances does an addition to plant get counted as new building? Who shall make the decision on such knotty points as this: Radcliffe College builds a new center for graduate students: Is it

new building? And what if a manufacturer puts a new wing on a plant? And in order to avoid fire storms, if for no other reason, slum clearance in target cities is still highly desirable, how can it be encouraged if new housing is not to be built in its place and the land is to be turned (as for safety it should be) into parks?

2. Vital products and services: Many basic national products and services are manufactured or developed entirely in target cities. In some cases, if the target cities were to be destroyed the goods and services could not be obtained elsewhere. Probably many essential parts of vital weapons are now produced exclusively in target cities; if several of these cities were knocked out, our capacity to retaliate would be much reduced or destroyed altogether. Conversely, then, our capacity to retaliate would be increased by some measure of dispersion.

At present, the purchasing agents for the Defense Department do not systematically take the contractor's safety from attack into account in placing contracts. Congress should make it unmistakably clear that they should do so. But, here again, the problem is complicated. Some order of priority needs to be set up. It matters relatively little if a contractor engaged in making uniform buttons is bombed out; some substitute can doubtless be found, and in all probability other button manufacturers in smaller cities can, at need, replace the defunct button king.

But, on the other hand, along the Charles River in Boston and Cambridge there is a terrifying concentration of scientific research, most of it defense oriented, all of it with defense implications. And it is right at the center of a target area. Yet, the Defense Department has kept on placing contracts with MIT, Harvard, and adjacent institutions; in most cases, new contracts have led to an even greater concentration of research talent in the field under study by bringing more specialists to Cambridge. But, in most instances, with some effort and perhaps at a slightly greater cost, it would have been possible to place the contracts at institutions like Cornell, the University of Missouri, the University of New Hampshire, or the University of the South, at Sewanee, Tenn.

3. Government operations: The Government itself is a prime offender in making life unsafe for everybody. The Federal Civilian Defense Administrator has often declared that he thinks Washington is the No. 1 target for any enemy. Yet only one Federal agency, the Federal Civilian Defense Administration itself, has actually arranged to move in order to meet the atomic threat.

The National Security Resources Board proposed plans, which were approved by President Truman, for dispersing essential governmental bodies into units so scattered that an A-bomb attack would use too much of the enemy's power to be worthwhile. This proposal, which seems the most obvious commonsense, has run up against a stone wall of indifference and hostility. Commonsense, similarly, would suggest dispersing Federal agencies out of metropolitan New York and San Francisco.

4. Inducements and compensations: A basic reason why the Federal Government has been unable to persuade itself to seek safety, so to speak, is the unwillingness of its employees to move. Indeed, at present writing it appears probable that a substantial number of Federal Civil Defense Administration employees will refuse to move to Battle Creek and will transfer or resign. They own houses, their children go to school in Washington, a wife or husband works in Washington and cannot find employment in Battle Creek, they like the metropolitan atmosphere of Washington, and so on.

All this proves, of course, that it is awfully hard to persuade a man who lives on a volcano to get off it—tomorrow never comes. So, no doubt, the elegant Romans of Britain in 390 A. D. would have disregarded any warning that they had better get out while the getting was good; 10 to 15 years later, most of them had been killed off or enslaved by the barbarian invaders.

Such historical parallels are unlikely to be convincing without the provision of concrete inducements. These the Federal Government can offer, if it will, to its employees in large measure. For instance, the Government could—and perhaps should—assume carrying charges on houses which are vacated and cannot be sold as a result of its requiring employees to move. In instances where employees suffer a loss because, for instance, a wife has to give up a job, a very substantial nontaxable cost of moving bonus should be provided; and, furthermore, the United States Employment Service or some similar agency should provide special aid and help in getting new jobs for displaced wives. The Government cannot exactly transfer Maryland schools to Battle Creek, but there should be legislation permitting it to give aid to Battle Creek schools as federally impacted areas immediately, before the move takes place.

The biggest obstacle to getting people to move out of cities is that they will miss some service that they are accustomed to. In some cases, for instances, there might be considerable movement to a town without obstetricians. In such cases, inducements should probably be provided for specialists to move into the area. A parallel has already been provided by loan programs for GIs entering business, and no doubt such legislation could be adapted to help those establishing new businesses or professional services in towns showing a population increase because of spreading out from the cities.

5. Transportation: This problem of services could also be tackled by improving our transportation arrangements between smaller towns. At present, roads, railroads and bus schedules spread out from the big city like spokes from the hub of a wheel. This means that people who want any sort of service—use of a big library, beauty treatment, medical care from a specialist, a chance to see the Pajama Game—have to go into the city. Consequently, the daytime population of cities is needlessly large, and anybody who lives outside the city is at a disadvantage. But if there were easy rapid transit between the smaller suburbs and outlying districts—that is, from spoke to spoke, rather than through the hub—the difficulties involved in getting people to move out would be reduced. In some instances, all the Government would need to do would be to provide subsidies to the bus companies for more frequent bus trips. In other cases, it would need to stimulate—financially—the building of roads or bridges, or the development of ferry services.

There are, no doubt, dozens of other ways in which people could be persuaded to seek safety by spreading out. Very likely many of these ways, if adopted, would be equally effective. The actual problems are: (1) What proposals would be adopted with the least resistance and resentment? (2) What proposals permit the most economical and effective administration? Discussion anywhere, but particularly before a congressional committee, will throw a good deal of light on what will be accepted most readily and some on the problems and difficulties of administration.

But public discussion of this sort can have even greater value. It might dispel the deadly lethargy of hopelessness about the possibility of effective defense against H-bomb attack. It might then reveal alternative methods of defense among which an

informed choice could be made. And this could have consequences far beyond the military field.

[From the Congressional Quarterly of June 18, 1954]

IS UNITED STATES CIVIL DEFENSE ADEQUATE?—CONGRESS, SOON TO SET FCDA BUDGET, SURVEYS 4-YEAR PROGRESS OF COMBINED FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL EFFORT TO PREPARE NATION AGAINST SNEAK ATOMIC ATTACK

Every American who watched the televised explosion of an atomic bomb last year or recently saw films of the detonation of a hydrogen bomb, dramatically was made aware of the urgent need for preparedness against enemy attack.

On the other hand, motorists who have traveled on civil defense highways dotted with signs warning that "this road will be closed" to all but military traffic in case of enemy attack, and all who have heard the warning sirens or scuttled for shelter during a test-attack drill, know of increasing preparation against a sudden and devastating attack.

President Eisenhower said April 30, "The task of civil defense is vital to our national life. It demands preparedness that can do more than limit the damage of wartime disaster. It means developing a preparedness, a vigilance, so impressive as to deter aggression itself. This awareness must touch every community, every citizen of our land."

#### PREPARATION COUNTS

The Federal Civil Defense Administration, set up in 1950, is dedicated to this principle that every ounce of preparation is worth a pound of security.

How great is the threat? In a recent report (H. Rept. 1340), the House Armed Services Committee said "It is believed that this country is in as much danger of enemy attack, if not more, than when Congress" first set up the FCDA. The unresolved Korean problem, fighting in Indochina, and Communist control in Guatemala have heightened United States—and world—tensions.

The possibility of an onslaught against the United States must be weighed in the light of these assumptions: The United States does not have a monopoly on atomic or hydrogen weapons; the Soviet Union, according to the FCDA, "is now capable of striking any target within the United States, probably with nuclear weapons delivered by air;" and that, as President Eisenhower said, "the awful arithmetic of the atomic bomb" allows no one to think that even the most powerful defense can "guarantee absolute safety for the cities and citizens of any nation."

#### BOOM. THEN DEATH, DESTRUCTION

The FCDA estimates that in an area eight-tenths of a square mile, hit directly and without warning by 1 of the smaller atomic bombs, 90 persons out of every 100 would die, no one would escape injury, and destruction would be almost complete.

FCDA has prepared a list of 193 potential atomic target areas, of which 70, with the greatest concentration of population and industry, are cited as critical target areas. These 70 critical targets, which include 92 key cities in 29 States, comprise less than 3 percent of the Nation's area but have a population of about 68 million, or almost half the national total.

Immediate civil-defense problems are how to give cities adequate advance warning of an enemy attack (present advance notice: About 20 minutes. This is expected to be lengthened to an hour's warning time by mid-1955), disperse the population from congested areas and provide adequate shelter.

Civil defense planning and activities to meet these problems are increasing. Numerous test drills, evacuations and "take shel-

ter" exercises have been held, and the first Nation-wide test was conducted June 14-15. "Operation Alert" involved a mock atomic attack on 41 key United States cities. Canada joined in this test.

More than half the attack-warning systems planned have been completely installed.

By the end of 1953, at least 32 States had mutual-aid civil defense compacts, more than 4.5 million persons had been assigned to civil defense jobs (however, this was only about a third of the number required), and more than 4,000 key personnel had completed FCDA staff and instructor training courses. The FCDA stockpile of emergency supplies and equipment is growing, while the CONELRAD (public emergency radio broadcasting) system became operative May 15, 1953.

The FCDA describes its "primary pre-attack function" as "helping the States and local communities in making preparations to protect life and property in case of enemy attack or other civil defense emergency." The States and the Federal Government have spent millions in this effort, with State and local organizations carrying the primary operational responsibility.

#### FUNDS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

In a budget that calls for cuts in fiscal 1955 funds for most Federal departments and agencies, President Eisenhower has asked Congress to grant for fiscal 1955 almost twice the amount appropriated for civil defense in fiscal 1954.

If the lawmakers grant the full \$85,750,000 requested the fiscal 1955 appropriation will be the largest in any year since creation of the FCDA in 1950 and almost half the entire amount appropriated in the 4-year period. However, in the past Congress has sharply pared Presidential requests for civil defense funds. In 1954, after President Eisenhower sought \$150 million and the House voted \$37,700,000, Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, told a Senate committee that the United States was "living in a fool's paradise" in its reluctance to spend for civil defense. In the end, Congress restored some of the funds, appropriating \$46,525,000.

Congress appropriated \$191,585,000 for civil defense in the fiscal years 1951 through 1954. Of that total, \$29,835,000 was for FCDA operations, \$58,250,000 for Federal grants to States, and \$103,500,000 for emergency supplies and equipment. This table shows how appropriations have compared with Presidential requests:

Fiscal year	Civil defense appropriation	Presidential requests
1951.....	\$26,750,000	\$403,000,000
1952.....	75,310,000	535,000,000
1953.....	43,000,000	600,000,000
1954.....	46,525,000	150,000,000
1955.....	85,750,000	85,750,000

Congress has not yet acted on the fiscal 1955 appropriation. However, the comparison indicates that in the past it never has considered the need as urgent as did the executive branch.

#### CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

It was not until 5 years after the first atomic bombs fell on Nagasaki and Hiroshima that Congress in 1950 acted to set up civil defense plans against any such attack on the United States civilian population. With the end of World War II, the threat of attack had receded, but the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in 1950 gave new impetus to the drive in Congress for a civil-defense program.

As they began work on civil-defense legislation, the lawmakers were aware of the atomic bomb as the major threat. A dispute arose between the Joint Committee on



Atomic Energy and the Senate Armed Services Committee over which group should handle the pending civil-defense bills. The armed services unit won out with its argument that an atomic attack wasn't the only kind that could be made on the United States.

On December 20, 1950, the House passed its version of the Federal Civil Defense Act, on a 247-to-1 rollcall. The only opponent of the bill, Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, Michigan, charged it was open to "boondoggling." The Senate passed its legislation December 22, and in January of 1951 a compromise bill was agreed to. The measure became law January 12, 1951. (Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. VI, 1950, pp. 458-462.)

The bill established a permanent Federal Civil Defense Administration, with an Administrator empowered to:

Prepare and direct civil defense planning, provide for civil defense communications and a system of warnings of enemy attack, develop measures to protect persons and property from such attack, and conduct training programs for civil defense officials and instructors.

Encourage States to make interstate pacts for mutual aid in case of attack; make financial contributions on a matching basis to States for civil defense; utilize the services of other Federal agencies, and, with their consent, of State and local agencies; establish security regulations with mandatory loyalty oaths for all Federal civil defense employees.

The bill also created a Civil Defense Advisory Council, consisting of 12 members to be appointed by the President—3 to be representatives of State governments, 3 of political subdivisions of the States, and the rest from among United States citizens.

The measure provided that the President or Congress (by concurrent resolution) could proclaim the existence of a civil defense emergency, and gave the President and the Civil Defense Administrator emergency powers to meet such a situation.

The declaration of policy carried in the law set the pattern of responsibility for civil defense planning with these words: "It is \* \* \* declared to be the policy and intent of Congress that this responsibility for civil defense shall be vested primarily in the several States and their political subdivisions. The Federal Government shall provide necessary coordination and guidance."

#### NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR: CONGRESS AND CIVIL DEFENSE

The Nation's current civil-defense efforts are geared to preparing for and minimizing the effects of a possible attack. There is a distinct line between this education-for-survival program and the actual defense of the Nation against an attempted attack, which is a military function handled mainly by the Defense Department and the National Security Council.

In April alone, nine resolutions (H. J. Res. 491-496, 499, 501, and 503) were introduced in the House, all designed to make the Federal Civil Defense Administration a separate executive department with wider power and a Secretary who would be a member of the National Security Council. A similar resolution (H. J. Res. 540) was offered June 1 by Representative PETER W. RODINO, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, who said the need was for a realistic civil-defense program thoroughly integrated with our continental-defense system.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, charged April 12 that "civil defense is completely inadequate and unless improved it will become a national scandal." He called for greater "Federal leadership in the field of civilian defense." Said, "we can-

not divorce the problem of civilian defense from military defense."

#### DEPARTMENT STATUS

Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, Republican, of New York, and Representative Charles R. Howell, Democrat of New Jersey, have offered resolutions (H. Con. Res. 233 and H. J. Res. 510) aimed at establishing FCDA as an executive department within the Department of Defense. RIEHLMAN criticized the present civil defense setup as a "loose confederation of individual State programs," and called it obsolete. He said, "Civil defense must be considered as a part of our military planning." Along the same lines, Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Democrat of Colorado, February 15 introduced a bill (S. 2943) which would transfer the powers, duties, and functions of the FCDA to the National Guard Bureau of the Department of the Army.

The lawmakers are also concerned about the disruptive effects of an atomic attack on the functioning of Congress. The Senate June 4 passed on a 70-1 rollcall, a measure (S. J. Res. 39) proposing a constitutional amendment to permit State governors to appoint temporary Members of the House of Representatives whenever a national emergency or disaster creates vacancies in more than 145 House seats. Governors can make temporary appointments to fill Senate vacancies. But under present law, House vacancies must be filled by special elections, and it was argued, this usually requires at least 60 days and might paralyze the work of Congress if too many House Members became casualties in an atomic or other attack.

Congress May 20 also gave final approval to a bill (H. R. 7308, Public Law 383) extending the standby emergency powers of the President and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to June 30, 1958. These powers would be employed in case of imminent or actual attack.

The highway-aid bill approved this year (Public Law 350, 83d Cong.) includes a provision authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to consult with the FCDA head on the civil defense aspect of highways to be built or improved.

#### CIVIL DEFENSE SINCE WORLD WAR I

Nineteen hundred and sixteen: Congress created the Council of National Defense composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

Nineteen hundred and forty-one: The Office of Civilian Defense was created by Executive Order 8757. It was subsequently abolished on June 30, 1945, by Executive Order 9562.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six: The War Department created the War Department Civil Defense Board to determine what should be civil-defense policies, responsibilities, and organization on Federal, State, and local levels. Maj. Gen. Harold R. Bull headed the Board.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven: General Bull's group issued a report calling for creation of an effective national civil defense program under civilian authority, with the Secretary of the Armed Forces responsible for additional overall civil defense planning. The Board recommended that planning begin at once.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight: The Secretary of Defense established the Office of Civil Defense Planning to prepare a United States civil defense program and a plan for a permanent Federal civil defense agency that would work with the States and local government in preparing a civil defense against enemy attack on the United States. The late Russell J. Hopley was named as Director.

In November 1948 the OCDP submitted a report recommending: A National Office of Civil Defense to lead in organizing and train-

ing people for civil defense tasks with basic responsibility for operations held by States and local communities; special preparations to meet hazards of an atomic attack, or any other enemy attack on the United States with modern weapons.

#### Planning assigned to NSRB

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine: Basing his action on wartime civil defense, and the Bull and OCDP reports, the President assigned the National Security Resources Board (created by Congress in 1947) to take over civil-defense planning.

The first two NSRB advisory bulletins on civil defense were sent to State governors.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: Additional civil-defense bulletins were issued which: Dealt with medical aspects of atomic weapons; announced training courses for key personnel in radiological monitoring; suggested the State approach to civil-defense planning; and defined the role of the American Red Cross in civil defense.

President Truman September 18 sent to Congress the NSRB report entitled "United States Civil Defense," which set forth the basic civil-defense plan. He recommended Federal civil-defense legislation and creation of a civil-defense agency.

On December 1 the President issued Executive Order 10186 establishing the Federal Civil Defense Administration in the Executive Office of the President to "promote and facilitate the civil defense of the United States in cooperation with the several States."

Congress began work on civil-defense measures.

#### Defense Act passed

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one: The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 became Public Law 920 on January 12. The act created permanent FCDA, outlined its job, and gave the President and its Administrator emergency powers for civil-defense purposes.

By Executive Order 10222 on March 8, many of the functions, property, and records of the National Security Resources Board which related to civil defense were transferred to the FCDA.

By Executive Order 10248 on May 11, many of the powers and functions under the First War Powers Act of 1941, as amended, were extended to FCDA. These powers related to engaging in emergency, developmental, specialized, and other contracts.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two: Public Law 268, 82d Congress, amended the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to permit limitations on Federal contributions for civil defense to be varied for the Territory of Alaska. And Public Law 412, 82d Congress, amended the Civil Defense Act to authorize the FCDA Administrator to lease property for civil-defense purposes, but barred him from acquiring title to such property without authorization from Congress.

By Executive Order 10346, President Truman, April 17, directed all Federal agencies and departments to prepare civil-defense emergency plans.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three: Outgoing President Truman, January 16, issued Executive Order 10427, authorizing the FCDA to direct Federal agencies to provide aid in major disasters, coordinate activities and plans involving Federal aid in disasters, and foster development of plans on a State and local level to cope with such disasters.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four: Executive Order 10529, President Eisenhower, April 22, directed that Federal employees be made available for participation in State and local civil-defense preemergency-training programs.

## Civil Defense: Money and manpower

	Federal grants, (fiscal 1951-53)	Federal grants, (fiscal 1954-55)	Major items in Federal grants through June 30, 1953					1953 CD workers	
			Health and weapons	Fire services	Training and education	Communications	Warning devices	Required	Enrolled-assigned
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama	\$264,318	\$209,170		\$120,159	\$39,274	\$69,126	\$33,661	\$451,753	\$27,136
Arizona	52,254	51,208		3,585	23,796	5,167	18,412	70,202	21,891
Arkansas	15,944	130,452		12,437	807	2,700		115,500	26
California	6,027,412	723,219	\$2,088,384	1,346,611	1,245,047	648,742	437,142	1,030,113	637,502
Colorado	114,346	90,531	15,891	24,468	33,094	9,642	29,869	155,818	33,705
Connecticut	714,303	137,130	318,426	171,126	65,761	70,216	62,979	200,600	102,994
Delaware	440,073	21,735	48,747	227,917	32,664	88,923	27,647	43,722	8,679
Florida	99,734	189,325	3,192	1,553	18,985	49,171	300,417	300,417	72,965
Georgia	359,791	235,326	511	168,174	11,088	55,936	54,951	414,794	49,421
Idaho		40,215						52,907	14,979
Illinois	1,172,362	595,192	16,869	780,354	22,828	164,891	174,950	1,345,151	168,143
Indiana	344,111	268,779	55,190	164,451	49,878	10,175	38,230	135,416	24,416
Iowa	64,856	179,067		25,932	15,423	4,494		47,618	9,713
Kansas	275,389	130,168	57,778	67,783	90,940	22,715	35,627	177,460	29,019
Kentucky	132,524	201,180	14,847	72,388	13,502	26,435		134,540	35,969
Louisiana	315,010	183,330	499	184,251	45,902	60,429	20,977	195,509	66,634
Maine	84,854	62,422	23,729		26,510	9,377		33,934	23,308
Maryland	934,200	160,072	418,753	28,394	158,302	128,904	170,336	274,192	71,510
Massachusetts	1,639,924	320,449	781,688	262,927	148,976	155,172	210,976	641,930	216,300
Michigan	994,954	435,298	206,525	279,048	205,620	172,937	106,550	474,174	151,953
Minnesota	391,364	203,752	54,204	91,363	70,040	16,878	65,083	519,980	106,073
Mississippi	29,932	148,858			503	17,591	10,250	56,890	1,527
Missouri	425,939	270,175	11,630	212,085	22,776	51,139	106,268	298,790	98,170
Montana	16,935	40,373		11,253		4,579		43,334	19,974
Nebraska	92,299	90,552	12,912		27,868	34,119	17,400	99,196	40,666
Nevada	18,674	10,941			18,627			15,139	5,308
New Hampshire	40,971	36,435	14,177		14,889	11,231		19,743	19,743
New Jersey	1,231,972	330,340	369,612	519,076	105,016	132,275	45,427	231,875	231,875
New Mexico		46,536						21,751	9,638
New York	8,507,539	1,013,155	3,764,341	1,638,508	1,081,399	1,130,680	523,929	2,209,185	944,450
North Carolina	57,984	277,504	19,520	13,335	1,576	4,569	13,647	203,500	40,043
North Dakota	22,497	42,336	827		21,670			32,465	23,292
Ohio	2,304,548	542,892	600,209	524,928	315,364	165,919	454,754	860,800	198,800
Oklahoma	238,076	132,575	12,430	58,691	3,197	161,960	1,585	189,896	20,197
Oregon	351,833	103,929	109,470	84,748	54,386	46,984	39,695	111,619	28,141
Pennsylvania	4,051,078	717,192	1,549,234	1,590,390	235,672	295,657	243,988	324,000	324,000
Rhode Island	185,080	54,096	10,350	87,803	14,252	41,778	25,424	69,334	29,244
South Carolina	9,645	144,627	53		9,557			3,136	1,211
South Dakota	787	44,593			787			25,880	16,854
Tennessee	566,212	224,878	86,767	219,813	69,997	104,821	72,808	275,037	54,374
Texas	337,150	526,816	225	37,018	37,018	54,215	57,775	440,000	112,058
Utah	58,119	47,061	6,803	5,240	23,645	18,574	1,794	39,675	5,347
Vermont	42,504	25,809			27,328	3,934		31,520	17,713
Virginia	448,911	226,726	66,778	136,604	63,298	76,016	83,805	177,700	76,166
Washington	772,530	162,529	277,574	143,883	88,280	107,280	226,720	226,720	79,018
West Virginia	20,285	137,014	3,536		1,025	8,120	7,263	173,257	28,680
Wisconsin	337,244	234,643	155,988	8,635	46,437	78,258	45,278	359,283	73,987
Wyoming	12,586	19,845			3,682	757	8,100	28,884	6,494
Alaska	411,663	8,788	57,608	132,055	26,727	75,298	98,392	9,972	5,063
Guam	22,121	4,064	661		6,113	5,750	4,928	6,598	3,764
Hawaii	206,123	34,146	197,401	7,049	51,960	6,759		70,485	26,444
Puerto Rico	297,500	151,032	59,179	100,674	75,407	58,071	4,169	211,200	91,198
Virgin Islands	614	1,817			614			646	332
District of Columbia	170,511	54,799	97,747		255	198	72,311	191,358	55,088
Total	35,792,318	10,500,000	11,594,998	9,693,140	4,758,641	4,419,276	3,587,831	13,864,578	4,561,195

1 Initial allocations (as of Apr. 30, 1954).

Source: Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to summarize by saying:

First. There is no absolute military defense—a realistic view is that in case of attack some attackers will pierce the best active defense that can be provided. An active civil defense can save literally millions of lives which cannot be saved by any military countermeasure.

Second. Everyone in the country is involved in civil defense; the thermonuclear bomb has changed the character of warfare and our civil defense because it affects a vast area and crosses State and national political boundaries as no other weapon. There is no such thing as a miss. Whereas an atomic bomb was a city problem, the super modern weapons of today are truly a national problem, particularly because of the great areas affected by residual radiation and the huge number of people who will require assistance.

Third. Civil defense is not hopeless; top scientists and military men agree that civil defense can be of immense value if proper planning and education take place. This means that we must

raise the stature, responsibility, and scope of civil-defense program over and above the present ridiculous situation which finds the Federal Civil Defense Administration budget to be about a tenth of 1 percent of the total Department of Defense budget.

Fourth. A civil-defense policy must be clearly stated. We face a serious threat from atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, and from the mononuclear missiles. The extent of that threat must be indicated to the American people, and a policy should be stated which establishes a criteria for planning evacuation, shelters, cover from fall-out, welfare, and other needed aspects for a full civil defense.

Fifth. The civil-defense program must be continuing. A plan with sufficient forethought must be instituted which is so compelling that we need not make repeated alarmist statements to arouse the public interest. Civil defense must be an essential part of Government responsibility so that it is accepted as a reality of living in the thermonuclear age.

Mr. President, I hope the Congress will take at least a few of these observations seriously. There is not a Member of the

Senate or of the House of Representatives who would be content for a minute to go home and face his constituency if he had not voted for the defense of his Nation. I hope that some constituents will be asking if we voted for the defense of their homes. Let us hope and pray that an attack will never come, but I suggest that preparedness is the best way to avoid an attack or to stop one. Preparedness does not mean merely a strategic air defense force or command that can strike at the enemy; it also means the interception of enemy planes and an adequate civil defense for the civilian population which makes possible resistance and striking back at any aggressor or attacker.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor. Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I gladly yield for that purpose.



Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until noon on Tuesday next.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me so that I may make another unanimous-consent request if it is understood that in yielding for that purpose he will not lose the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield under those circumstances, Mr. President.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Harlan Bruce Munger, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration; and

George P. Daley, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Albert Pratt, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

General Walter Bedell Smith, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission.

Mr. JACKSON. From the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John Slezak, resigned, and ask that this nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Mr. Finucane.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the biographical sketch will be printed in the RECORD.

The biographical sketch presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

CHARLES C. FINUCANE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT)

Charles C. Finucane was born in Spokane, Wash., on September 6, 1905, the son of

Francis J. and Mary Gertrude (Sweeny) Finucane. He received his early education in Spokane, attended the Taft School at Watertown, Conn., for 4 years, and was graduated from the Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University, in 1928 with a degree in industrial engineering. In the same year he married Marion Madeleine Burke, of New York City. They have no children.

After his graduation from the Sheffield School, Mr. Finucane returned to Spokane and entered his father's wholesale hardware business, which he was instrumental in selling in 1930. In that year he became vice president and general manager of the Sweeny Investment Co., which owns and operates commercial buildings. Since 1949 he has been its president.

In 1936 he became vice president of the Callahan Lead-Zinc Co. and treasurer of Sunshine Consolidated Mining Co. After resigning 2 years later, he purchased and operated a wheat- and pea-ranch in southeastern Washington. In 1939 he was elected to the State legislature and served as majority (Democratic) floor leader during the 1939 session. He was then appointed chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Spokane County and was active in the county government until military service intervened. In 1940 he ran for Congress in the Fifth District of Washington and was defeated.

Mr. Finucane was commissioned an ensign in the Naval Reserve in 1934 and went on active duty in June 1941. During the war he served as an Ordnance officer in various important staff assignments with the Northwest Sea Frontier, the 13th Naval District, and the Bureau of Ordnance, Washington, D. C., rising to the rank of commander.

In 1946, with T. H. Galland, of Spokane, he founded Finucane & Galland, which manages commercial buildings and handles general insurance. The following year he purchased the Davenport Hotel in Spokane and operated it until its sale in 1953. Since 1946 he has been a director of the Spokane and Eastern Division of the Seattle First National Bank and also treasurer and a director of the James Smyth Plumbing & Heating Co., of Spokane. He also owns and operates cattle ranches.

Mr. Finucane was vice president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce from 1947 through 1953. He has been active in the Republican Party in Washington for a number of years. He is a member of the Elk and Moose Lodges and of various social clubs in Spokane and New York City.

He was nominated by President Eisenhower on August 4, 1954, and confirmed by the Senate on August 18, 1954.

Mr. STENNIS. From the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably a group of nominations of flag and general officers in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Army and ask that they be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

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;

John H. Sides and sundry other officers for permanent appointment in the line and staff corps of the Navy;

Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to be Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy;

Brig. Gen. Raymond A. Anderson, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general; and

Brig. Gen. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. STENNIS. From the Committee on Armed Services, I also report favorably a number of routine nominations in the Army, for the grade of colonel and below, which have already been printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that these nominations lie on the table, in order to avoid the expense of having them again printed.

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

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated in order.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip D. Reed, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1958, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information for a term expiring January 27, 1958, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

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

#### THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Arizona, for yielding to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have been happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, the subject of the Dixon-Yates contract has been peculiarly quiet since the resumption of the session. But that has not been true of the press, particularly of the press of the city of Washington.

I do not wish to detain the Senate long this afternoon, but I should like to invite attention to the comments of several newspapers in Washington on this subject.

Mr. President, in last night's Evening Star there was an article by Mr. O'Leary which went on to say regarding the Dixon-Yates contract:

ATOM PROGRAM SEEN SNAGGED BY DIXON-YATES—DEMOCRATS ACCENT DANGER AS GOP DEFENDS CONTRACT

(By J. A. O'Leary)

Senate Democrats charged today that the administration distracted the Atomic Energy Commission from its primary task of assuring atomic leadership by involving it in the power needs of the Tennessee Valley area through the Dixon-Yates contract.

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee made public a report of more than 100 pages in

which Republicans and Democrats summarized their conflicting positions on the contract.

That follows very closely an article printed in the Washington Star of the previous evening, quoting the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as follows:

JACKSON SEES FIGHT ON DIXON-YATES DEAL AS BURDEN ON AEC

Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, said today it is quite obvious that the furor over the Dixon-Yates contract has interfered with important tasks of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Senator JACKSON said this had been clearly shown in testimony by Commission members this week before the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee on which he serves.

AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss told the group yesterday the Dixon-Yates project may have added to the burdens of AEC members, but he said it had not interfered with their work.

Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the joint committee, said in a separate interview "The differences they have in the Commission seemingly have all developed since they got into Dixon-Yates."

#### CLOSED SESSION TODAY

The hearings, continuing today with a closed session, are designed to review progress on peaceful uses of atomic energy.

However, they have been punctuated by a debate on the Dixon-Yates contract, negotiated by the AEC last year at President Eisenhower's order.

On Monday, Commissioner Thomas E. Murray announced that he believed the contract should be dropped by AEC—an action already asked by the present Democratic majority on the joint committee.

Mr. Murray said the contract was a drain on the time and energies of the Commission and not in the public interest, because, he said, it diverted the agency from concentrating on its two big jobs—weapons and peacetime uses of the atom.

#### COMMENTS ON MURRAY

Yesterday Mr. Strauss told the committee he had not known of Mr. Murray's statement until it was read Monday, and he declared:

"I must not allow the inference to stand that the effectiveness and the results of the Commission's efforts have been impaired by the controversy over the Dixon-Yates contract."

"Commissioner Murray has access to the same information we all do and surely is aware that the production of atomic weapons for our Armed Forces is at an all-time high."

But Senator JACKSON commented: "There are just so many hours in a day. The more time the Commission devotes to nonatomic matters, the less time it has to give to its important tasks that really matter."

Mr. President, I suggest to those persons who are concerned with the extra burden which may be placed on the AEC that they realize that the contract is in the best interests of free enterprise in this country and in the best interests of the people. If they wish to unburden the AEC, it is within their power to do so by approving the contract. Certainly, those of us who have advocated the adoption of the contract have not laid additional work upon the AEC.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator explain what business the Atomic Energy Commission has negotiating a contract

when not one kilowatt of power to be generated under it is to be sold for the use of the AEC?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is that unusual in Government operations? Are they restricted in their contract negotiations?

Mr. JACKSON. But they are supplying the power needed in Ohio for the great gaseous diffusion plant in Portsmouth, Ohio. Not one kilowatt of power under the Dixon-Yates contract is to be used to produce a single atomic weapon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The TVA has for years asked for additional sources of power, and this is a free-enterprise way of providing the TVA the power of which it has been deprived by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. JACKSON. Then, why not let TVA negotiate the contract?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Because the people of this country have never had an opportunity to vote on the question of whether they want the Government to engage in the production of power.

Mr. JACKSON. The people of the country have the right at every election to vote for Representatives and Senators to pass such laws as those Representatives and Senators deem to be in the best interests of the country. Does the Senator mean to infer that we should have a plebiscite on various issues? Are we going to refer these national issues to the States and let them decide the issues on an initiative and referendum basis?

Mr. GOLDWATER. On an issue so basic as this, I would go so far as to suggest that some day it be put to a plebiscite, but I do not think it is necessary now.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator from Arizona want to amend the Constitution so as to provide for national plebiscites on issues such as that involved in the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No less an authority than Norman Thomas has stated that the TVA is socialistic. I do not believe that in its original conception it was intended to be socialistic. I do not believe it was looked upon at that time as a Government sponsored and financed source of power. I think when it was first envisioned, it was to be a flood control and navigation control facility; but as it developed, it became a source of power supply, with a complete prohibition of private power. Private power industry could not come into that area. I do not believe that was envisioned by Members of Congress.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Arizona would not say, would he, that when Mr. Eisenhower, during the campaign in the fall of 1952, gave great praise to TVA, he was praising a socialistic project?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would say that he gave great praise to TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. Was he praising socialism?

Mr. GOLDWATER. He was praising a project which is socialistic.

Mr. JACKSON. He was?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator say that, therefore, the President was supporting a socialistic project?



Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I do not think the President was supporting a socialistic project.

Mr. JACKSON. But he was praising it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I say that during the campaign Mr. Eisenhower, as a candidate for President, made some remarks about TVA that could be construed as being complimentary. I do not say the President supports socialism, but he has made complimentary remarks about TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. I see. He did not support socialism, but he praised it. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. He praised TVA, and TVA is socialistic. I am glad to hear the Senator admit it, according to the Senator's statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not quoting any statement made by me, I am quoting Norman Thomas. I am quoting a report in the newspapers of last night.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, if Norman Thomas had said that reclamation in the State of Arizona was socialistic, would the Senator say that reclamation projects in the State of Arizona were socialistic?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think a very sound argument could be presented to show that that is not so.

Mr. JACKSON. But reclamation is a government project and is entirely Government-financed, is it not?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Washington is entirely wrong. Reclamation is a cooperative enterprise, with which he is fully familiar, and from which the sums expended are paid back.

Mr. JACKSON. The revenue from power provides a means for paying back the costs of TVA. Is that not correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is entirely incorrect about that.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator say that revenues are not used to pay back the costs of the power facilities provided by the TVA?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not intend to get into this phase of the matter this afternoon.

Mr. JACKSON. I would not have referred to it either, but my name was mentioned, so I thought it was necessary to get into it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Since the Senator has brought up the question, I will ask him if he thinks this is paying the Government back: Since 1934, \$1,785 million have been appropriated for the TVA. Of that amount approximately \$341,719,000 can be subtracted for flood control and navigation. That leaves a balance, roughly, of \$1,400 million. There has been paid back in this time about \$87 million.

Mr. JACKSON. So the Senator agrees that some money has been paid back.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not agree to that.

Mr. JACKSON. I am merely taking the Senator's figures.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There has been repaid \$87 million. If we simply take the compound interest at 2.6 percent, which is the figure given me by the Gov-

ernment as an average figure that should be used in these computations, then to the \$1,400 million should be added about \$244 million in interest alone. So we find only \$87 million having been paid back to the Government by TVA, with not even the interest beginning to be paid.

I have no quarrel about any project which will eventually pay back to the Government what is put into it. At this rate, as I stated last year in the debate, it would take about 300 years to pay back what the Government has put into the TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. In connection with power facilities of the TVA, the principal will be paid back, including interest, which varies according to the interest rate on the national debt.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The best estimate is that that will take 300 years.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Figures do not lie. I have obtained the figures from the TVA reports.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that the power features of the TVA are scheduled to pay out, the time varying with some projects, in from 40 to 50 or 60 years?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not in the TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that in the Senator's State, where there are several fine Federal reclamation projects, not one dime of interest is paid on the investment, but the interest is used as a subsidy? However, as to the power features, the entire cost, including principle and interest is paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this case, as I have tried to illustrate to the Senator—and he can certainly examine the figures—only \$87 million has been paid back by the TVA during the entire period. If that covered all the cost of interest and the other carrying charges, I would not be here today objecting.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the Senator saying that as to the power features, no arrangement has been made to pay the interest on the investment or the principle, or both?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the case of TVA, the only interest which is being paid is on the bonds which TVA has floated itself. I think the rate is about 1 percent or a fraction over that amount.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it the Senator's position, as to the power features in the TVA project, that no arrangement has been made to pay the interest on the Government investment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have said to the Senator—

Mr. JACKSON. I am merely asking a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe that any payment at all is being made; in fact, up to 1950 I believe the law provided that the payment of interest was not necessary.

Mr. JACKSON. That the TVA did not have to pay interest on the investment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is my understanding of the original act.

Mr. JACKSON. I think the Senator from Arizona will find that he is in error.

Let us get back to Dixon-Yates. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the only reason why the Atomic Energy Commission was used as a contracting vehicle for entering into the agreement with Dixon-Yates to build a steam plant was that the AEC was the only Government agency on which the Government could hang its legal hat to enter into that kind of contract?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator is a little wrong in his statement. The TVA has tried for many years to secure approval for the construction of a steam plant. I think in the first session of the last Congress a request was made for some \$60 million for the building of a steam plant. It has been obvious for many years that Congress—at least, it is true of the present Congress and of the past Congress—does not intend to grant additional money to the TVA for the purpose of constructing a steam plant. Power in the TVA area has been wheeled into other sections where it is needed, and where it could have been produced by free enterprise.

Mr. JACKSON. The Atomic Energy Commission is not a free enterprise; it is a Government monopoly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is an agency of the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. Why does not the Government enter into an agreement with TVA, which is an agency that markets power? The Atomic Energy Commission is in the business of splitting the atom; it is not in the business of selling power to another agency.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If it were a question of private power, and the AEC and the TVA came forward and asked that private enterprise be allowed to build a plant in Arkansas where the proposed plant is to be located, would the Senator be perfectly agreeable to doing that?

Mr. JACKSON. I am certain the distinguished Senator is aware of the real reason why the contract was entered into with the Atomic Energy Commission; namely, that the Government cannot dictate to the TVA at this time and tell the directors they should enter into this contract, because the directors are determined to assist the people of the valley to get cheap hydroelectric power firmed up with steam. I think that is the reason why the administration did not go to the TVA. They knew that TVA would turn them down.

So the Atomic Energy Commission was embroiled into a useless fight over a matter that has nothing to do with atomic weapons and nothing to do with peaceful uses of atomic energy in any way, shape, or form.

I think it is regrettable, indeed, that the Atomic Energy Commission should be split so many ways, as it is today, because it has had foisted upon it a contract that has nothing whatsoever to do with the duties of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Washington favor the development of power by private industry in that area?

Mr. JACKSON. I am in favor of having TVA develop power in that market-

ing area; that is, in its own marketing area as provided by law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has hit right at the heart of my argument. The Senator is in favor of public power; I am in favor of private power. Basically, that is the whole argument.

The argument does not revolve around the AEC. It revolves around one thing, namely, that we have in this country people who advocate public power, and also people who advocate private power. It is as simple as that, to me; there are no other ramifications.

Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask one other question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the distinguished Senator from Arizona aware of the fact that the TVA was soundly endorsed and soundly supported by none other than Hon. B. CARROLL REECE, a Republican Representative from eastern Tennessee, and former chairman of the Republican National Committee? Would the distinguished Senator think the distinguished Representative from eastern Tennessee, Mr. B. CARROLL REECE, would be supporting a socialistic venture?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. REECE is from Tennessee.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator does not impugn his motives, does he? The Representative would not support a socialistic project, which touches not only eastern Tennessee, but goes all over the State, would he? Does the Senator think Mr. REECE would advocate for one moment a socialistic enterprise?

Mr. GOLDWATER. All I can say to the Senator is that it has been called socialistic by better experts than I.

Mr. JACKSON. Would the Senator take the word of Norman Thomas over that of Representative REECE?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In the matter of socialism, yes.

Mr. JACKSON. If Norman Thomas were to state that reclamation in Arizona were socialistic, would the Senator accept his word for it?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I would argue with him on that.

Mr. JACKSON. Because it was in Arizona?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I would argue with him if the project happened to be in Washington, Arizona, or any other State, because reclamation projects pay back. TVA does not pay back.

Mr. JACKSON. TVA has paid back \$87 million.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There has not been paid back even a third of the interest.

Mr. JACKSON. How much has been paid back in Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The cost of the Roosevelt Dam was paid back completely. With respect to the Hoover Dam—

Mr. JACKSON. When was the Roosevelt Dam started?

Mr. GOLDWATER. In 1911.

Mr. JACKSON. And it has only recently paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is not an accurate statement.

Mr. JACKSON. Was it not recently?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If my memory serves me correctly, the cost of the dam was paid back some 14 years ago. I would not want to stand on that answer, but it was about that time.

Mr. JACKSON. The costs of TVA projects, as well as the costs of projects in the Senator's State and my State are being paid back, and I am proud of that record. The fact that in one case, where power is supplied by Government-owned facilities, it is called socialism, and in the other case, where the project is for reclamation purposes, it is called free enterprise, does not add up.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Washington is completely missing the point. He and I know that the law providing for reclamation projects contains a provision for paying back, and the Senator and I know that TVA is not paying back in like manner. Only \$87 million out of a total expenditure of \$1,400,000,000 has been paid back. That is not really paying back.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely wish to say that a great many people opposed to the Dixon-Yates contract are not primarily concerned in wrangling with the question of public versus private power. An examination of the record will disclose that as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I supported strongly the construction of the EEI and the OVEC plants. Both of those plants had groups of private utilities brought together to furnish power directly to the Atomic Energy Commission. That has been the accepted pattern. That is private enterprise. It is that pattern we were trying to work out. In the Dixon-Yates contract that program has been abandoned entirely. Those concerned tried to make use of the Dixon-Yates contract to accomplish a wholly different purpose than the supplying of power to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What would that purpose be?

Mr. ANDERSON. To build a plant at West Memphis, Ark., to supply power.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would TVA have been able to supply the power?

Mr. ANDERSON. That I cannot answer. I understand those who were not able to build the Fulton steam plant will provide their own facilities, and I think they should; but, nonetheless, the fact is that if the Atomic Energy Commission had wanted to deal with any power shortage which it could not reach, it could have come to the Congress with a request to build another plant of the type of EEI or OVEC. It would have been private money to be used for the Atomic Energy Commission. It was the failure of the Atomic Energy Commission to follow the pattern which had been worked out that precipitated the entire discussion and debate. It still tears the Atomic Energy Commission to pieces. It is a constant source of friction. Personally I think it is going to remain so until the matter is resolved in a different fashion than has been undertaken up to this time. I wish to repeat

that not all those who are opposed to the Dixon-Yates contract are opposed to it on the basis of public versus private power.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I appreciate that, and I do not want my remarks to infer that that is the case. Nevertheless, the issue has been brought out into the open. It is a point of difference between public-power and private-power adherents. If the discussion has served no other good, it has served that particular good.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to make it clear that I happen to be one who is in favor of both private and public power. I think a complete monopoly of power by the Government is bad for the country, and I think a complete monopoly of power by private interests is bad for the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Washington mean public power in the true sense of the word, as I am speaking of the term?

Mr. JACKSON. What does the Senator from Arizona mean by public power?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I mean power produced by the Government in competition with private enterprise without paying charges or taxes.

Mr. JACKSON. Power developed by a local municipality or a State is publicly owned power. If the Federal Government develops the power, it is likewise public power. The truth is that in the case of the great rivers in this country, most projects involve more than power. They involve reclamation, navigation, and flood control, and in many cases it would be unfair for a private utility to be called upon to engage in those many and diverse activities.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think that is where the program of this administration comes in. If a project involves areas where private utilities cannot venture, because of the scarcity of population or the immensity of the project, the Federal Government should cooperate in advancing the money for such a project, and then the Government should be paid back. In the Northwest the money advanced for projects is being paid back.

Mr. JACKSON. In the Northwest?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. The Federal partnership power program of this administration is quite simple. It means that the Federal Government will pay for the nonreimbursable features, that is, navigation and flood control. The local private utility will pay for and build the reimbursable features. It would be a project such as the Senator and I would go into if the Senator were getting the bills, he being Uncle Sam, and I was getting the profits. It is difficult for me to understand how the Federal Government is going to come out even in that kind of program, because the Federal Government would be saddled with the nonreimbursable features of the project, whereas the private utility would get the profitable features, namely, those from which power is to be developed and sold.



Before I conclude—and I wish to say that the distinguished Senator has been very fair, in yielding to me—I should like to point out that under our reclamation laws it is true that the water users pay back a certain portion of the cost of the water. The remainder of the cost comes from revenue derived from the sale of power at the dams. In addition, the water user does not have to pay interest on the Federal investment. On the other hand, where power features are installed in a dam, under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 all of the investment must be paid back with interest. In the Northwest the Bonneville Power Administration has paid back \$123 million.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am not arguing about Bonneville. My statement does not include Bonneville. I am talking about paying back the cost of projects. TVA has paid back a little less than one-third of the interest which ordinarily would be due on the amount invested by the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. What did the Senator say TVA had paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. A little more than \$87 million.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the total investment in TVA?

Mr. GOLDWATER. When there is subtracted from the investment the costs of flood control and navigation, we arrive at the figure of approximately \$1,400,000,000.

Mr. JACKSON. And \$87 million has been paid back?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If we were compounding the interest at 2.6 percent on \$1.4 billion—

Mr. JACKSON. Where did the Senator get the figure of 2.6 percent?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is an average figure I obtained from the Treasury Department. We have paid lesser and higher rates of interest; 2.6 percent interest paid on a private loan is a rather low figure.

Mr. JACKSON. Eighty-seven million dollars has been paid back on TVA out of a total investment of how much?

Mr. GOLDWATER. One billion four hundred million dollars.

Mr. JACKSON. The Government will get its money back in less than 300 years.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, yes; 300 years; but I will not be here then. I should like to see TVA pay back as other projects do, namely, in from 50 to 74 years. If they did that, I would not be here quarreling with the TVA.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to say in all sincerity—

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The purpose of my participation in the discussion this afternoon is to insert in the RECORD—which I shall do at the conclusion of these remarks—a column of figures to show what it has cost each State to support the TVA. If the TVA did not require the support of all the States constantly and in the years ahead, there would be no objection to it. But I am sure the people of the State of Washington are not particularly interested in

providing at their own expense cheap power rates in the Tennessee Valley year after year. If the purpose is to give the TVA a start toward taking care of itself, that is fine. I think we would agree about that.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think we are subsidizing the power features.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a matter on which the Senator from Washington and I disagree, and I think we could stand here and could argue it for days and days.

Mr. JACKSON. Does not the Senator from Arizona agree that everything that has transpired on this floor during this discussion goes back to the Dixon-Yates contract, which in turn goes back to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I wish to say to the Senator in all candor that politics and the atom do not mix; and I say that the administration made a serious mistake in injecting the whole issue of public power and private power into the atomic-energy question, in connection with a matter wherein not one kilowatt of power is being used to aid and abet the atomic-energy effort.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there again I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the remark I made, which brought his name into the discussion. If he does not wish to have the AEC burdened with this matter, and if he never wanted it to be burdened with it, then they should have acceded to the request for this contract in the first place.

Mr. JACKSON. Who should have acceded to the request?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Those who objected to it.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not request it. Why did the administration not go to the Department of the Interior with the request? It is the official agency in this field, and is established by law to handle such contracts. Why did it not go to the TVA, the marketing agency in that area?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The TVA has been denied, time and again—through Federal means—the right to expand.

Mr. JACKSON. But congressional authorization is not needed in order to go ahead on the basis of the contract. Why did the administration come to Congress?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is my suspicion that, regardless of whatever agency might have been named, objection would have been raised to the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure of that; but the administration made the fatal mistakes of selecting an agency which does not have a single thing to do with this activity. If the contract had been placed with the TVA or the Department of the Interior, I think the terrible split which now has developed in the Atomic Energy Commission would have been avoided. Our committee is holding a hearing on the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission. In the course of the hearing, we are spending much of our time discussing the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that that is not because of the desire of anyone ex-

cept himself and of his group—not the desire of his party, even.

Mr. JACKSON. Is the Senator from Arizona aware of the fact that the Democratic members of the committee were unanimous—the vote was 10 to 8—in voting to rescind the approval previously given to waiver of the 30-day period, in the case of the Dixon-Yates contract? Let me point out that those members come from the North, the South, the East, and the West.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; and I think the Republican members did the same thing last year, when they were in power; and I think the remark made by the Senator from New Mexico was rather apropos, namely, that the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks on the subject under consideration.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. NEUBERGER. A moment ago the Senator from Arizona was discussing with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] the question of Federal power monopoly. Is it not correct that if there is any power monopoly in our country, it is a private-power monopoly?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; I do not see how the Senator from Oregon can say that, because the private utilities—and, of course, they are looked upon, I assume, as natural monopolies, or whatever one may wish to call them from the point of view of law—are regulated by the State agencies; and so long as such regulation exists, I do not subscribe to the idea that they are monopolies, as such. If they operated completely on their own, without any regulation at all, I would agree that they would be monopolies, just as I would agree that any business which dominated a field and which was without regulation would be a monopoly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that the distinguished President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, made the very plain statement that only a very small proportion of the electricity used in the United States is generated by the Federal Government?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. I think the figures are 84 percent as against 16 percent generated by the private utilities.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think the Senator from Arizona will find that the correct figures are approximately 81 percent generated by private power companies, approximately 13 percent generated by the Federal Government, and the remaining 6 percent generated by municipal systems.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said 86 percent—

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Arizona said 84 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said 84 percent was generated by the Federal Government, I should have said that 84 percent is generated by private power companies; and I will use those figures, because in listening to the testimony given

yesterday by Mr. Olds, those were the figures he used.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would not that again indicate there is no danger of a Federal power monopoly, such as has been alleged by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. So if 1 percent of the electricity used in the United States were generated by the Federal Government, I think those of us who are interested in the maintenance of free and private enterprise should be vigilant. Certainly it would not be alarming if 14 percent or 16 percent or even 25 percent were generated by the Federal Government; even 25 percent might not be a figure indicating a trend. But certainly such a doctrine speaks against the accepted free enterprise of this country; and we do not wish to see it grow.

Mr. NEUBERGER. At the present time, only 13 percent of the power is generated by the Federal Government; and the Senator from Arizona has suggested that it would not be alarming if 25 percent were so generated. Therefore, at least 12 percent more could be produced by the Federal Government, and the Senator from Arizona would not be objecting, I assume.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, no; I think the Senator from Arizona would be objecting to one-half of 1 percent more, just as today he is objecting to 13 percent or 14 percent.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the Senator from Arizona just said it would not be alarming if the figure were 25 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is possible, but it would alarm me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Arizona was commenting on the partnership proposal in the Pacific Northwest. This administration is dedicated to fiscal solvency and to reduction of the public debt, according to the Secretary of the Treasury and the distinguished President of the United States. Is it not true that if the Federal Government enters into such a partnership arrangement in the Northwest, the Federal Treasury will be sacrificing millions and millions of dollars of revenue which now comes into the Federal Treasury and aids in reducing the national debt?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That might be possible in the immediate future, but under a true partnership arrangement, those properties would produce taxable wealth in their own right.

Let the Senator understand that I am not discussing the situation in the Northwest. I am not discussing the situation which exists in the reclamation States of the West, where these payments are being made. I am discussing TVA, and TVA only. I do not believe the Senator can compare the operation of TVA with the operation of the Northwest plants he is discussing. I maintain, as I have repeatedly said, that TVA is not paying its way, as are the other projects of the country. That is why I pick on TVA.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But the Senator recently referred to the Northwest, because he endorsed the partnership plan as it applies in the Northwest. The Senator himself brought that into the discussion only a few moments ago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Certainly I endorsed the partnership program.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator endorsed the partnership plan; but I recur to the fact that at the present time the Federal Government has invested a total of \$128 million in the Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington. That represents construction costs, operation costs, and maintenance. That project with all its turbines and generators has been in full operation only 11 years, and yet \$48 million, or about 38 percent, has already been returned to the Treasury. Does the Senator know of any similar project, either public or private, with respect to which there is such a speedy return of the investment to the Treasury?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator wishes to discuss Bonneville, I suggest that he do it at another time, because we are not discussing Bonneville. I have not criticized Bonneville. I have not given Bonneville the study I have given TVA. I am discussing TVA and the Dixon-Yates contract.

I am not particularly familiar with the situation in the Northwest, but had private enterprise been able to construct a project of that size, I suggest that far more wealth, in the form of taxes, would have been returned, not only to the States concerned, but also to the Federal Government.

I return to the statement which prompted me to bring this subject up today. Fundamentally, this is an argument between the proponents of public power and the proponents of private power. The proponents of partnership power had not entered into any discussion at all, until the Senator from Oregon brought up the question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me refresh the Senator's memory for a moment. I was discussing this problem with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. In Arizona we have partnership agreements. I believe it was in that connection that the Senator heard the word "partnership." We have a true partnership in my State, which has been operating beautifully for years.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I hesitate to disagree, but I think, if the Senator will check the remarks in the RECORD as they have been taken down by the reporter, he will find that he endorsed the partnership program of this administration.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator was talking about the Northwest.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is where the partnership program is mainly localized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let us say that I extend it to the Northwest, although I was not discussing the Northwest in particular.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In his remarks a moment ago, the Senator was referring to the possibility that private enterprise could build projects like Bonneville. The

Senator will grant, will he not, that private enterprise cannot build projects like Bonneville?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I will not say it is impossible. I will say it is improbable, because of the amount of money involved. But if private enterprise were able to do it I maintain that it would be far more desirable to use that approach than to use the Government approach, even though the Government would be paid back.

Again I return to the statement that when the Government builds these projects and the projects pay themselves out, and ultimately come under the control of the State, or even under the control—let us hope, some day, of private citizens—no quarrel can be found. I am only complaining about a project which does not pay itself out, a project which has not paid itself out, and is not paying itself out at an acceptable rate, or even approaching an acceptable rate.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator said he hoped these projects would ultimately come under the control of private citizens. Earlier in his remarks the Senator praised Roosevelt Dam, in his own State. I am not too familiar with the Senator's State. Is that dam under the control of private citizens?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. It is under the control today of a quasi-governmental agency called the Salt River Valley Water Users Association. I say "quasi-governmental." In some respects it is tax-free. It is operated entirely by the users of the water. The Federal Government enters into the operation now only because of certain agreements made since the paying off of the entire debt, when the organization had to get additional Federal aid for improvements.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President—

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me finish my reply.

I say that it is my hope that these projects will be turned over to private citizens some day. That is my personal hope. Many people share that hope. Many others do not. However, that is my personal hope.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question about Bonneville. Inasmuch as the Senator stated that he would grant that it was probable that private enterprise could not build a project like Bonneville, would not the Senator be willing to agree that the Federal Government should build other projects of the size of Bonneville, if private enterprise cannot build such projects?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If they will pay themselves out, and if they will compete on the same basis on which private enterprise must compete, then I find no quarrel with them. As I have said, in Arizona we operate from Federal dams up and down the Colorado River. The power is purchased by a State authority and is sold by private utilities. Over the same transmission lines comes power generated by private utility steam and diesel plants.



Mr. NEUBERGER. Then the Senator will have no objection when my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and I, and other Members of the Senate, propose to build, at Hells Canyon, a great project like Bonneville?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, I will, because I am convinced that private enterprise can build it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator believe that private enterprise can build a dam of the same magnitude as the Federal Government can?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think private enterprise can build 3 dams. There will be an argument between the Senator and myself as to whether 3 dams are equal to 1. I think we should rely upon the engineers to tell us what is right. I believe that wherever private enterprise can develop the resources of this country it should do so. Wherever private enterprise cannot do so, and the people of a certain area need such development, Federal money should come in on a partnership basis, as has been done. There is no argument about that.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Has the Senator from Oregon concluded?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have not, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation. I have not been present throughout all this debate. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that this question is fundamentally one of private ownership versus public ownership of the hydroelectric power resources—of the public heritage.

I came from an area which can offer very potent and convincing testimony as to the gain which comes from publicly developed power. We in New York State and in New England today pay at least twice as much for our industrial and domestic power as the people in the Pacific coast area are paying. That, in my opinion, is due to the fact that we in New York State and in New England have virtually no publicly developed water power, whereas we know, of course, of the great public hydroelectric developments on the Pacific coast and in the Northwest and Southwest.

At the same time, while we are paying twice as much for power in New York and in New England as do the people on the Pacific coast, in the Northwest, the per capita consumption there, because of the low cost of power, is double what it is in New York and New England. Yet today the administration objects to the public development of power, with safeguards of the consumer interest, in the State of New York. I refer to the power which could be generated from the waters of the Niagara River. It has been boldly proposed that this great asset, which belongs to all the people, should be turned over to a monopoly of five privately owned utility companies.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. At the same time we are estopped from reducing the cost of power which is delivered to the consumers in our section of the country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am always surprised to hear the Senator from New York advocate public power. Last year it cost the people of his State, to support TVA, \$15 million in taxes as their share for giving the Tennessee Valley area what the Senator calls extremely low power rates.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot understand why the Senator from New York is so willing to say that his people will support, to the tune of \$15 million, the Tennessee Valley development, so that it can take business away from New York State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield. I can answer that question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The reason the people of New York State are willing to bear a considerable cost in the development of the resources of other areas, is, I am proud to say, that the people in New York State realize that we are one Nation. We do not believe in setting off one region against another. We do not want one part of the country to profit at our expense. But we do want all parts of the country to share in a general prosperity.

I believe—and I am glad to say that the people in New York State also believe—that what is good for Arizona, in spite of what the distinguished Senator from that State is saying, is good for New York. I feel that what is good for Pennsylvania or for Alabama or for Mississippi or for California or for Oregon is good for New York, too.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does not the Senator from New York realize that with the \$15 million to which I have referred private interests with invested money could start to develop a plant on the Niagara River and provide the power the Senator is talking about?

I am amazed at the Senator's willingness to give away money of the people of New York State so that other areas can compete with his State on a more favorable basis. If the Senator does not have any feeling for industry in New York or for the people in New York, I suggest that he is working on the right track in developing TVA.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator with one further observation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will not the Senator agree with me that when we develop the trade and commerce of the country as a whole, either through the development of cheap waterpower or through the building of that great seaway for which I have fought for 30 years, we benefit not only New York, but every other part of the country? We have passed the stage where we feel only in terms of what is good for Arizona or New Mexico or Mississippi or New York. What is good for the development of New York is good for the growth of Arizona; and I think if Arizona grows and prospers, we in New York also benefit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to learn of the continuing generosity of my friend, the Senator from New York. I should like to suggest that if he wishes to collect \$15 million in his State and send it to Arizona to help the State of Arizona, we will be glad to have him do so.

However, the Senator from New York is missing the point. The point is that the private power companies pay taxes. TVA does not pay taxes. The power companies in his State, for example, must pay back the money they borrow. TVA does not need to pay back the money it borrows. I am not quarreling with the operation of the companies in the Northwest, the Southwest, or in the Far West. I am quarreling with TVA, period.

Mr. COTTON and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I had not expected to venture to ask the Senator from Arizona to yield for a question, or to take any of his time. However, I was no little surprised when the distinguished Senator from New York, who, in part, represents New York so ably, insisted, in effect, on also representing New England in the questions which he propounded to the able Senator from Arizona.

In the first place, New England, or at least a large portion of it, with perhaps the exception of a small area in the extreme southern section, is not starved for power because it is not the recipient of public power.

We are starved for power because the development of our rivers has reached its limit. We cannot increase the power derived from them without moving cities which have been in existence for 150 to 200 years.

I was particularly interested in the Senator's statement with regard to power being made available to New England from the great Niagara development. The people of New England have long been interested in power from that source either through private or public power development; but we have never been able to get that power.

As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, in New England we have paid taxes to furnish the Tennessee Valley power in such quantities that it is being used even for heating houses there, for the maintenance of recreational facilities, which are widely advertised, and for the production of white pine seedlings.

While I have no doubt that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York apply to the State he, in part, so ably represents, I take exception to his speaking, also, for the New England States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The contribution of the New England States toward TVA,

through the payment of taxes by the citizens of that area, was \$4,398,000. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would not object to having the people in his area get that money back.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire realizes that the rate which the consumers in his State pay for both industrial and commercial power is twice as high as that paid by the industrial and domestic consumers on the Pacific Coast, where power is furnished by great public development projects.

I wonder whether he recalls that when the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the State of New York to develop the St. Lawrence power, it insisted—the provision is contained in the license—that a fair share of the power developed on the St. Lawrence River shall go to the New England States?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. First, in response to the observation of the distinguished Senator from New York, I should like to say that we in New England fully realize that power is more costly in our section of the country than in any other section. However, it is not because of the cost of the production or development of power.

As we face the challenge of the development of power by atomic energy and by other means, which we hope will take care of our power situation, we feel it is, in a sense, adding insult to injury to reach into our pocket for developments in other sections of the country, where the cost of power is much cheaper.

With reference to the second point made by the Senator from New York, which I am glad he made, it is true that in the legislation looking toward the development of Niagara power, lip service is rendered to the idea of providing New England with some of that power. The legislation provides that a fair share shall go to New England. However, I should be very happy to have placed in the RECORD this afternoon a definite statement as to what a fair share is. We have long desired to have some definite assurance along that line.

It is the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, as well as the opinion of other people in my section of the country who have watched very anxiously this proposed development, that the term "fair share" is rather general. I am sure the Senator from New York will agree that that term has never been defined.

Because of the long distance and other conditions which are involved—not because of the desire of the people of New York to deprive us of anything—it is our opinion that the portion of the power which will actually come to New England will be infinitesimal so far as adequately dealing with our power problem is concerned.

Again, Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished Senator

from Arizona. What he has said this afternoon has struck a responsive chord in my heart. We in New Hampshire desire to see the TVA prosper; we are proud of the manner in which the defense plants have been operated there and the manner in which power has been generated, but my people are becoming tired of being told that the remarkable development in the Tennessee Valley is something they should be very happy about, and that they own part of it. We own a part of the White House, but we cannot live in it. We keep pouring our money into the TVA, but TVA power does not heat our houses or turn our wheels of industry.

So I should like to commend the Senator from Arizona for his very timely speech and for furnishing to my State a reminder of what we are contributing to this socialistic experiment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield in order that I may comment on the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from New Hampshire said he objected to asking funds from the people of his section to develop power in other parts of the country. Does the Senator object to developing improved navigation in other parts of the country?

Mr. COTTON. I shall answer the Senator in this way: Had I been a Member of this body at the time of the beginning of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I doubt that I would have opposed it, because, not being gifted with second sight, I might have accepted the idea, which I think was sincerely suggested, that the Federal Government was lending a helping hand to develop navigation, increase agricultural facilities, and, as a byproduct, to aid a valley that had its problems by the power developed from the Tennessee River.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from New Hampshire concedes that it is within the province of the Federal Government to develop and improve navigation, what logical reason is there for suggesting that while doing that the Federal Government should not develop hydroelectricity to more than pay for the cost of improving navigation? On the Columbia River, Bonneville Dam was built as a navigation project. The year the development was started, only 85,000 tons of cargo moved by river into the upper Columbia River. Two years ago, more than 1,350,000 tons of cargo moved into the upper Columbia. It has been very important in keeping down trucking rates and rail rates, not only in that section, but also in Utah. Bonneville has also been able to build generators, turbines, and penstocks and pay back 80 percent in the short time it has been in operation.

The Senator from New Hampshire would not say it was all right to develop navigation, but that it was all wrong to install in the river turbines and genera-

tors to more than pay for it. Even the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, who is one of the Government officials most opposed to Federal power development in this country, admitted last year that Bonneville was many years ahead of schedule in repaying to the Treasury the investment in it. What is wrong with doing that and, at the same time, improving navigation?

Mr. COTTON. I dislike to keep inviting this to the Senator's attention, but we did not start out to discuss Bonneville. I have not made any criticism of Bonneville on the floor this afternoon. I am talking about the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA was to be merely a helping hand, and the money invested in it was to be paid back.

I probably would not have foreseen then what we all know now, that, after the last kilowatt of power that could be developed by dams and by hydroelectric plants in the Tennessee Valley had been developed, the TVA would go on and on and on, building steam plants and reaching out and expanding its perimeter, until it has become a great power-producing activity, and everytime anyone raises a voice to say it has gone far enough, a great deal of discussion is caused.

The trouble with the proposition is that it started out and got a foot inside the tent with the perfectly modest suggestion that it was desired to develop navigation, which was a project in which all the people were interested. Then it was sought to develop the power which was latent in the stream. Soon it reached the point where it was producing power, and then more and more power was wanted. We in my section of the country are not in the happy situation of having those facilities, but are paying our share for them.

So, Mr. President, I must say to the Senator that I would not have objected, and would not now object, to a reasonable development of navigation, but I think I would go very slowly in supporting any more of these propositions which are so fair and attractive on their face and are advanced with great sincerity. I am sure, by their supporters, but which lead we know not where.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Constitution provides that the Federal Government is responsible for navigation on interstate streams. That certainly cannot be compared with power. I have found no place in the Constitution where it is stated that it is the duty of the Federal Government to supply power to any of its people. I believe, by inference, it has to provide flood-control, although I have not noticed that specifically stated in the Constitution.

When the Tennessee Valley project was started it was to control floods and improve navigation and also for the purpose of reclamation. Its sponsors should have been sure that the power would pay for itself. The power has not paid and is not paying for itself. That is the whole question. I am not arguing about projects which pay for themselves.

The whole question of the Dixon-Yates contract is one of private power versus



public power; and the day when the Tennessee Valley Authority starts to pay its share, as Bonneville evidently has, then I shall certainly not make any comments on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In the course of the Senator's remarks on the Dixon-Yates contract and the TVA, he endorsed the partnership program of the administration, which means the end of projects like Bonneville in my region; it means the giving away of the great Hell's Canyon site to a private corporation for piecemeal development. The Corps of Engineers of the Army, which is non-political and is very conservative, specifically recommends a high Federal dam at that site.

The Senator, also, in endorsing the partnership program, says there should be no more projects like Bonneville. But Bonneville and Grand Coulee are paying for themselves. That is the reason why I entered into the discussion. The Senator endorsed that program. That program will mean the end of regional development on a sound paying basis in the part of the country in which I live.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I note the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon calls attention to the fact that the administration would end all public power—

Mr. NEUBERGER. In my region.

Mr. WATKINS. I doubt that very much. I invite attention to the fact that the President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, asked Congress to approve and authorize the upper Colorado storage project, which calls for nine multiple-purpose dams, much of the power to be hydroelectric power, for the development of the community. At the same time, much of the power will be sold to private utility companies, that will take it on terms which will protect the Government and the public. So I think the generalization with respect to the administration's power program misses the point just a little.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I was referring to the region from which I come. I am glad the Senator brought up that point.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, to allow me to proceed further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In my region there are some excellent sites where power can be generated at very low cost and sold at a profit within very economical transmission distances. Therefore, the administration proposes that the power development at those sites be turned over to private utilities.

But in regions such as that of the Senator from Utah, where the rivers are not so steady in their flow, where power cannot be developed at nearly so low a cost, as I think all engineering studies demonstrate, the administration proposes that the entire development shall be made by the Government.

I wonder what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON],

who only a few moments ago said that the people of his region resented the taking of money to develop power in other parts of the country, will say about the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senator from New Hampshire cannot help do anything but approve it, for the simple reason that it will repay with interest all the capital costs for power allocations and for the water used for industrial and municipal purposes. The only item on which interest will not be paid is that part which will be allocated to irrigation, which is about 7 percent of the total, and that will come under the basic reclamation law, which has been on the books and has been regarded as sound policy for more than 50 years. The upper Colorado project will repay all the capital outlay with interest.

But the Tennessee Valley Authority in the beginning, and for a large period of its existence, has been a project which has provided for no compensation to the public treasury, no repayment of cost to the Government. That is a far different situation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I suggest, then, that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire speak for himself, inasmuch as the Columbia River project will pay for itself much more quickly than will the project on the upper Colorado? Will he not then join both of us in urging the development of the upper Colorado and the upper Columbia and the projects for Hells Canyon, John Day, and Ice Harbor?

Mr. WATKINS. I would not expect the Senator from New Hampshire to do so unless he has had an opportunity to study some of these projects. With respect to some of them, I have been very much misrepresented, particularly with respect to the upper Colorado storage project. Very few Members of Congress really understand what it is all about.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am certain the Senator from New Hampshire will accept the word of the Senator from Utah and my word.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. In view of the fact that my distinguished friend insists that I answer these questions, I shall make my position very clear. For the past 5 years, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have been dealing with questions affecting the Tennessee Valley Authority, and my remarks with respect to the development of the Tennessee Valley under that Authority were intended to indicate what I believe to be a fact that it has been continuously borrowing and reaching for more money, but has paid back only a nickel every time it collected a dollar.

In response to the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], that I go on record in favor of some of the vast projects which are so dear to his heart, and also projects which are dear to the heart of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I simply say that if I, as

a good New Hampshire Yankee, can be convinced that the money spent on such projects will come back to the Treasury, then a different situation will be presented.

What I said a few moments ago in response to the Senator's very innocent question about navigation was this: As a result of my sad experience with the Tennessee Valley Authority, from this day forward, and forevermore, I intend to scrutinize with great care every proposal coming before the Senate which contemplates taking Uncle Sam's money to develop a particular area of this country.

If I should be convinced that the money will be repaid—if the distinguished Senator from Utah can assure me of that—then I might go along with him. But I am not going to sign on the dotted line this afternoon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from New Hampshire vote for funds for the development of navigation on the Mississippi River, where there is absolutely no possibility of the development of power, and no possibility of any repayment of the funds? Would the Senator vote funds for such a project?

Mr. COTTON. I am very happy to say that I would never vote for such a project on such a basis. When my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, has been here longer, and understands the old-time New England Yankee a little better, he will find that it will be a long, cold day before I shall vote to pour Federal money into projects from which it may never be returned. I shall want to be convinced that all the people of the country are being treated fairly.

If the people in any given area of the United States can develop their own section, I say more power to them.

The people of New England have been fighting their battles in an area where the problems with respect to soil and other conditions would appall some of my distinguished colleagues from other areas. Yet we in New England have received less Federal help than has, I think, any other section of the country.

If people are able to develop their own localities, we admire them. If they desire some help from the Federal Government on a partnership basis, in a safe proposition, which will result in repayment to the Government, and as to which a great Frankenstein monster will not develop, we might go along with them if we were convinced of the worthiness of their project.

But the question which the Senator from Oregon asked me was the easiest question I have ever been asked to answer in my life. If I should be asked to pour money down the Mississippi Valley, from which it will never return, most certainly I should vote against it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Then, as I understand, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote against appropriations for the development of navigation on the Mississippi River, would he?

Mr. COTTON. I shall meet these problems one by one, when I see what they are.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from New Hampshire said he would be willing to support partnership proposals on a safe basis in instances when the money would be returned.

Mr. COTTON. I said that perhaps I would if I were convinced that a proposal was sound and that the money advanced would be returned. I ask the Senator not to put words in my mouth.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator think there is the slightest possibility that the money will be returned under the partnership proposals of this administration? Under the partnership proposals of the present national administration, does the Senator think there is the slightest possibility of the money being returned by the private utility corporations?

Mr. COTTON. Oh, yes; most certainly I do. If I did not, I would not be prepared to vote for some of them.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Has the Senator studied any of them? Does he know what they entail?

Mr. COTTON. I am certain I shall study them before I vote upon them.

Mr. NEUBERGER. May I describe one of them?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think we are getting far afield. If the junior Senator from Oregon wishes to extoll the virtues of Bonneville and the power development in that region, I shall be very happy to sit here some afternoon and listen to him. But what started out to be a discourse on Dixon-Yates and the Tennessee Valley Authority has suddenly become transformed into a discussion about another very beautiful section of the United States.

I am certain that all Senators, as well as all the people of America, are aware of the problem of that area, and also are aware of the progress which has been made everywhere in America under the free-enterprise system.

I hope to bring this discussion to an early close.

To continue with the newspaper account of the report which was made 2 days ago, it concludes by saying:

Let us be frank. To adopt that policy would be rank, unrestrained, unadulterated socialism.

To that statement I can only add my amen.

Earlier during the colloquy I supplied various Senators with the amounts their

States had to pay in support of the TVA during last year.

I should like to insert this table in the Record at the end of my remarks. But I wish to call to the attention of persons who might read it that there are two columns on the right-hand side of the table. In one column is the amount of money paid by each State for the support of TVA this year. The next column contains the amount of money which would be saved to the various States by the construction of private-enterprise facilities, as under the Dixon-Yates contract, the total sum being \$107,250,000.

This is a most interesting compilation of figures, which I urge every Senator to study. I urge them also to ask themselves the question, Has TVA gone on long enough without paying back to the Government its proper share of the cost of its development, based upon the figures I have submitted this afternoon? I believe that the answer will be "No."

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a table I have compiled, which I will designate as exhibit 1, be printed at the end of my remarks, and that the table to which I have previously referred be designated as exhibit 2, to be printed following table 1.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Fiscal year	Total appropriation	Charged to flood control and navigation	Balance	Compound interest at 2.6 percent	Years used	Fiscal year	Total appropriation	Charged to flood control and navigation	Balance	Compound interest at 2.6 percent	Years used
1934	\$50,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$17,859,756	21	1948	\$18,700,000		\$18,700,000	\$3,682,543	
1935	25,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	8,376,808	20	1949	30,339,061		30,339,061	5,051,564	
1936	36,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	11,314,819	19	1950	61,041,650		61,041,650	8,358,695	
1937	39,900,000	19,900,000	20,000,000	11,745,440	18	1951	194,714,000		194,714,000	21,052,288	
1938	40,166,270	20,166,270	20,000,000	10,940,974	17	1952	238,389,600		238,389,600	19,082,966	
1939	40,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	10,156,895	16	1953	336,027,000		336,027,000	17,699,136	
1940	39,003,000	19,003,000	20,000,000	9,392,685	15	1954	188,480,000		188,480,000	4,900,480	
1941	65,000,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	14,054,746	14	Total	1,785,214,581	\$341,719,270	1,443,495,311	244,532,667	
1942	196,800,000	117,902,000	78,898,000	30,558,787	13						
1943	136,100,000	56,100,000	80,000,000	28,864,813	12	Less credits for repayments			87,098,166	10,863,790	
1944					11						
1945					10	Balance			1,356,397,145	233,668,877	
1946	9,648,000	648,000	9,000,000	2,339,606	9						
1947	39,906,000		39,906,000	9,099,666	8						

EXHIBIT 2

Division, State, or other area	Internal revenue collection, 1952 <sup>1</sup>		Appropriations by Congress plus transfers of property to TVA by War Department	Portion of \$80,000,000 annual subsidy of TVA which was paid in taxes by citizens of various States	Portion of immediate reduction in tax outlay by States through Dixon-Yates contract being financed by private funds
	Percent of total	Amount			
New England	5.497	\$3,574,000,000	\$90,242,000	\$4,398,000	\$5,895,000
Maine	.251	163,000,000	4,121,000	201,000	269,000
New Hampshire	.172	112,000,000	2,824,000	138,000	184,000
Vermont	.103	67,000,000	1,691,000	83,000	110,000
Massachusetts	2.827	1,838,000,000	46,425,000	2,262,000	3,033,000
Rhode Island	.451	293,000,000	7,404,000	361,000	484,000
Connecticut	1.692	1,100,000,000	27,777,000	1,354,000	1,815,000
Middle Atlantic	29.781	19,360,000,000	488,900,000	23,825,000	31,940,000
New York	18.962	12,327,000,000	311,297,000	15,170,000	20,338,000
New Jersey	2.923	1,900,000,000	47,985,000	2,338,000	3,135,000
Pennsylvania	7.895	5,133,000,000	129,618,000	6,316,000	8,467,000
East North Central	27.155	17,654,000,000	445,790,000	21,724,000	29,124,000
Ohio	6.980	4,538,000,000	114,587,000	5,584,000	7,486,000
Indiana	2.090	1,359,000,000	34,310,000	1,672,000	2,242,000
Illinois	8.277	5,381,000,000	135,879,000	6,622,000	8,877,000
Michigan	7.830	5,090,000,000	128,541,000	6,264,000	8,398,000
Wisconsin	1.978	1,286,000,000	32,472,000	1,583,000	2,121,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes individual income and employment taxes, corporation taxes, and miscellaneous internal revenue. Does not include customs collections of \$550 million in 1952.



## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

Division, State, or other area	Internal revenue collection, 1952		Appropriations by Congress plus transfers of property to TVA by War Department	Portion of \$80,000,000 annual subsidy of TVA which was paid in taxes by citizens of various States	Portion of immediate reduction in tax outlay by States through Dixon-Yates contract being financed by private funds
	Percent of total	Amount			
West North Central.....	6.927	\$4,503,000,000	\$113,717,000	\$5,542,000	\$7,429,000
Minnesota.....	1.496	973,000,000	24,559,000	1,197,000	1,604,000
Iowa.....	.804	523,000,000	13,199,000	643,000	862,000
Missouri.....	3.084	2,005,000,000	50,628,000	2,467,000	3,308,000
North Dakota.....	.107	69,000,000	1,756,000	85,000	115,000
South Dakota.....	.117	76,000,000	1,921,000	94,000	125,000
Nebraska.....	.604	393,000,000	9,916,000	483,000	648,000
Kansas.....	.715	465,000,000	11,738,000	572,000	767,000
South Atlantic.....	10.615	6,901,000,000	174,261,000	8,492,000	11,385,000
Delaware.....	1.183	769,000,000	19,421,000	946,000	1,269,000
Maryland <sup>2</sup> .....	2.685	1,745,000,000	44,078,000	2,148,000	2,880,000
District of Columbia.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Virginia.....	1.617	1,051,000,000	26,545,000	1,294,000	1,734,000
West Virginia.....	.487	317,000,000	7,995,000	390,000	522,000
North Carolina.....	2.341	1,522,000,000	38,431,000	1,873,000	2,511,000
South Carolina.....	.406	264,000,000	6,665,000	324,000	436,000
Georgia.....	.980	637,000,000	16,088,000	784,000	1,051,000
Florida.....	.916	595,000,000	15,038,000	733,000	982,000
East South Central.....	3.403	2,212,000,000	55,865,000	2,722,000	3,650,000
Kentucky.....	1.834	1,192,000,000	30,108,000	1,467,000	1,967,000
Tennessee.....	.760	494,000,000	12,476,000	608,000	815,000
Alabama.....	.594	386,000,000	9,751,000	476,000	637,000
Mississippi.....	.215	140,000,000	3,530,000	172,000	231,000
West South Central.....	5.269	3,425,000,000	86,499,000	4,215,000	5,651,000
Arkansas.....	.242	157,000,000	3,974,000	194,000	260,000
Louisiana.....	.760	494,000,000	12,476,000	608,000	815,000
Oklahoma.....	.984	640,000,000	16,154,000	787,000	1,055,000
Texas.....	3.283	2,135,000,000	53,895,000	2,627,000	3,521,000
Mountain.....	2.041	1,327,000,000	33,506,000	1,633,000	2,189,000
Montana.....	.178	116,000,000	2,922,000	143,000	191,000
Idaho.....	.181	118,000,000	2,971,000	145,000	194,000
Wyoming.....	.098	64,000,000	1,609,000	78,000	105,000
Colorado.....	.885	575,000,000	14,529,000	708,000	949,000
New Mexico.....	.157	102,000,000	2,577,000	126,000	168,000
Arizona.....	.219	143,000,000	3,595,000	175,000	235,000
Utah.....	.226	147,000,000	3,710,000	180,000	243,000
Nevada.....	.097	63,000,000	1,593,000	77,000	104,000
Pacific.....	90.021	5,865,000,000	148,093,000	7,217,000	9,675,000
Washington.....	1.161	755,000,000	19,060,000	929,000	1,245,000
Oregon.....	.714	464,000,000	11,721,000	571,000	766,000
California.....	7.146	4,645,000,000	117,312,000	5,716,000	7,664,000
Alaska.....	.068	44,000,000	1,116,000	55,000	73,000
Hawaii.....	.208	135,000,000	3,415,000	166,000	223,000
Puerto Rico.....	.015	10,000,000	246,000	12,000	16,000
Total.....	100.000	\$65,010,000,000	\$1,641,650,000	\$80,000,000	107,250,000

<sup>1</sup> Collections for the District of Columbia included with Maryland; separate data not available.

<sup>2</sup> Statistical abstract of the United States, 1953.

<sup>3</sup> TVA Annual Report, June 20, 1953, includes \$45 million of transfer of property.

<sup>4</sup> In 1953 private utilities paid out approximately 9 percent of plant account for taxes and cost of money. If TVA paid 9 percent on its plant investment of approximately \$1,100 million, they would have paid approximately \$99 million as compared to payments of \$4 million for taxes and interest, and approximately \$14 million repayments to U. S. Treasury, leaving a net difference of approximately \$80 million that TVA did not pay on a comparable basis.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the so-called power-partnership proposal of this administration was discussed at length this afternoon, I should like to take just 2 or 3 minutes to say what that proposal really involves. The major partnership bill proposed by this administration had reference to the John Day powersite on the upper Columbia River. What the bill proposes is this: The Government should invest \$156 million in a great multipurpose power site. The so-called local partner, which in this case would be the Portland General Electric Co., would invest \$164 million. After the great dam is built it would be divided as follows: The Government would get the fish ladders, the floodgates, and the navigation locks. The utility company would get a lease on the powerhouse and all its kilowatts for at least 50 years. In other words, the way it is divided up is

that the Government gets those parts of the dam which return no revenue, and the utility company gets the only part of the project which yields income and receipts.

At the present time the projects on the Columbia River, which have been built by the Federal Government and are exclusively under Federal operation, have been more than paying for themselves. As I mentioned earlier, even the annual report by Secretary McKay admits that the Bonneville Power Administration is far ahead of schedule in repayments to the Federal Treasury.

Although Bonneville Dam itself has been in full power operation only 11 years, it is approximately 38 percent paid for, which is a remarkable record either for a public or a private project. Yet at the John Day site, the Government would put up half the investment, but would relinquish virtually all the revenue.

I think the best description of the so-called partnership was sent to me in the mail by a schoolteacher in Yamhill County, Oreg., who wrote me that the so-called partnership was similar to two men owning a cow. One man got the front end of the cow to feed, and the other man got the rear end of the cow to milk. That is the way the so-called partnership works. The Government gets to pay half the investment, but surrenders nearly all the revenue. That is why, in view of the success which has come from Federal management of existing Columbia River projects, many of us are opposed to this kind of so-called partnership.

#### COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is extremely gratifying to me that Time magazine has seen fit to devote an article in its January 31 issue to the Colorado

River storage project, an eminently sound water-resource development of vital interest to 3 million residents of 4 semiarid States—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The article is a well-written, condensed, and objective report of the project. It provides helpful background material of interest to all Members of Congress.

When the Colorado River storage project bill is approved, one of the most arid parts of the country will be provided with a project based on sound reclamation law of over 50 years standing to construct some dams to control a great river and provide vitally needed water and power for communities, industries, and thirsty irrigated farmland in a 4-State area. The dams will yield all those regional benefits, return enough money into the Federal Treasury to more than repay the cost of construction of the big, long-range project, and create a superb recreational area for all America to use and enjoy.

In addition to all these benefits, I can assure honest conservationists that the few remaining fossils in Dinosaur National Monument will be left safely high and dry, 25 miles from the proposed Echo Park dam site.

These facts are made clear to help correct impressions formed by several years of distorted reporting and speech-making by individuals who should have been better informed. For example, several years ago, paid propagandists and self-styled conservationists deliberately fostered the impression that water backed up by Echo Park Dam would flood out valuable dinosaur fossils located in Dinosaur National Monument. We who live there and know the area feel that we have at long last laid this canard to rest, but it still occasionally rises to haunt us in our mail and in conversations with uninformed people.

Other misrepresentations are still being foisted upon Congress and the public to this day, so Time's honest reporting is greatly appreciated by the residents of our area. People who know the facts and appreciate our need for water, approve the project overwhelmingly.

We of the upper basin have waited since 1922, when the Colorado River Compact was signed, to begin development of the upper Colorado. During that time, we have cooperated with the lower basin States in the almost complete development of the lower river. Congress has appropriated many hundreds of millions of dollars toward this development, and I am sure that each of us recognizes that it was a wise Federal investment.

We also have seen other great river basins developed with Federal assistance or open sponsorship. Today, as Time so aptly pointed out, the upper Colorado is the last great unharnessed river system in the United States.

During that period, I am pleased to observe, we have not been content merely to wait. We have now spent nearly \$10 million in basinwide studies and surveys of the river and plans for the construction of this giant project.

Consequently, the Colorado River storage project offers to the Congress a

sound, engineered program of river development, produced over years of on-the-spot study and research by the world's foremost reclamation engineers. This approach is so sound and logical, that I predict that it will become a pattern for similar water resource development planning in the future.

The Colorado River storage project is, in fact, the greatest conservation project ever devised for the West's so-called intermountain area, with first consideration given to the natural resource most vital to us—water. For much of the area involved, the Colorado River is our last waterhole, and the future development of a great domain, as large as New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania combined, depends largely upon its authorization.

Mr. President, one of our State newspapers, the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, was so pleased to see a fair and objective report of this project that it reproduced the Time article in full. Carried on the same editorial page was a terse commendation, which I would like to append to my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD both the Time magazine article and the Deseret News editorial.

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

[From Time magazine of January 31, 1955]  
ECHO PARK BENEFITS OUTWEIGH WRATH OF DINOSAUR FANCIERS

Early one morning shortly after he had fought the McCarthy censure proceeding to a finish, Utah's Republican Senator ARTHUR WATKINS dragged himself from bed to answer his telephone. On the line was a Presidential aide who wanted to know if WATKINS could be at the White House by 9:30. Weary, ARTHUR WATKINS managed to put off the appointment until 10 o'clock, then went down to receive Dwight Eisenhower's congratulations for a job well done.

Just before he left, WATKINS had an idea. "Mr. President," he asked, "would you permit a suggestion for your state of the Union message?" Said Ike: "Go ahead."

WATKINS proceeded to put in a plug for something near to his heart: The billion-dollar power and reclamation project proposed for the upper Colorado River Basin. There was, said WATKINS, nothing socialistic about the idea; private utilities in the West were ready and eager to buy the power. Moreover, backing by the President would help refute some of the talk about the administration's "giveaway" policy on natural resources.

"That's a good idea," said Ike, turning to an assistant and giving the necessary order.

The President did mention the upper Colorado Basin project in his state of the Union speech. He went even further than WATKINS had hoped: last week, in his budget message, the President recommended that \$5 million be appropriated to get engineering started.

#### TREASURE HOUSE

Ike's powerful support was thereby given to a plan which has been talked about for some 50 years and has been passed over by 4 previous Congresses, largely because of unrelenting opposition from (1) southern California power interests who profit under the present distribution of Colorado River water, and (2) conservationists (e. g., Ulysses S. Grant III) who for years charged (erroneously) that the big dam proposed for Echo Park, Colo., would flood out the dinosaur remains in the national park there. They have since shifted their argument to the claim that if Dinosaur National Monu-

ment is invaded today, Yellowstone will be tomorrow's victim.

To the conservationists, Interior Secretary Douglas McKay has a trenchant answer. Says he: "As it is now, 2,200 people a year see that park. On the other hand, more than 3 million people live in the upper Colorado Basin States and they are hungry for water. Which is more important?"

The upper Colorado Basin includes 110,000 square miles of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona (the upper and lower basin are defined in a seven-State compact signed in 1922, with the dividing line at Lee Ferry, Ariz.). More than 43 million acres—an area larger than the 6 New England States combined—are already given over to public recreational use (the Federal Government owns 72 percent of all the land in Utah and 52 percent of Wyoming). Some 70 percent of the farming in the upper basin depends on irrigation but only a small portion of the land is irrigated.

The upper basin is a treasure house: lead, gold, silver, zinc, coal, oil—and now, uranium. But the water is not to be had for full development of these resources.

#### THE BIG SIX

The upper basin's water shortage is the supreme irony, for through the area flows the Nation's fifth longest river, the Colorado, draining one-twelfth of the United States. It rises in the Rockies of Colorado and Wyoming, travels some 1,400 miles southwest past mountain meadows, breath-taking gorges, and desert wastelands. It borders southern California, which diverts its share of the water.

Then it empties, with more than half its volume still unused (and of that which is used, the lower basin gets some 60 percent), into the Gulf of California. Along its vast upper reaches, the Colorado is the last great unharnessed river system in the United States.

The project now being backed by President Eisenhower proposes six major dams at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. Each would have a dam, a reservoir, and a power plant (exception: Navaho, for which no power unit is planned).

The Glen Canyon Dam would be the most imposing; next only to the Hoover Dam, it would stand 700 feet high, provide storage for 26 million acre-feet of water, and produce 800,000 kilowatts of power. In addition to the big 6, there would be 14 lesser projects, for irrigation purposes at such odd-sounding sites as Gooseberry, Seedskaadee, and Silt.

The entire system, say its supporters, would open 300,000 new acres to farming, vastly enhance the agriculture of 470,000 acres now partly under irrigation, and produce 1,622,000 kilowatts of electrical energy for an area now in desperate short supply.

Insofar as the administration is concerned, the Upper Colorado Basin has another great virtue. The people of the area want water; how they get it is less important. Missing, to a large extent, is the highly emotional issue of public versus private power that hampers reasonable discussion of power development in the Pacific Northwest. Administration advisers feel that they can make the upper Colorado a showcase for their policies on power development.

If so, they consider it well worth braving the wrath of dinosaur fanciers and southern California.

[From the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram of January 29, 1955]

#### TIME ON THE COLORADO

We have just one point to make regarding the reprint on this page of Time magazine's story on the Upper Colorado Basin.



It is this: Isn't it gratifying how logical and persuasive the case for the project appears when the story is told—at last—factually, without bias, and, without maudlin emotions? Congratulations to Time.

### THE FORMOSA TREATY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have 3 or 4 miscellaneous items I wish to comment on briefly for the RECORD.

The probability is that next week there will be before the Senate the so-called Formosa Treaty. At least I understand it is the present intention of the Committee on Foreign Relations to have it considered. There is much that can be said in support of the observation that the ratification of that treaty at the present time will constitute putting into treaty form, with the sanctity of a treaty, the joint resolution passed last week, which has already caused so much world disturbance, as a few of us, in debate last week, tried to indicate that it would.

I have in my hand an editorial published in the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., written by Mr. Charles Sprague, its editor and former Governor of the State of Oregon. Mr. Sprague is a recognized leader in the Republican Party of the State of Oregon, and formerly a United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In the editorial he raises some very serious questions as to the efficacy and the desirability of the Formosa Treaty.

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

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

#### IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

On December 2 Secretary of State Dulles and the Ambassador of Nationalist China signed a treaty of mutual defense. (Why is it called mutual? What has Chiang Kai-shek to give the United States of America?) Its key provisions are:

1. Agreement for mutual help in resisting armed attack and Communist subversive activities directed from without against their territorial integrity and political stability.

2. Recognition that an armed attack in the western Pacific against the territories of either "would be dangerous to its own peace and safety," and a joint declaration for action to meet the common danger in accordance with constitutional processes.

3. Grant by the Republic of China to the United States to dispose its military forces around Formosa and the Pescadores as may be required for their defense.

Dispatching the 7th Fleet to guard Formosa when the Communists launched their aggression in Korea was a move to protect Formosa and confine the shooting to Korea. The Truman order was made without any limit as to time. In other words it was issued to meet an immediate emergency, leaving to the future the decision as to United States responsibility for protecting Formosa from the Reds.

This treaty, however, would freeze that protection into permanence. Insofar as its terms go it imposes no restraint on the Nationalists who might by raids provoke the Reds to an attack although there are intimations that Chiang has agreed to keep his forces under some measure of restraint.

The fault of the treaty lies in creating a block against any overall settlement in the Far East. It preserves a friction point which

promises us continuous trouble with Red China and serves as an irritant with our Allies, Britain in particular. The wise course is to avert warfare for the time being while the nations grope for some settlement with a promise of endurance. As I have remarked in this column previously, it just doesn't make sense to keep our ships and planes on patrol duty in Formosa straits, month in, month out, year in, year out.

The United States has its differences with Red China. They are serious; but the hope is general that we can resolve them without resort to war. To that end we have exercised great patience both in the Korean war and in regard to later acts violating normal good relations between nations. Just now we are seeking through peaceful agencies the repatriation of our prisoners-of-war. The future of Formosa poses one of the most difficult problems in any general peace settlement in the Orient. Yet it must not serve as the perpetual roadblock to such a settlement.

Nathaniel Pfeffer, professor of international relations at Columbia University, who writes with a considerable degree of authority on Far Eastern questions, offered in a recent issue of the Nation this compromise for solving the Formosa question:

"Formosa must be declared to be part of China, within the scope of Chinese sovereignty. The present Nationalist regime must be liquidated, with asylum elsewhere given to the leaders of the government and such others as wish to leave. But for a transitional period—10 years, if possible, 5 years certainly—Formosa must have a special status. It must be put under the jurisdiction of the U. N. and administered by a commission composed of representatives of three small states. After 10 years, or 5, Formosa would be incorporated in China proper, whatever government was in power. By that time all the important men now in Formosa would have left or died and the incidence of penalization by the Communists minimized."

This is one suggestion which at least looks to a solution without keeping Formosa dangling as an appendage of the United States of America, dependent on this country for military support and continuous economic wetnursing. Some other plan might be more practical; but one is urgently needed which will get the United States off the hook in Formosa and Asia. It is vital to our own interest to hammer out a settlement in the Far East. Our diplomacy should be directed to that end, not toward bolstering the repudiated regime of Chiang Kai-shek which maintains itself by United States beneficence as a rump China Government on the island of Formosa.

Mr. MORSE. The observations by Mr. Sprague in his editorial involve points which must necessarily be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations next week. I shall see to it that those points are raised for committee discussion. I am afraid that, in its present form, the treaty will only tend to increase the tension in the south Pacific because of language in the treaty which may very well encompass the protection by the United States of Chinese territory within 7 to 10 miles of the Chinese coast—territory in which the United States does not have a scintilla of legal interest. Obviously, an attempt on the part of the United States to maintain a defense of the Quemoy and the Matsus will be bound to be a continued threat to peace in that quarter of the world.

Mr. President, I repeat that we and the American people had better be willing to run the risks of peace and to start talking less about running the risks of war.

It should be surprising to no one that the Premier of China would be making the warlike statements he has made in recent hours, for certainly he has no appreciation of human life, human values, or human dignity. But we do. As a Christian nation, we have the great moral and traditional obligation of running the risks of peace. I hope the Senate will take a long, hard look at the Formosa treaty and will make certain that it is not subject to the interpretation that its ratification will place upon the United States an obligation to defend territory in the East over which we have no sovereign interest.

I wish to repeat that in my judgment the Formosa issue should be submitted to juridical, not military, determination, and that we should continue to exercise our military obligation of carrying out caretaker interest until the United Nations, under its charter, proceeds with its obligation to make a juridical determination as to Formosa. We have a clear duty to defend Formosa and the Pescadores until the United Nations disposes of those islands. We have no international-law right to defend the Quemoy and the Matsus. Until we are at war—and we are not now at war—I shall continue to plead with my country not to proceed in the South Pacific with a course of action that increases the risks of war and lessens the possibilities of peace.

While there is hope of peace I favor standing on the side of peace. While there is hope of having this threat to the peace of the world settled by the juridical processes of the United Nations, I shall continue to urge my Government to lay the matter formally before the United Nations for final determination, with no conditions attached.

It is anomalous, Mr. President, to walk before a court and say to it, "We will let you render a decision, provided you render it within the terms and conditions we lay down." We must not permit ourselves to be put into a comparable position on the Formosa question. If we do so, we merely feed the furnaces of Red propaganda.

That is why, Mr. President, in a period of time in which so much thinking is being done by so many through their glands rather than through their cortexes, it is well for us to pause long enough to reflect upon such contributions of intellect as the one to be found in the February 1 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. I refer to an article entitled "The Dark Tunnel," written by Walter Lippmann. I have been waiting to hear some arguments in answer to Mr. Lippmann. I believe the American people are greatly indebted to the calm, penetrating, intellectual approach he has made to the South Pacific problem, both before the passage of the joint resolution and since then. It is not too late for us to demonstrate more clearly that we are willing to let this matter be determined by the United Nations. It is no answer to say that the vicious, threatening, dictator leader of Communist China is hurling more and more insults and warlike talk toward us, because we would make a great mistake if we were to let his threats cause us to

make, in Asia, a mistake which would throw us into a war on the mainland of China.

Mr. President, is it not interesting what the Russian attitude has been during the last week? I may be wrong, but I think it is more and more clear that there would not be mourning in the Kremlin if we were to be sucked into a war on the mainland of China. On the other hand, I think it is also quite clear that there would be mourning in the capitals of some of our allies if that should happen, because they are expressing obvious concern as to what might happen to Europe if we should become tied down in China.

So, Mr. President, as we go over the weekend preceding what undoubtedly will be another historic debate in the Senate over the Formosa Treaty, let us, as Americans, unite on two propositions: first, that once again we make clear to the world that we will defend to the hilt Formosa and the Pescadores. That has always been my position; it has been my position from the very beginning of the issue in the South Pacific, and I repeat it today, because, despite the fact that it has been my position, newspaper story after newspaper story and radio commentator after radio commentator have given the American people the impression that the three of us who, last week voted against the joint resolution, voted against the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. We did not. On the contrary, we argue that we could better defend Formosa and the Pescadores if we did not follow a course of action which would involve a greater danger of getting into a war on the mainland of China by reason of the defense of some islands within 7 to 10 miles of the mainland of China.

We pointed out that the defense of those islands is not at all necessary to the defense of Formosa, but that the defense of those islands might very well increase the military danger of an attack on Formosa, and might very well increase the danger of Chiang sucking us into a war on the mainland of China. I hold to that point of view, which is held by many who voted for the resolution. The time has come to make it very clear to the American people that this Government is not going to go to war to protect Chiang on the Quemoy and the Matsus. If he wants to stay there, let him stay there and take the consequences. We are not going to sacrifice American boys to keep him there.

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

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. However, we will protect his withdrawal from there if his remaining there means that we will become sucked in and involved in the Chinese civil war on the Quemoy and on the mainland.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio. Mr. BENDER. Is Chiang less reprehensible in Formosa than he is in the Quemoy? The Senator is painting a dreadful picture of Chiang, but Chiang is running the show in Formosa. When do we love Chiang, and when do we stop loving him?

Mr. MORSE. All I can say to the Senator from Ohio is that I will vote to

protect Chiang on Formosa, but I will not vote to get my country involved in a civil war in China over Chiang. Formosa has nothing to do with the civil war in China. Formosa involves a territorial obligation of the United States as a caretaker over that area until the United Nations disposes of Formosa.

But we have not the slightest legal right to the Quemoy or the Matsus; and when we are dust, and decades go by, would that we could come back and read the judgment of history. I say that will be the judgment of history. As a matter of international law we have not the slightest right to defend the Quemoy and the Matsus, because we have no sovereign interest in them. We never have had, and there has never been any question as to the territory to which they belong. They belong to China. But I am a good enough Christian, I hope, never to advocate that we walk out on Chiang and let him be subjected to a blood bath if he is willing to evacuate and go back to the territory where we have the sovereign right to protect him. That is my position, and that was my position all through the debate last week.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that Formosa was a part of the Chinese Empire—

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

Mr. BENDER. Seventy or eighty years ago before the Japanese took over?

Mr. MORSE. But China ceded it to the Japanese under solemn treaty.

Mr. BENDER. She ceded it to the Japanese when she had a pistol at her head.

Mr. MORSE. It was in settlement of a war.

Mr. BENDER. Formosa on that basis certainly was a part of the Chinese Empire.

Mr. MORSE. Not after she ceded it.

Mr. BENDER. The fact of the matter is that it was a part of the Chinese realm.

Mr. MORSE. Decades and decades ago, of course it was, but it ceased to be when, by a solemn treaty, Japan and China entered into a territorial settlement. Unfortunately, throughout history the animalistic side of man has caused him to fight wars, and as a result of those wars there have been treaty settlements. In those treaties there have been territorial adjustments. As a matter of international law, when that solemn treaty was signed and became the settlement of that war, Formosa became Japanese territory, and we joined in taking it away from Japan as a result of the peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the Senator will agree that all of us are endeavoring to avert any possibility of another Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure all of us appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oregon is just as sincere as any other Member of the Senate. I respected him in the convention which nominated him then leader and our present President.

I shall never forget joining in the demonstration for the late great Senator Taft on the floor of that convention hall. The Senator from Oregon was yelling himself hoarse for President Eisenhower and telling us what a great military leader he was, and what a fine Christian gentlemen he was. I was for Taft, but now I have come to know that the Senator from Oregon was right then.

The Senator from Oregon speaks of President Eisenhower as being a fine Christian gentleman, and he speaks of this Nation as being a Christian Nation. That is correct. We have never had a greater military leader or a greater statesman in the President's chair than President Eisenhower. There has never been a greater Christian in that office than the present President. If the Senator from Oregon knows of any other who has been greater, I should like to have him name him.

So far as the present situation is concerned, I am reminded of what an editor back home instructed one of his reporters to ask me. He asked me the following question:

Do you believe that the people of the United States should go to war with Red China, if necessary, to defend Formosa?

I replied:

I do not think we should go to war for anyone unless we have to. The entire purpose of the resolution which we passed last week and the present policy of the administration with respect to Formosa is to prevent the outbreak of a major war. We are doing our best to show the Chinese and the Communists that we are prepared, if necessary, to fight against any further Communist aggression. I pray that this will prevent the necessity of war, and that it will serve as a guidepost to the United Nations in compelling peace.

That is what we are endeavoring to do. The Senator from Oregon referred to the radio and television commentators misrepresenting his position. Frankly, I assumed, after sitting here listening to my good friend from Oregon on the floor of the Senate, that what the radio and television commentators and the newspapers said was correct. The Senator was opposing a program to which the overwhelming majority of Members of Congress, not only here, but in the other body, agreed. Certainly we know that if we fail to preserve peace in the Formosan area, the entire problem will be on our doorstep.

I did not intend to get into this discussion. At the moment I happen to be sitting in one of the seats of the mighty. Temporarily I am occupying the chair of the minority leader. When the Senator from Oregon speaks, I try to understand what he says. I cannot quite figure it out. However, I know that in my judgment we are pursuing the only course we can pursue to preserve the peace. That is our only objective.

So far as our great President is concerned, I am sure my distinguished friend from Oregon would not say that the President is acting in a warlike manner, or that he wants war. Certainly he craves peace. No man in the world knows the cost of war better than he does. No man knows the price we all pay for war any better than our great President knows it.



Under the circumstances, I say that his judgment and the advice he receives are the kind of judgment and advice we need at this time in a world of strife.

Mr. MORSE. In reply to my good friend from Ohio I should like to say that I certainly have complete confidence in his sincerity. I respect his devotion and dedication to peace. However, as to many of his remarks I must say most respectfully that I find myself in the position in which one sometimes finds himself in a courtroom when he is confronted with arguments which are irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential so far as the issue before the court is concerned. Because I feel that so much of what the Senator has said is immaterial to the subject I was discussing, I shall make no additional comment on his remarks but return to a further discussion of the issue I was talking about before the Senator from Ohio interrupted.

The question is how best to defend Formosa. The Senator from Oregon is perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself on that question. He voted against the joint resolution last week because he did not believe it provided the best way to defend Formosa. He believed that the resolution increased the danger of war on the mainland of China.

Certainly nothing has transpired since the resolution was passed which would indicate that we have decreased the danger of such a war. I repeat my major thesis that we best defend Formosa when we remain within the international law rights of the United States. We do have those rights on Formosa, and we do not have them on the Quemoy and the Matsus.

Therefore, I believe we should continue to make perfectly clear that we shall defend Formosa from attack. I believe we ought to try, through some such resolution as the Humphrey resolution, which was postponed in the Committee on Foreign Relations last week, to urge the United Nations to exercise its jurisdiction, because it has the power to call upon the countries involved in this dispute to submit their case for judicial determination.

One more point, and I shall have completed my argument on this issue today.

I wish to express again, for the week-end consideration of the American people, the fact that we have a legal duty to defend Formosa. Formosa is not Chinese territory. Under the Sino-Japanese treaty of many years ago, following the Sino-Japanese war, it became Japanese territory. Under the Japanese treaty following World War II, it ceased to be Japanese territory. If I read correctly the writings of international lawyers, its status awaits final settlement and international legal determination by the United Nations.

That is why the Senator from Oregon for many months has been urging the establishment of a United Nations trusteeship over Formosa, and that we maintain a military protectorate over Formosa until the United Nations assumes jurisdiction.

It seems to me that the real threat of war in that area at this time lies in the fact that there may be committed in connection with Quemoy and the Matsus some act which may make it necessary to proceed to exercise all the power contained in the joint resolution passed last week.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is quite right when he points out that the intentions and objectives and purposes of our President are intentions and objectives and purposes of peace. I said as much over and over again in the debate last week. I am satisfied the President seeks only peace. What I fear is that he and all the others of us may be maneuvered into such a position that peace cannot be attained. I believe we greatly increase the risks of war unless we get the whole question before the United Nations for juridical determination, without any strings attached, either by Red China or by the United States. If we believe in a system of international justice through law, that must be done.

Interestingly enough, in my 10 years in the Senate I do not know of 2 Senators who stood more firmly in support of a system of international justice through law than the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, and the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft. When I stood on the other side of the aisle and fought for the Morse resolution in 1945, calling for the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of a world court, which subsequently became the United States attitude in our membership in the United Nations, no one helped me more than the late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft. He was always one of the most ardent advocates in the Senate for the settlement of international disputes, not by a show of military force, but by the force of reason in a juridical body.

I believe it is not too late for us to win world opinion solidly behind us, and thereby throw the vicious, lying Russian Communist propaganda for a great loss, by making clear to the world that we are willing to let the issue of the Quemoy and the Matsus and Formosa and the Tachens be settled by juridical decision through the United Nations, or by whatever tribunal the United Nations wishes to create to settle it. Certainly some of the phases of the issue might very well be determined by a world court.

I now turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

#### OUR TRADE POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning in the hearings on H. R. 1, the so-called trade-program bill, there appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. William R. Shinn, of Salem, Oreg. He appeared in behalf of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation. He submitted testimony, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks before I make certain comments on it.

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

STATEMENT ON H. R. 1 BY WILLIAM R. SHINN, OF SALEM, OREG., FOR THE CHERRY GROWERS AND INDUSTRIES FOUNDATION, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, FEBRUARY 4, 1955

I appear at this hearing on behalf of the Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation, the principal office of which is located in Corvallis, Oreg., for the purpose of discussing H. R. 1 from the point of view of the sweet cherry industry of the United States, comprising the growers, handlers, processors, and shippers of sweet cherries grown commercially throughout the United States.

The sweet-cherry industry is vitally interested in H. R. 1 for the reason that this industry to a large extent is dependent upon tariff protection on imports of brined cherries and finished maraschino or glacé cherries.

The Cherry Growers and Industries Foundation is a trade association of 18,432 growers, shippers, and processors of sweet cherries in California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Michigan, and New York. It presumes to speak on these matters on behalf of the sweet-cherry industry by reason of its wide membership among all factors of the industry. I offer for the record a list of the officers and members of the board of trustees of this organization.

I am a member of the board of trustees of the foundation, and have been directed by the executive committee of the board to present this statement. My personal connection with the industry is as secretary and assistant general manager of Willamette Cherry Growers, Inc., a cooperative marketing association of cherry growers in Oregon's Willamette Valley.

Brined cherries (also known as "sulphured" cherries) are cherries which have been treated in a sulphurous acid solution as the raw stock for manufacture of maraschino, glacé and candied cherries widely used by the confectionery, ice cream, and bakery trades, sold as cocktail cherries, included in canned fruit salad or fruit cocktail packs, and bottled for household use.

The domestic cherry industry is highly vulnerable to imports, by reason of the much lower foreign production and processing costs. There is a tremendous disparity between the labor costs in the foreign and American cherry orchards and processing plants. Basic wage rates prevailing in the Pacific coast cherry brining plants are about \$1.31 per hour for men and \$1.13 for women, for unskilled workers. Classified rates, such as for brine makers, barrel headers, and mechanics are much higher. These rates are exclusive of the cost of health and welfare coverage, overtime and double time, guaranteed minimum work periods, and other fringe benefits.

In comparison, our latest reliable information is that Italian and French plants brining cherries for export to the United States have been paying average wages equivalent to from about 25 cents to 46 cents per hour, inclusive of the value of certain government benefits to workers. These competitive foreign wage rates range between about one-fifth and one-third of our lowest base wage rates.

Labor costs in growing and harvesting the American cherries likewise are far greater than those applicable to the Italian and French cherries. The foreign growers are content to receive prices amounting to about one-half of the American growers' costs of production.

These differences in labor costs, which the American industry cannot possibly reduce or overcome, are of critical significance, for more than 60 percent of the cost of growing

and harvesting sweet cherries, and approximately 50 percent of the cost of brining and pitting cherries in the United States, is cost of labor, despite recourse by the American industry to every practicable mechanization in producing, handling, and processing the cherries.

The disparity between foreign and American production costs is not overcome by delivery costs. Ocean freight rates on brined cherries from Italy or France to the United States are less than rail or water rates on Pacific coast cherries to the eastern buyers. Even as to cherries grown and processed on the east coast, the shipping costs of the imports far from make up for the higher domestic costs.

The present tariff rates, particularly the reduced rates on finished cherries, do not equalize these cost differences. Present import duties merely place a low floor under import prices. The domestic industry is now particularly vulnerable to French glacé cherries, which have entered the United States in substantially increasing quantities since the second tariff reduction on those cherries in 1948, and at prices which American glacé manufacturers report to be below their costs of production.

The obvious purpose of H. R. 1, considered in the light of the majority report of the Randall Commission, is to continue the course of widespread tariff reductions as an instrument of international politics. No doubt those nations which have been gratuitously advising us on our tariff policy and clamoring for further reductions of our already low duty rates, without manifesting any sincere intent to lift the artificial barriers which they so effectively maintain against our own products, will take this measure, if enacted, as an assurance of wholesale reductions of our tariff rates, and accordingly will press vigorously for such reductions.

We object to provisions of H. R. 1 which would authorize the President to reduce to a 50 percent ad valorem equivalent any and all rates determined by him to have exceeded that figure during such time as he may consider to be "representative." The implication of H. R. 1 that any rate in excess of 50 percent ad valorem is excessive is wholly fallacious. For example, the present 9½ cents per pound rate on pitted brined cherries is equivalent to 58.2 percent ad valorem if computed on the basis of 1952 imports, or 55.3 percent if based on 1953 imports; yet as I have pointed out, the present cherry rates cannot possibly be considered excessive with relation to comparative domestic and foreign costs of production, and do not now give the American producers an even break with the foreign producers in their own American markets. The American cherry industry should have more, rather than less, tariff protection than the present duty rates provide. We submit that the 50 percent ad valorem basis specified in H. R. 1 as one of the devices for tariff reduction is without adequate basis in fact, is delusive, and should be deleted from the bill.

Certainly any such provision should be surrounded with limitations beyond the present "representative period" wording. The ad valorem equivalent of specific duty rates may fluctuate widely from season to season or even month to month, according to variations of market prices as affected by supplies available and many other factors. In fact, it is during times of domestic or foreign surpluses and consequent depressed prices, when the ad valorem equivalent of the duty rates is highest, that tariff protection is most urgently needed. Low import values and thus a high ad valorem level of the import duty, may even be the result of foreign subsidizing of exports, or artificial "rigging" of foreign export prices. We propose that any determination of ad valorem equivalent rate be required to be on the

basis of a definite period of time, such as the previous 3 years, rather than left to the unlimited discretion of the President.

Of similar concern to us are the provisions for possible 50 percent reduction of rates on commodities the President determines are being imported in "negligible" quantities. The bill does not define the word "negligible." Does this mean inconsequential in comparison with imports of other commodities, or with the dollar average of all imports, or in relation to imports of the one commodity involved; and if this latter, then in comparison with imports of that commodity during what period of time? Even more alarming is the fact that this provision would make the quantity of imports at the time the trade agreement is entered into, the controlling factor.

Imports of brined cherries vary widely in volume according to the size of domestic and foreign crops or brined packs, price levels, and even the extent of pure food and drug surveillance of imports in any particular period. The imports at the time a trade agreement is signed may thus be negligible in comparison with imports of all commodities at that time, or in comparison with the imports of brined cherries during the same time in previous years. The "negligible" standard makes no allowance for prospective or potential imports. More than 20 million pounds of brined cherries were imported from Italy in 1929, before the present tariff rates took effect. Italy is reported to have more than doubled its cherry production since that time. Even if current cherry imports could be considered "negligible" (and certainly they are not), such would not necessarily mean that present tariff rates are excessive or not needed. A dike erected against a known flood danger is not torn down merely because at the moment no water is pouring over its top.

If multilateral trade agreements are to continue, or if tariff rate revisions are to be made in any other manner by Presidential action, then certainly peril point and escape clause procedures are essential. Future bargaining with foreign governments on trade matters must preserve for American industry the opportunity to compete fairly with foreign products in our own markets. If a trade commitment is found to have the result or potential effect of destroying that opportunity for fair competition, and thus destroying or seriously injuring the American industry concerned, there must be reserved a method for correcting that result. We, of course, disagree with and deplore the proposals of some individuals (who we note usually are from industries without serious import competition) that our Government deliberately sacrifice those of our industries which cannot survive without some import protection.

We favor making the Tariff Commission's determinations in peril point and escape clause proceedings mandatory upon the President. We feel strongly that if the purpose of peril point and escape clause provisions is sound, and if the intent is to protect the opportunity of American industry to compete fairly with imports in the American markets, then there can be no proper basis for continuing the present authority of the President to disregard or veto the factual determinations of the expert Tariff Commission arrived at after public hearing and thorough competent consideration. The entire peril point and escape clause mechanism at the Tariff Commission level tends to be farcical so long as the President may arbitrarily and for reasons entirely foreign to the purposes of the peril point and escape clause provisions disregard the Commission's findings.

We strongly believe that the tariff should be taken out of executive control, removed from the realm of international politics, and

handled by the Congress as a domestic matter, with fact-finding functions final in the Tariff Commission.

Our concern about these matters is not academic. More than one-third of the commercial sweet cherry production of the United States is now brined. Practically the entire large Michigan production of sweet cherries goes into brine, and from 75 percent to 90 percent of the New York crop. Oregon also brines most of its cherry production.

The tariff-protected brined market is now the keystone to the advantageous and orderly marketing of the entire sweet cherry production of the United States. The fresh and canning markets, which before the rise of the cherry brining industry in the United States were the only markets for the sweet cherry crops, could not now possibly absorb sufficient quantities of the annual production of cherries to keep today's sweet cherry industry in business.

The domestic brined cherry industry has developed entirely since the Tariff Act of 1930 established the present tariff rates on brined cherries, and the rates on finished cherries which prevailed until reduced under the 1936 trade agreement with Italy. Prior to 1930 it was impossible for the American growers and processors to compete with the cheaply produced foreign cherries, with the result that practically all brined cherries then used in the United States were imported. There was no important commercial cherry brining industry in the United States prior to 1930. This is an industry which was created and is largely maintained by tariff protection, and which would rapidly fall back to insignificant size without adequate tariff protection.

The American cherry industry has no present or potential export market. It depends entirely upon its own domestic markets which it has developed by vigorous effort and enterprise to their present substantial proportions. Its tariff protection has been the cherry industry's sole reliance upon Government assistance to date. We consider this to be far more wholesome for the industry and for the Nation as a whole than any kind of Government subsidy program or public relief. We believe further that no practicable type of Government support or relief program could sustain the American cherry industry if it were deprived of reasonable tariff protection.

We are appalled by the apparently serious suggestions now being made that industries such as ours should acquiesce in the sacrifice of our hard-won domestic markets on the altar of international diplomacy, and that we be content with assurances that upon destruction or serious limitation of our industry we shall all have the opportunity of being retrained, relocated, and rehabilitated at public expense. You can well imagine the reaction of an Oregon or New York cherry grower who may have spent the larger part of his mature life in bringing his cherry orchard up to a point of economic production, when told that if the cherry tariffs are cut to the point where he cannot make a living out of his cherry orchard, the Government will pay the expense of relocating him in Detroit as an automobile mechanic or in California to work in the airplane factories.

Much of the cherry production in the United States is in areas best suited to that crop, and has been established under strong encouragement by the United States Department of Agriculture and by the State agricultural colleges, as the best utilization of certain types of land and for agricultural diversification. Loss of this agricultural industry in those areas could not be made up to any substantial extent by production of other commodities. A case in point is the specialized cherry producing district in the area of The Dalles in eastern Oregon. Land use committees of growers



and government officials set up for the purpose of considering what use might be made of such cherry acreage should it become necessary to pull the orchards have failed to find any possible satisfactory alternative utilization for that land.

A mature cherry orchard represents a heavy investment, and frequently constitutes a lifetime family enterprise. It cannot be converted under any circumstances to some other crop or usage without a tragic loss of time, effort, and investment.

The growing of cherries is typically a small-farm family-size operation. It is carried on in the United States by many thousands of farm families heavily reliant upon their "cherry money" for their livelihood.

The great amount of hand labor required in the harvesting, packing, and processing of the cherry crop results in extensive employment and payrolls in the States involved. For instance, approximately 6,500 people were employed in harvesting the 1954 sweet cherry crop in the Willamette Valley in Oregon which is served by the cooperative association with which I am identified. It is estimated that the gross returns from the 1954 crop brined cherries packed in the Salem, Oreg., area, covering the fruit itself, wages paid, and cost of the Oregon fir barrels, will total approximately \$7 million.

Our operations in Salem, Oreg., of course, are only a small portion of the United States cherry industry, but the economic importance of this activity to this one relatively small community indicates the substantial extent of the national industry when measured in terms of payrolls and returns to the many communities and separate areas involved.

The American industry does not seek to exclude the foreign cherries. It does, however, require equalization of the cost of the foreign and domestic cherries, through the medium of import duties, so that the domestic industry may continue to exist and compete fairly with the foreign cherries in its own domestic markets. We know very well and very clearly that without adequate tariff protection our domestic markets frequently would be demoralized and ultimately would be taken over by the foreign cherries, at least in years of normal foreign crops. The domestic industry could not exist under such conditions in the future, any more than it was able to exist under such conditions prior to the Tariff Act of 1930.

H. R. 1 appears to be aimed directly at this and similarly protected industries. It is no comfort to us that H. R. 1 purports to dilute its lethal dosages over a period of 3 years. An untimely, even if slow and agonized, death would be the prospect for our national brined cherry industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a reading of the testimony will bring to mind a problem I have discussed on the floor of the Senate many times in the last 10 years. I discuss it now as one who favors a reciprocal trade program. I discuss it as one who knows that the program of "trade, not aid," if it is put into operation, will cause some dislocations in some segments of our economy.

However, there are certain phases of the program on which I wish to comment briefly. In the Willamette Valley of Oregon, which is of great agricultural value, and which produces a large volume of the agricultural commodities of my State, there are a great many soft spots today. The cherry industry is soft. The filbert and walnut industries are soft. The dairy industry is experiencing difficulty. The hop industry, which is a very important agricultural industry in the Willamette Valley, is in a serious situation. Some hop growers have written

to me, saying that they believe the importation of hops might very well make it completely unprofitable in the near future to produce hops in the Willamette Valley. The fruit industry generally is greatly concerned.

Therefore, Mr. President, as we move into a consideration of H. R. 1 and the international trade program which will grow out of it, I think we need to recognize the importance of a proposal which I made, as I recall, 5 years ago in the Senate when I pointed out that cherry trees, walnut trees, filbert trees, and other fruit and nut crops are not grown in a year. It takes years to produce them. The investment in them is exceedingly heavy; and the following of a course of governmental action which makes it impossible for the growers to market their harvests at a profit places, I think, a moral obligation on the Government to take the necessary steps to come to the assistance of the farmers who suffer as a result of such action.

I have made suggestions in the past as to the form of assistance, but I think it is well at this point to take note of two comments of Mr. Shinn in his testimony this morning:

The sweet cherry industry is vitally interested in H. R. 1 for the reason that this industry to a large extent is dependent upon tariff protection on imports of brined cherries and finished maraschino or glacé cherries.

The domestic cherry industry is highly vulnerable to imports, by reason of the much lower foreign production and processing costs. There is a tremendous disparity between the labor costs in the foreign and American cherry orchards and processing plants. Basic wage rates prevailing in the Pacific coast cherry brining plants are about \$1.31 per hour for men and \$1.13 for women, for unskilled workers. Classified rates, such as for brine makers, barrel headers, and mechanics, are much higher. These rates are exclusive of the cost of health and welfare coverage, overtime and double time, guaranteed minimum work periods, and other fringe benefits.

In comparison, our latest reliable information is that Italian and French plants brining cherries for export to the United States have been paying average wages equivalent to from about 25 cents to 46 cents per hour, inclusive of the value of certain Government benefits to workers. These competitive foreign wage rates range between about one-fifth and one-third of our lowest wage rates.

Labor costs in growing and harvesting the American cherries likewise are far greater than those applicable to the Italian and French cherries. The foreign growers are content to receive prices amounting to about one-half of the American growers' costs of production.

These differences in labor costs, which the American industry cannot possibly reduce or overcome, are of critical significance, for more than 60 percent of the cost of growing and harvesting sweet cherries, and approximately 50 percent of the cost of brining and pitting cherries in the United States, is cost of labor, despite recourse by the American industry to every practicable mechanization in producing, handling, and processing the cherries.

Then Mr. Shinn points out a procedural matter about which I wish to comment in conclusion. He says:

We object to provisions of H. R. 1 which would authorize the President to reduce to

a 50-percent ad valorem equivalent any and all rates determined by him to have exceeded that figure during such time as he may consider to be "representative." The implication of H. R. 1 that any rate in excess of 50 percent ad valorem is excessive is wholly fallacious. For example, the present 9½-cents-per-pound rate on pitted brined cherries is equivalent to 58.2 percent ad valorem if computed on the basis of 1952 imports, or 55.3 percent if based on 1953 imports; yet as I have pointed out, the present cherry rates cannot possibly be considered excessive with relation to comparative domestic and foreign costs of production, and do not now give the American producers an even break with the foreign producers in their own American markets.

Elsewhere in his testimony Mr. Shinn points out:

If multilateral trade agreements are to continue, or if tariff rate revisions are to be made in any other manner by Presidential action, then certain peril-point and escape-clause procedures are essential. Future bargaining with foreign governments on trade matters must preserve for American industry the opportunity to compete fairly with foreign products in our own markets. If a trade commitment is found to have the result or potential effect of destroying that opportunity for fair competition, and thus destroying or seriously injuring the American industry concerned, there must be reserved a method for correcting that result.

I shall have something to say in a moment about possible methods. I read further:

We favor making the Tariff Commission's determinations in peril-point and escape-clause proceedings mandatory upon the President. We feel strongly that if the purpose of peril-point and escape-clause provisions is sound, and if the intent is to protect the opportunity of American industry to compete fairly with imports in the American markets, then there can be no proper basis for continuing the present authority of the President to disregard or veto the factual determinations of the expert Tariff Commission, arrived at after public hearing and thorough competent consideration.

Elsewhere in his statement this morning Mr. Shinn pointed up the procedural problem which I now wish to emphasize.

I do not go all the way with Mr. Shinn in regard to the operation of the peril point. Neither do I believe that the President of the United States should be given the very arbitrary discretionary power he will have unless some check is placed upon him.

I am talking about a procedural matter which greatly concerns me these days in the operation of the executive branch of our Government. This is no new position with me. I expressed a similar point of view under the administrations of both President Roosevelt and President Truman, because I think we are moving too far in the direction of eliminating congressional check upon the executive branch of the Government. We are placing entirely too much executive discretionary power in the President in connection with trade. We see this problem cropping out these days, Mr. President, in connection with the President's relationship to a great many commissions. Do not forget that the United States Tariff Commission is our "baby." The United States Tariff Commission is a child of the Congress, as is the Interstate

Commerce Commission, as is the Atomic Energy Commission, and as are all the other commissions established by Congress.

What is happening in our country is that many of our people are overlooking the fact that under our constitutional system the functions being performed by these commissions originally were performed by the Congress, but the job of administering government became so extensive and complex that it became perfectly obvious that the Congress of the United States could not function as a regulator of railroad rates and tariff rates or perform the many other functions now performed by commissions. So what did the Congress do? Congress passed legislation which delegated the administrative power of the Congress—not legislative power—in the field of law administration to bodies which have become known as commissions and similar regulatory bodies. But they are carrying out primarily the work of the Congress. We must keep a check on them.

In recent years there has been developing on the part of the Congress a tendency to allow the President to pass final judgment upon the decisions of these congressional bodies, with the result that the President is coming to exercise more and more quasi-legislative power. The big fuss over the Dixon-Yates contract is because the President has stepped in and ordered a congressional agency to enter into it. That is an abuse of the executive power. The act of the President of the United States in directing and ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to make the contract when a majority of that Commission was on record as being opposed to it, because, in the opinion of the majority of the Commission, it represented unsound public policy, was, in my judgment, an abuse by the President of the United States of executive power and a trespass upon legislative prerogatives and rights. This tendency is increasing.

The last item I shall take up this afternoon will deal, in my judgment, with another improper use of Executive power by the President of the United States in connection with another Government commission. But in connection with the matter of the Tariff Commission, I do not go along all the way with Mr. Shinn on the point that the President should not have the power in any way to modify the recommendation or the decision of the Tariff Commission in the operation of the peril point. I do say, however, that when the President of the United States reverses one of our agencies, one of our legislative children, one of the bodies responsible to Congress, we had better review the President's act. We had better exercise a check upon him.

So as we begin the debate on H. R. 1, I wish to say that, in my judgment, in connection with agricultural problems such as Mr. Shinn brought out in relation to the cherry industry of my State—and there are other phases of agriculture which are going to be likewise adversely affected—Congress clearly has the duty of reviewing the action taken by the President. I shall give very care-

ful consideration to proposals, which I understand are in the making, for some procedural modifications in regard to the exercise of power by the President of the United States whereby Congress will exercise a check upon him. In this connection I think we should give serious consideration to the suggestion that Congress should have a limited time within which to review the President's actions in these trade cases. In the absence of such congressional review the President's ruling would become operative.

This afternoon all I have sought to do in connection with the cherry problem in my State is to get the material into the Record and to point out the serious injury which is likely to flow, not only to the cherry industry, but also to other types of orchards in my State—in fact, also, I think, in regard to some other phases of American agriculture.

I am for working along with the President in building up world trade, recognizing that some dislocations are bound to occur in the national economy. But I also say that all the people of the United States, when these dislocations occur, owe a responsibility to the people of our country who are damaged thereby, at least to the extent of providing a procedure whereby some adjustment will be made for losses which will be suffered by some segment of the industry until it can make another agricultural adjustment.

To be specific, I remember that about 5 years ago I pointed out that I did not think it was fair, as happened in many parts of my State, to have the importation of Turkish and Italian filberts result in the tearing out of acres and acres of filbert orchards in my State, with the Government taking the attitude that because it had inaugurated that policy, 164 million American people had no responsibilities whatsoever to the filbert growers, who, in fact, were subjected to the tremendous losses which followed from that course of action.

On the basis of the moral principles of a fair insurance policy, I felt that our Government ought to have been looked upon somewhat as an insurer in that case, and that there should have been some adjustment made to the farmers who suffered those losses. I think the principle is sound. The problem is to find a way to work out the mechanics and the equities which would do justice to the taxpayers as well as to the persons who suffer losses.

I now turn to another matter, which involves another regrettable example of this administration's concern on behalf of big business. It is to be found in the President's action of February 2, in which he refused approval of the unanimous recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board that the Northwest Airlines be recertified for service from the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii.

I recall that it was a few years ago when I fought on the floor of the Senate shoulder to shoulder with the Senators from Washington in an attempt to get authorization for certification for Northwest Airlines to fly schedules to Hawaii via Portland and Seattle. We were successful, although, as is the case in this

instance, approval is always on a so-called temporary basis.

What has happened has been that the temporary permit being subject to renewal, the Civil Aeronautics Board, by a unanimous decision, recommended that the permit be extended. But the President has reversed the Board, and the result of the reversal is to do great damage to Northwest Airlines and to subject my section of the country, the Pacific Northwest, to the monopoly of Pan-American.

By action which is little short of amazing, the President specifically disapproved the Portland-Seattle-Hawaii route certification for Northwest Airlines, and expressed a desire that the certificate to Pan-American World Airways be renewed on a temporary basis on this Hawaiian run. By the President's action, Pan-American will be placed in a monopoly position over this route.

The people of the Pacific Northwest share my deep concern over this mandate of the President to the Civil Aeronautics Board. The protests of the people in Oregon have come to my office in the form of many urgent telegrams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks some of the telegrams I have received on this issue from citizens of Oregon in recent hours.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent attention to President's reversal CAB's recommendation that Northwest Airlines serve Pacific Northwest-Hawaii route subsidy free Northwest Air Lines sole interest in Seattle-Portland Gateway. NWA has been first and foremost on the route from Pacific Northwest.

BOB MADDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

In interest of national economy request you investigate the President's refusal to accept the unanimous decision of Civil Aeronautics Board to grant permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines from Pacific Northwest to Hawaii. This refusal is serious blow to Pacific Northwest as Northwest Air Lines' sole interest is development of Pacific Northwest instead of California Gateways.

ALLEN W. McCAULEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Northwest Air Lines offer of subsidy free service Portland-Honolulu is a refreshing confident move in an industry that has too long been Government supported; urgently request you investigate why President has refused to accept CAB unanimous decision in favor of NWA, whose sole interest is the development of Pacific Northwest Gateway and your State.

W. D. WHITE.

VANCOUVER, WASH., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Air Lines' service exclusively to



Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request you investigate why President Eisenhower or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant NWA permanent subsidy free certificate for this route.

C. O. LINDSEY.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Air Lines has carried more passengers and did more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest Gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition only Northwest Air Lines had offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. This is backed by CAB recommendations.

GEORGE J. MIKULA,  
Employee, Northwest Air Lines.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Air Lines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii; in addition only NWA has offered to operate this route on subsidy-free basis, and this is backed by CAB recommendation.

DENNIS E. LYSNE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request you investigate why President refused to accept CAB's original unanimous decision in favor of Northwest Airlines in Pacific Northwest Hawaii route case. Northwest is as much interested in Pacific Northwest as you. This is the one and only gateway. Their service is excellent and should be continued.

DOROTHY LAWRENCE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you investigate President's refusal to accept CAB's unanimous decision to grant permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland to Honolulu route. NWA is the only carrier which can assure full development of the Pacific Northwest gateway to Hawaii, as Northwest Airlines has no California interest.

GUS N. BALLAS.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition only Northwest Airlines has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. Then this is backed by CAB recommendation.

W. R. WATSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous deci-

sion to grant a permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Airlines from Portland to Hawaii.

ERVIN A. WAGNER,  
Wagner Tractor, Inc.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airlines service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records urgently request you investigate why President or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant NWA permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

C. GUILLES.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland-to-Honolulu route.

THEODORE THYE,  
Western Athletic Club.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition only NWA has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. This is backed by CAB recommendation.

HOWARD Q. PEASE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airline service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request you investigate why President or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant NWA permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

ROY ZORN.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urge congressional attention Eisenhower's recommendation reversing Aeronautics Board decision regarding Portland-Honolulu route. Northwest pioneered route. History indicates Pan Am received certification through political pressure. Northwest offered flying subsidy free. Feel Eisenhower ill advised on decision promoting monopoly in Pacific area. Suggest pro Pan Am policy, Eisenhower and Weeks be examined.

BORDEN F. BECK, Jr.

HILLSBORO, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request urgent investigation President's reversal of CAB's unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Airlines as sole operator Seattle-Portland-Honolulu not consistent with avowed policy of administration to reduce Government spending inasmuch as NWA only carrier offering to operate Pacific-Northwest-Hawaii route subsidy free.

JOHN TEUFEL.

ROSEBURG, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you investigate CAB ruling effecting Northwest gateways to Pacific in order to insure Northwest Airlines receives fair deal. LEWIS TRAVEL SERVICE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request your urgent investigation President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland to Honolulu route.

HARRY E. HEATHMAN,  
President, Heathman Hotels.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire urgent investigation of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote Pacific Northwest as its sole gateway to Hawaii in addition only NWA has offered to operate route subsidy free. This backed by CAB recommendations.

HELEN MADDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airlines service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request you investigate why President or advisers refuse to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant Northwest Airlines permanent subsidy-free certificate for this group.

ALLEN E. FOXWORTHY.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request your urgent investigation President's refusal to accept CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Airlines for the Portland-Honolulu route.

H. D. LEWIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Airlines service exclusively to Hawaii as evidenced by past CAB hearing and record. Urgently request you investigate why President or adviser refused to accept original CAB unanimous decision to grant Northwest Airlines permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

CHARLES E. ALBERT.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you make immediate investigation into the reversal by the President of recent CAB recommendation that would name Northwest Airlines as the operator of the Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route. Northwest Airlines is the only carrier which can assure full development of the Pacific Northwest gateway to Hawaii as Northwest Airlines has no California interest. In addition only Northwest Airlines has offer to operate this route on a completely subsidy-free basis.

JOHN W. KELLY, Jr.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The reversal by the President of the CAB's unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Air Lines as the sole operator Seattle, Portland, Honolulu is not consistent with the avowed policy of the administration to reduce Government spending, inasmuch as NWA is the only carrier offering to operate the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii route on the absolutely subsidy-free basis.

D. LILE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle, Portland, Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Air Lines has carried more passengers and done more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition, only Northwest Air Lines has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. Then this is backed by CAB recommendation.

O. RONALD MC CLEOD.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you can protest CAB Northwest Air Line Hawaii decision. Letter follows:

IVAN BLOCH.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

As businessmen and taxpayers, we feel a great disservice is being done Oregon and the Northwest by the President's decision to reverse Civil Aeronautics Board recommendation in canceling Northwest Air Lines franchise to fly to Hawaii. Urgently request your immediate investigation of this serious error.

ED J. DEARING and LEE G. ALLEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

President Eisenhower's reversal of CAB unanimous recommendation respecting air service from Pacific Northwest to Hawaii shocking politics. Believe President Eisenhower ill advised. Northwest Air Lines much more vitally interested in serving Northwest area than is Pan American. Northwest has been first to introduce improvements and increase service to Hawaii and to decrease Government expenses, by offering to operate route without subsidy. Urge you exert all possible influence on behalf of fair competition.

DOROTHY VAN NUYS TRAVEL SERVICE.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

As former student of yours and now in partial travel agent, request your investigation of President's refusal to accept CAB's unanimous decision to grant permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines for Portland, Honolulu route so valued by our tourists.

ROBERT POWELL TRAVEL SERVICE,  
ROBERT POWELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

We are very disturbed by the President's overruling of CAB's decision to grant North-

west Airlines permanent subsidy free certificate from Portland to Hawaii. Please review permit.

LOYAL D. NELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request your investigation in regard to President's reversal of CAB decision to have Northwest Airlines fly Hawaii route. Northwest will fly subsidy free. Pan American interest not in Northwest area. Recommend Northwest continue present service.

DR. J. P. CRAVEN.

VANCOUVER, WASH., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Northwest Airlines offer of subsidy-free service, Portland, Honolulu is a refreshing confident move in an industry that has too long been Government supported. Urgently request you investigate why President Eisenhower has refused to accept CAB unanimous decision in favor of NWA, whose sole interest is development of Pacific Northwest gateway and your State.

CHARLES B. SHOEMAKER.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Desire your urgent investigation of Seattle, Portland, Hawaii route case. Records show Northwest Airlines has carried more passengers and one more to develop and promote the Pacific Northwest gateway, as its sole gateway to Hawaii. In addition, only Northwest Airlines has offered to operate this route on a subsidy-free basis. Then this is backed by CAB recommendation.

C. R. NELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request urgent investigation President's reversal of CAB's unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Airlines, sole operator Seattle, Portland, Honolulu. Not consistent with avowed policy of administration to reduce Government spending inasmuch as NWA only carrier offering to operate route subsidy-free.

K. S. MADDEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please investigate reason President of CAB reversed decision and recommendation to certify Northwest Airlines as sole subsidy free operator from Pacific Northwest to Honolulu.

GEORGE L. BLOMBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request you make immediate investigation into the reversal by President Eisenhower of the recent unanimous recommendation by the Civil Aeronautics Board that would name Northwest Air Lines as the operator of the Seattle, Portland to Hawaii route. It seems essential in the interest of economy to certificate Northwest Air Lines, who offer to provide this service with no subsidy to the Government. The interest of this area will also be better served by a carrier who can assure full development of the Northwest gateway to Hawaii as Northwest Air Lines can, who has no California

interest. In addition, Northwest Air Lines was first to seek the route, first to operate the route with Boeing Stratocruiser equipment, first to offer tourist rates to this area, and first to increase frequency of service. In the face of the foregoing, how can President Eisenhower justify the appointment of Pan American Airways who will require subsidy payment from the Government when Northwest Air Lines will provide equal or better service at no cost to the taxpayer.

JAMES W. SPEER.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy-free certificate to Northwest Air Lines from Portland to Hawaii.

JOSEPH and MAURE SOLARI,  
Solari Sales.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Please examine President's reversal of unanimous recommendations of Civil Aeronautics Board regarding air route to Hawaii. Northwest Air Lines has offered to fly the route without subsidy. The President awarded the exclusive to Pan American with subsidy. Why?

DON J. ALLEN.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Am surprised at decision favoring Pan American over Northwest Air Lines on Northwest Hawaii flights. Pan American does not belong here. Northwest by virtue of direct service from Midwest does. Understand Northwest is willing to operate without subsidy. Please reconsider.

M. S. FARRELL.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

I have today sent the following message. Northwest Airlines is sole subsidy free operator to Hawaii. Elimination of Northwest Airlines service to Hawaii will cause numerous job losses here. Urge you to reconsider your decision which is contrary to your CAB Department recommendation.

BILL WAY,  
President, Portland Central Labor  
Council, AFL.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request your urgent investigation President's refusal to accept the CAB's unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines for the Portland to Honolulu route.

MELVIN G. REAVIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you make immediate investigation into the reversal by President of recent CAB recommendation that would name Northwest Airlines as the operator of Seattle-Portland-Hawaii route. Northwest Airlines is the only carrier which can assure full development of the Pacific Northwest gateway to Hawaii as Northwest Airlines have no



California interest. In addition only Northwest Airlines has offered to operate this route on a completely subsidy-free basis.

RONALD C. KIELTY.

BEAVERTON, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

In the interest of national economy, we request that you investigate the President's refusal to accept the CAB unanimous decision to grant a permanent subsidy free certificate to Northwest Air Lines from Portland to Honolulu.

Mr. and Mrs. ALLEN HOSS.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Reversal by President Eisenhower of the CAB unanimous decision and recommendation to certificate Northwest Air Lines as the sole operator Seattle-Portland to Honolulu is not consistent with avowed policy of the administration to reduce Government spending, inasmuch as Northwest Air Lines is the only carrier offering to operate the Pacific Northwest to Hawaii route on a subsidy-free basis.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT MALMBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 4, 1955.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The Pacific Northwest wants and needs Northwest Air Lines service to Hawaii, as evidenced by the past CAB hearing and records. Urgently request that you investigate why the President or his advisers refused to accept the original CAB decision to grant Northwest Air Lines a permanent subsidy-free certificate for this route.

J. E. DICKEY,

First Vice President, International

Woodworkers of America, CIO.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the President's action on the airways matter deserves serious reconsideration. It sets an example of Government action which cannot be justified, and establishes a precedent for hasty, ill-considered reversals of Federal administrative agency rulings in the future. It is another example of the future I made a few minutes ago of the growing tendency on the part of the President of the United States to exercise a very arbitrary discretion over Federal agencies.

Furthermore, the President's reversal action, if put into effect, will constitute a serious blow to the whole Pacific Northwest. The traveling public in the northern tier of States should not be denied through service to Hawaii via Portland or Seattle. The Pacific Northwest would be bound to suffer from this decision relating to the Northwest Airlines because it would play right into the hands of the whole monopolistic trend in America today.

Mr. President, I desire also to have printed at this point in my remarks the press release of the Civil Aeronautics Board indicating the decision of the President reversing the Board.

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

TRANS-PACIFIC AND WEST COAST-HAWAII CASES  
DECIDED BY PRESIDENT

The Civil Aeronautics Board announced today that orders disposing of the pending

Trans-Pacific Certificate Renewal Case (Doc. No. 5031 et al.) and the West Coast-Hawaii Case (Doc. No. 5589) were being prepared for submission to President Eisenhower in accordance with his instructions transmitted to the Board by the following letter dated February 1, 1955:

"DEAR MR. GURNEY: I am returning herewith without my approval the proposed orders of the Board in the West Coast-Hawaii Case (Docket No. 5589 et al.) and in the Trans-Pacific Certificate Renewal Case (Docket No. 5031 et al.).

"I approve the actions proposed by the Board in the Trans-Pacific case with reference to the applications of Trans-World Airlines and Transocean Airlines. I do not approve at this time the permanent certifications of Northwest Airlines, but desire that its certificate be renewed on a temporary basis for 7 years. The continuation of two United States-flag carriers across the Pacific at this time is required by considerations of national defense and foreign policy. However, I believe that permanent certification of Northwest Airlines is premature as long as subsidy payments are necessary for its operations. A temporary certificate will provide the carrier with the opportunity to demonstrate its ability to operate without subsidies within a reasonable period of time and will give the Government the opportunity to review the matter when the certificate expires. I desire to hold in abeyance my decision concerning the use of the Great Circle route by Pan American pending further study and later report on the economic and technical feasibility and the military and foreign policy implications of nonstop service between the west coast and the Orient.

"I approve the actions proposed by the Board in the West Coast-Hawaii case with reference to the applications of United Air Lines and Transocean Airlines. I do not approve at this time the continued certifications of Northwest Airlines on the Seattle to Portland-Hawaii route, but desire that the certificate of Pan American World Airways be renewed on a temporary basis. I believe that the choice of this carrier will contribute most to the sound development of our air transportation system in the Pacific.

"Accordingly, I request that the Board present for my approval revised orders in these cases, consistent with the above comments.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

"HON. CHAN GURNEY,

"Acting Chairman,

"Civil Aeronautics Board,

"Washington, D. C."

In the Trans-Pacific Case, the revised order will provide for the following authorizations: (1) For Northwest Airlines, a Seattle/Portland-Anchorage-Tokyo route for a period of 7 years; beyond Tokyo to Okinawa, Formosa, and Hong Kong, and beyond Okinawa to the Philippines, for a period of 5 years; and to Korea for a period of 3 years; (2) For Pan American World Airways a route from Hawaii to Tokyo and beyond to Hong Kong, for a period of 5 years; and between Hong Kong and points in India for a period of 3 years. Decision as to the renewal of previous authorizations to serve points in the Orient now in Communist hands will be deferred, as will PAA's application for service over the Great Circle route between the United States and Tokyo. Applications for new services filed by TWA and Transocean will be denied, and Northwest's previous authority to operate direct between the Twin Cities and Tokyo via Anchorage will not be renewed, although the question of local service between Anchorage and the Twin Cities remains for decision in the pending States-Alaska Case.

In the West Coast-Hawaii Case, the order to be approved by the President will not provide for renewal of Northwest's present

service to Hawaii, but will authorize the continuation of PAA's existing Seattle/Portland-Hawaii route for a period of 5 years. United's present route from Los Angeles and San Francisco to Hawaii is to be made permanent, and the application of Transocean will be denied.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying that I also have the feeling that if there are administrative agencies in Washington which are the children of Congress, which are making such mistakes in judgment and are doing such poor work that they should be subjected to this kind of reversal on the part of the President, then Congress had better bring about some personnel changes in those agencies. We must not forget that in this instance the parties do not have the right to appear and present their case before the so-called Appeal Board, which in this case is the President of the United States. But it is very dangerous in a democracy to turn over to a mere man, even though he may be the President of the United States, the kind of veto power which is exercised in instances such as this, and as was exercised, in effect, in the Dixon-Yates case. In that instance it was really a veto by way of affirmative order—a veto of the Atomic Energy Commission. I say it is very dangerous to turn such power over to a mere man, even though he be the President, unless Congress is willing to get busy and pass some amendments to the laws governing these agencies which will require such a decision to come before Congress for check and approval.

So I am again standing on the floor of the United States Senate, as I have done so many times in the past, pleading with my colleagues to give meaning to our constitutional system of checks and balances. I say that this example of what has happened by way of a reversal of the Civil Aeronautics Board shows the need of legislation which will strengthen our system of checks and balances.

Lastly, Mr. President—

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad the Senator mentioned the difficulty the President has been having. Most of these persons have been frozen into service during the 20 years preceding the President's taking over his office. I am sure the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle would be very happy to have the senior Senator from Oregon give us the formula as to how we can make these changes.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Ohio this particular decision was handed down by a bipartisan board. It has to be bipartisan under the law. The chairman was Chan Gurney, former Senator from South Dakota. If the Senator from Ohio is concerned about his being frozen in the Government, let me point out to him that he holds his job by appointment for a definite number of years. After that period has passed and an opportunity is had to review his record, if the President should desire to appoint him for a further term, he would be re-appointed.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator referred to some of the members of the board.

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator is mistaken. I am talking about a unanimous decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is the Board the President has reversed, and he has reversed a unanimous decision of a bipartisan board, composed of both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. BENDER. Is the Senator from Oregon complaining about the Democrats as well as the Republicans?

Mr. MORSE. I am saying, on the basis of the study I have made of the decision to date, I think the Board is completely correct and the President is completely wrong in reversing the decision. I have read the Board's decision, and I have read the President's announcement of the reversal.

Mr. BENDER. The Senator from Oregon is not complaining about our former colleague, is he?

Mr. MORSE. I am supporting the Board and complaining about the President's act, because we do not have a check on it.

Mr. BENDER. I admit I sometimes have difficulty following the Senator. Of course, I am a brand new Senator. I shall learn after a while.

Mr. MORSE. I express that hope.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I am glad it was my good fortune to be here today to listen to my colleague. I not only heard about cherries, but about the Dixon-Yates contract, Formosa, and China. I heard about so many different subjects I had difficulty in following the Senator, but I am sure it will be a pleasure to read the Record and try to understand exactly what the Senator was referring to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to yield for a question, then.

Mr. BENDER. Very well.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Ohio and I temporarily occupy these two majestic seats, he that of the minority leader, and I that of the majority leader. Quite a while ago, when the Senator from Ohio asked the senior Senator from Oregon about his views on Formosa, the Senator from Ohio read a statement which he had sent to an editor in Ohio about the policy of this Government on further Communist aggression. I believe the Senator from Ohio used that language in his statement. It was quite a while ago, and I am not certain of the language he used.

Mr. BENDER. The junior Senator from Oregon is uncertain of what I said, just as I am uncertain of what his colleague from Oregon said.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Ohio made the statement. I wondered if he would return to it.

Mr. BENDER. I have the statement in my hand.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator read the portion wherein he referred to Communist aggression?

Mr. BENDER. I stated that—

I do not think we should go to war for anyone unless we have to. The entire purpose of the resolution which we passed last week and the present policy of the adminis-

tration with respect to Formosa is to prevent the outbreak of a major war. We are doing our best to show the Chinese and the Communists that we are prepared, if necessary, to fight against any further Communist aggression.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The last was the sentence to which I was referring.

Mr. BENDER. That is what I stated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. This is the question I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio, inasmuch as he is, at least temporarily, spokesman for the administration, as I am the temporary spokesman for the majority leader in the Senate: What is the policy of the administration in case there should be further Communist aggression, to use the words of the Senator, in Indochina?

Mr. BENDER. I think the administration has stated its position regarding that situation. Indochina was under the control of a colonial power, and certainly our attitude was based on other considerations than those which now prevail in the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, am I to take it as the policy that if there is, to use the language of the Senator, further "Communist aggression" in Indochina, the administration does not propose to do anything?

Mr. BENDER. That is a program or a policy to which we are not committed, as we are in the Formosan situation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. My reason for asking the question is that something has puzzled me in this whole situation. I think I was as faithful as was any other Senator in attendance on the debate on both sides of the question.

One of the questions which has puzzled me in this entire situation, as one who knows extremely little about the question, and as one who was hard put to know how to vote on the question, is that Indochina was scarcely mentioned in the debate at all. Yet was it not the President of the United States who used the simile of dominoes being knocked down, and was not Indochina the key domino? Yet in the debate, Indochina was scarcely mentioned. I wonder what the policy of the administration will be in the event there is further aggression in Indochina.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the policy will be considered very carefully. Whatever our position is, I am sure Members of Congress in both Houses will have an opportunity to learn the President's policy and be consulted regarding any decision which is made, just as the Congress was consulted in the Formosa action of last week. Certainly this administration did not create this problem; it inherited the problem as a result of the deals which were made at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran, and as a result of millions of people in the world being placed behind the Iron Curtain as a consequence of those decisions. Under the circumstances, we are coping with a problem we inherited, and it is necessary for this country to maintain a tremendous defense machine and keep ourselves prepared for any exigency.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio indicated that the administration was not responsible for the problem, but merely inherited it, is

he inferring that if at some future hour other persons should sit in these august seats, and there should be a discussion of Indochina, and of the people who are behind the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain, those persons, in discussing the problem in the future, should say they inherited the Indochina problem, and place the blame on those who were responsible for their inheriting the problem? Is the Senator inferring that should be the sequence of discussion throughout our history?

Mr. BENDER. No; I was merely referring to dealing with any situation which might arise, and I was referring to the action of the administration, which was meant to insure world peace, being confirmed by an almost unanimous vote of the Congress. We are doing something to stop the march of communism everywhere throughout the world.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to repeat my question. Does the Senator think it should be the policy of those in the legislative branch of Government, whenever they have a problem to discuss, to bring up the faults and alleged blunders of those who served in the previous administration, right on through our history?

Mr. BENDER. I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have heard discussions relating to past events in our history; and I am sure we will hear such discussions as long as our country exists.

Certainly we profit by our mistakes. But the mistakes of the past should not be applied to this administration, which is coping with the mistakes of the past, and is endeavoring to handle them in an intelligent, forward-looking, and realistic way.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am wondering whether we are to profit by the mistakes made diplomatically or otherwise.

Mr. BENDER. In every way.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the previous order, the Senate will now stand adjourned until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, February 8, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1955:

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia, vice Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, resigned.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Stephen P. Dorsey, of the District of Columbia.

George Mason Ingram, of Tennessee.

S. Houston Lay, of Illinois.

Francis A. Linville, of Maryland.

Samuel T. Pareiman, of Pennsylvania.



The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Robert G. McGregor, of Massachusetts.  
William L. S. Williams, of Wisconsin.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss H. Alberta Colclaser, of Ohio.  
Alton L. Gillikin, of Virginia.  
John W. Halderman, of Oregon.  
Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi.  
Gilbert E. Larsen, of Illinois.  
James A. McDewitt, of Illinois.  
Adrian T. Middleton, of Texas.  
John Patterson, of Maryland.  
Samuel E. Perkins IV, of Indiana.  
William G. Vale, of New Jersey.

John A. Armitage, of Tennessee, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Joseph B. Alexander, of Virginia.  
Arthur P. Biggs, of California.  
William B. deGrace, of Massachusetts.  
Miss Nyal C. Dokken, of California.  
Norman H. Grady, of Maryland.  
Carl O. Hawthorne, of California.  
Milan W. Jerabek, of Maryland.  
Charles K. Johnson, of Virginia.  
John A. Lacey, of Maryland.  
Miss Anita C. Lauve, of Maryland.  
Dean B. Mahin, of Maryland.  
Melville E. Osborne, of New York.  
Wendell A. Pike, of Washington.  
Albert Post, of the District of Columbia.  
Henry W. Prentice, of Minnesota.  
Robert M. Sayre, of Virginia.  
Walter W. Sohli, of Illinois.  
George D. Tibbits, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Edith C. Wall, of California.  
Charles C. Carson, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Carl E. Forkel, Jr., of Texas.  
Robert F. Griggs, of New York.  
Donald C. Mansfield, of Virginia.  
Earl R. Michalka, of Michigan.  
Richard W. Ogle, of Indiana.  
Monteagle Stearns, of New York.  
Roger Steinkolk, of Virginia.  
Miss Cherry C. Stubbs, of Minnesota.  
Harold C. Voorhees, of New Jersey.  
Miss Julia L. Wooster, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Eugene H. Bird, of Oregon.  
Carl A. Bischoff, Jr., of Missouri.  
Miss Jane A. Culppepper, of Louisiana.  
David R. Gottlieb, of New York.  
J. Daniel Loubert, of Maine.  
Robert E. Mangan, Jr., of Minnesota.  
Gerald F. Nollette, of Washington.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Miss Norah Alsterlund, of Illinois.  
John R. Bartelt, Jr., of Massachusetts.  
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Engdahl, of New Hampshire.

Herbert M. Hooker, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Trevor Gardner, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Newell Brown, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term expiring December 31, 1960.

#### TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Allin H. Pierce, of Illinois, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1948, vice Arnold R. Baar, deceased.

#### IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Galen B. Allen	Grant R. Johnson
David L. Ayers	Edwin R. Kohn, Jr.
George W. Baumann, Jr.	James C. Lafferty, Jr.
John R. Bond	Charley H. Lucas
Ronald A. Brush	Thomas S. McCaffrey
Leland E. Butler	Leo M. MacCourtney
George R. Curry	Donald C. Magee
Sherrill A. Conna	Jesse E. Matheny, Jr.
James J. Connors	John A. Michael
Ian E. M. Donovan	Ward J. Mottel, Jr.
Raymond D. Dowsett	David B. Murton
Francis J. Eberhardt	Richard E. O'Leary
Joseph G. Endres	John J. Pakiz
John P. Engvall	Ben W. Phillips
Gerald R. Etcheson	John P. Rasmussen
Richard P. Evans	Charles E. Schott
William L. Flowers	Robert J. Schwartz
Gerald F. Fricker	Leland R. Selna, Jr.
James J. Galtner	Jimmy Simmons
Gerry W. Gillispie	Thomas M. Thomas
M. John Guhl	Richard C. Turnblade
Jerald T. Hage	Gordon F. Udall, Jr.
Robert O. Harger	Gordon G. Vaughan
William C. Hawley III	Ellis E. Whiting
George W. Holyfield	Leonard Whistler
Harry A. Hoover	William F. Wiese
David N. Immendorf	Frederick C. Williams
	Jack E. Young

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Delbert H. Beumer	James M. Robbins
Terry D. Burton	William H. Sibley, Jr.
Donald P. Kohl	

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators), to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ronald F. Carlson	Richard S. Olson
William M. Clew	Joseph J. Ortega
Verlyne W. Daniels	Edgar H. Preston
John W. Dawley	Leon R. Shelley
Terry L. Lane	Joseph F. Small
John S. Kelly	John F. Triplett
John E. McBrayer, Jr.	

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the line in the Navy (special-duty officers), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Phillip K. Folk	Robert C. Stubbs
Richard L. Fruchterman, Jr.	William S. Sullivan
Donald E. Gross	Bernard G. Sykes
Donald E. Selby	Richard A. Walsh

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Paul E. Black

#### LIEUTENANT

Jack O. Stoffel

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIEUTENANT

William J. Kennedy  
Philip C. Hotz

#### LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jean-Pierre E. Bouquet

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald M. Adams	Charles L. Meserve
Arthur H. Anderson	Donald E. Moors
William B. Cobb, Jr.	Robert D. Peloquin
Curtis E. Comer	John J. Powell
George F. Comstock, Jr.	John J. Prendergast, Jr.
Norman F. Daly	Fernando Ramirez-Rodriguez
Bernard F. Gilmartin, Jr.	Rolph E. Schaber
Charles E. Hepner	David E. Sigsworth
Louis R. Lester, Jr.	Robert R. Simmons
Paul W. Lindgren	Donald L. Stephenson
William R. Lowry	Homer J. Swope, Jr.
Billy Matthews	David H. Thomas

#### ENSIGN

George J. Adams, Jr.	Roy E. McCoy
Buele G. Balderston	Harry Ohan
Malcolm L. Barringer	Harvey P. Rodgers
John C. Barrons	"C" "J" Rorie
Ernest Fischbein	Harold H. Sacks
Richard E. Heon	Walter G. Squires, Jr.
Harold L. Hinkley	Eugene K. Walling
Robert L. Logner	Philip W. Wehrman
Henry W. Marbott	John R. Weimerskirch
James F. McAvo	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line (aviation) of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Miles J. Barnes	Joe P. Howell, Jr.
William T. Barron	Robert F. Lawson
Don "H" Black	Henry G. Moxey
James Bradfield	Russell G. Walden
Wilbur B. Cretsinger	"J" "D" Ward
Joseph D. Duddleston	

#### ENSIGN

Loinel R. Harsh	William J. Ogle
Edward F. Havel	Tommy H. Warren, Jr.
John MacGregor	Marvin M. Weissman

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William W. Anderson	Robert E. Hendrix, Jr.
Charles W. Crowley	Robert Kauder
Oscar T. Fleisher, Jr.	Frank G. Pattermann
Raymond W. Funk	Arch C. Roll
John J. Gordon	"H" "L" Sumner, Jr.
Robert L. Harn	Fred Wolter

#### ENSIGN

Charles R. Hohenstein	Charles C. Madeira
Frank J. Jerich	Augustine G. Saukas
Hugo M. Luoto, Jr.	Donald W. Searles

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John W. Clark

#### ENSIGN

John W. Woodring  
Lindsay C. Getzen (Naval Reserve officer) to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Herbert G. Arm	Norbert A. Schlamm
John P. Charles	Leroy E. Walter, Jr.
Charles D. McGuire	

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Roger "M" Baxter, Jr.	Jacob A. S. Fisher
John W. Berger	Robert H. Heath
James W. Conte	Rodger F. Hill

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIUTENANT

Florence C. Brown	Caroline A. Kelce
Betty J. Coady	Ann R. Kubicz
Alice L. Davis	Shirley A. Miller
Eva C. Deming	Olive C. H. Ogden
Virginia Donson	Phoebe T. Singley
Mary G. Elias	

#### LIUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

June J. Everett	Lilly M. Pechal
Grace O. Fisk	Rose M. Quillin
Peggy S. Heimberger	Johanna Reid
Violet M. MacKenzie	Marion M. Seabury
Thekla W. Morris	Mary J. Wathen
Dorothy F. O'Loughlin	

#### ENSIGN

Emily E. Gullotte	Betty J. Price
-------------------	----------------

The following-named women officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

#### LIUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Frances J. Krebs	Margaret A. McMillan
------------------	----------------------

#### ENSIGN

Shirley L. Carter	Marjorie H. Mogge
Marion F. Collins	Robin L. C. Quigley
Ann Dixon	Margie A. Screws
Pauline M. Hartington	Shirley S. Simpson
Sylvia N. Haugen	Eleanor S. Swing
Carolyn E. Kearney	Clara A. Vereen
Madella L. Knoph	Joanne P. Vradenburg
Dolores A. Milford	Lots J. Wilson
Nancy B. Miller	Sue E. Young

The following-named women officers to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Janet Slater	Joan L. White
--------------	---------------

John J. Mitchell, United States Navy, retired, to be lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy pursuant to 34 U. S. Code 275, 276, 277, section 403 (a), 406 (a), 407 (a).

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gerald G. Abel	John A. Barry
David R. Adams	Levi G. Bateson
Donald R. Adams	Thomas J. Bath
James M. Adkins	William A. Baxley
Mars M. Adkins	Thomas E. Beasley, Jr.
Carl M. Albert	John T. Beatty
Donald E. Albert	Charles A. Beeman
Karl V. Albert	Richard L. Beery
Philip L. Altick	Robert M. Benning
Harry T. Ambrose	James H. Benson
James D. Anderson	Francis N. Berdanier
Phillip T. Arman	Robert H. Berendzen
William P. Arnold	Herbert T. Berwald, Jr.
Michael W. Arnstein	Barton M. Biggs
Henry E. Austin, Jr.	Charles S. Bishop, Jr.
Richard C. Bahler	John W. Bjorke
Richard A. Bailey	Ronald E. Blanchard
Herbert S. Ball	Philip H. Bohart, Jr.
David A. Ballantyne	Howard P. Borjeson
Douglas B. Barfield	Charles E. Bottcher
Alfred P. Barra	Donald V. Bowers

Brinton D. Bowles	Robert A. Gallart
Robert L. Bradley	Grigsby V. Gamble
Joseph E. Brent, Jr.	Dominic R. Gannon
Frank E. Brinegar	William R. Garrett
Robert P. Broussard	Robert D. Garton
Boyd R. Brown	Gerald W. Geraghty, Jr.
Donald P. Brown	Loren D. Gerleman
Leonard K. Brown	James S. Gill
Joseph A. Busl, Jr.	John G. Gleichauf
Leland E. Butler	George C. Gohde
William P. Byrne	Patrick F. Golden
Robert C. Caldwell	William L. Golemon, Jr.
Gordon B. Cameron	Edward W. Graeff
Robert S. Cameron, Jr.	Robert D. Grant
Joseph R. Capka	James B. Green
Robert A. Cappelletti	Samual J. Greene II
George W. Carey	James T. Griffin
Randall C. Carl	Esta D. Grissom
Thomas J. Carmody	Donald J. Gruber
Elwayne Carter	Michael J. Hadfield
Thomas V. Cassidy	Denis A. Haggerty
Robert W. Charlton, Jr.	George P. Haley, Jr.
Rufus Choate, Jr.	Richard C. Hallden
Don C. Clark	Richard D. Hanna
Edward A. Clark	Billy M. Hansen
Edward J. Clarkson	Carl A. Hanson
Robert H. Clayton	Charles I. Harding
Watson S. Clifford	James H. Harding, Jr.
Morrel G. Clute	James D. Hargleroad
Kenneth J. Coffey	Michael H. Harrington
John C. Coffin	Charles E. Haupt
George F. Coleman	Joseph W. Hayes
Richard M. Condrey	John F. Helfner
James A. Connelly II	Samuel H. Helms
Arthur B. Cornthwaite, Jr.	Robert R. Henrich
Bernard A. Coyne	James M. Herron
Stuart W. Cragin, Jr.	Louis A. Heyd, Jr.
Thomas T. Creamer	Robert E. Hill
Robert E. Crevier	William P. Hill
Edward W. Cuthbert	John A. Hoag
Michael B. Cwayna	Harvey B. Hoff
George R. Darnold, Jr.	William L. Hogan
Frank S. Davis	Richard A. P. Hogarty
Robert D. Davis	George L. Holdridge
John W. Day	Glenn A. Holloman
Burley A. Daye	Robert K. Hopkins, Jr.
Johnny O. Dean	George E. Hotz
Robert L. Decker	Noel R. Hueber, Jr.
Robert H. Dee, Jr.	Homas O. Hunter
James B. Devlin	Marvin A. Huss, Jr.
John L. Dickinson	Arthur M. Jackson
William O. Doll	Howard A. Jackson
Kerry M. Donovan	Frank C. Jacobs
Edwin J. Doran	Robert V. Janis
Edward F. Doyle, Jr.	Vincent T. Jazwinski
Francis X. Doyle, Jr.	Willard B. Jensen
John A. Drexel	James H. Jiranek
Rudolph W. Driscoll	David K. Jones
Donald Ducoff	George E. Jones
James W. Duff	Charles H. Kalbach
Rupert W. Dunevant	William F. Keith
Jack P. Durrett	Thomas E. Keller
Albert S. Eaton	Hugh T. Kerr
Thomas J. Ebner	Robert D. King
Herbert E. Edson	William J. Klaess
Louis G. Edwards	James E. Knowles
Myrddyn E. Edwards	Robert F. Koontz
Randall E. Egertonson	Tom L. Kornegay
John F. Elvig	Nathan K. Kotz
Donald E. Endacott	Billy D. Krazberger
Franklin S. Evans	Preston C. Kronkosky
John W. Evrard	Conrad W. Kuhlthau
Donald D. Ewbank	III
Edward E. Faber	James A. Lamar
John J. Fahle	Andrew J. Lampe
Edgar R. Ferguson	Anthony J. Larocca
Samuel J. Fisher, Jr.	John E. Larsen
Terry N. Fliske	Ralph L. Lary
William M. Foley	Francis M. Logan, Jr.
William L. Foote	William R. Loss
Harry V. Foster	Robert L. Loucks
Kenneth F. Fox, Jr.	Charles J. Lynch III
Donald H. Franklin	James E. MacDonald
Charles H. Frazier	III
Thomas F. Fricke	Donald P. Madden
Eugene R. Friederich	John A. Magadini
William N. Frengel	Richard L. Maher
Jack A. Gaffney	Mark E. Mahowald

James J. Mallett	James E. Schulken
William M. Manes	Frederick W. Schwab
Robert W. Manning, Jr.	Leo J. Scofaro, Jr.
Roy M. Marks	Paul D. Searles
Ronald C. Martin	Devon C. Seeley
Frank W. Martino	John L. Sentous
Mathias M. Mattern	Paul J. Shank, Jr.
Richard J. Matuska	George L. Shea
Lauriston H. McCagg	Jerry L. Shelton
Phillips R. McCarty	Alvah R. Shepherd
John H. McClintock, Jr.	John J. Sheridan
Jaren K. McCormick	James E. Shildneck
John S. McCormick	James M. Shoemaker, Jr.
William O. McCoy	Albert E. Shohfi, Jr.
Howard M. McElroy	Larry L. Shupe
James M. McGarvey	James J. Sieger
Richard J. McKee	Colben K. Sime, Jr.
Lawrence V. McMurrer	Ronald L. Sipie
Clifford J. McNamara, Jr.	James D. Skinner
Robert A. Meyer	Emery T. Smith
Paul W. Miller	Robert E. Solomon
Tracy L. Moon	Roland F. Spahr
Ralph E. Moore	Roy W. Staggs
Hunter M. Morris	Richard M. Stahler
McLendon G. Morris	Phillip J. Sterling
William S. Mortensen	Wallace Stettinius
Richard C. Movich	James T. Stewart, Jr.
John A. Mulcahy	Charles H. Stoy
John D. Murphy	Jimmy S. Sullivan
Alfred P. Murrab, Jr.	Patrick A. Sullivan
John D. Murray	James N. Swift
James B. Murty	Williston B. Symonds
Joshua A. Muss	Paul A. Taglia
Jack P. Nelson	James B. Talley
Haril W. Newton	William N. Temple
Raymond A. Njos	Bernard R. Terhorst
Caldwell V. Norred III	Edward L. Thomas
Alan R. Novak	William E. Thomas, Jr.
Kevin O'Connell	John R. Thornton
Robert G. Ohly	George B. Thurmond
Richard E. Onofrey	John E. Torbett
Robert C. Onslow	David C. Townsend
William M. Osgood	George O. Trabue, Jr.
Fred Owlett	John Tramentine
John W. Paden	George M. Trautman
Robert J. Patrick	John M. Traynor
Hal V. Patton	Stephen A. Trimble
Ray B. Patton	Donald R. Trundle
Bruce D. Peterson	Brandon E. Tynan
David W. Pfifer	Walter S. Underhill
Frank J. Pike, Jr.	Mario S. Valentini
Lloyd A. Pine	Hildebert VanBuren
Max R. Pirner	IV
Robert A. Pokorny	Arthur B. Vance
James A. Poland	James D. VanPelt
Russell W. Porter	Andrew R. VanSickle
Marlin A. Pound	Peter A. VanWagenen
Sherwood F. Prescott, Jr.	Peter A. Voneschen
Reding F. Putman	Eugene R. Vosicky
Charles E. Randall	George L. Vosmik
Thomas O. Raney	Gerald A. Walsdorf
Troy G. Rankin	Donald R. Wash
Niles Rasmussen	John D. Way
Stephen L. Reveal	William H. Weaver
Richard S. Robertson	Wesley E. Wedge
James L. Robinson	Winfred E. Wedge
Marcus B. Rogers	Robert C. Wenrick
Charles D. Rollings, Jr.	John T. Whatley
John P. Roos	Robert B. Whigham
Richard D. Ross	Francis V. White, Jr.
Julian H. Rountree, Jr.	Edward P. Whitte-
James P. Rourke	more
Rudolf A. Ruda	Robert J. Wiedemann
Donald J. Russell	Jack H. Williams
Barry P. Rust	Robert H. Williams
Thomas D. Samford	Edward H. Williford
Richard P. Sanders	Donald B. Wilson
Dale S. Sappenfield	Milner B. Wilson III
George M. Sasko, Jr.	Peter B. Wilson
Francis V. Scanlan	Thomas E. Wilson
John R. Schapp	James M. Winberg
David E. Scherer	Gerald O. Witt
Edward Schoenfeld, Jr.	James R. Wright
William C. Schrader	Milan K. Yager
	Donald G. Yeckel
	Richard E. York
	Lawrence H. Yost
	David L. Young



The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Arthur K. Groppe  
Herbert S. Larosa  
John S. Oldham

Robert C. Miller (civilian college graduate) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

James C. Hitz (meritorious noncommissioned officer) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

James E. Knott for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Howard A. Aronson	Joe S. Hitt
William T. Baldwin	John E. Hurley, Jr.
Charles A. Barstow	Russell I. Kramer
Keith L. Christensen	John E. Kussmann, Jr.
Thomas M. Culligan	Arthur S. Loughry
Stanley J. Czubal	Thomas Martin
Daniel Ellsberg	Charles O. Pitts
John W. Engelhardt	John K. Porter III
Fred T. Eslick	Thomas W. Raphael
Tommy I. Folks	Hugh L. Scott III
Henry R. Gannan, Jr.	Lloyd W. Smith, Jr.
Robert E. Green	Willard M. Stephens
John L. Groff	John W. Terwilliger
Vincent J. Guinee	Frederick N. Vansant
John W. Hamber	Charles Ward
Richard W. Hanne-	Daniel E. Wight, Jr.
man	

The following-named Reserve officers (naval aviators) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Joseph C. Anderson	Robert W. Lewis
Stanley D. Cox	Leroy A. Madera
Robert J. Fagot	Reynold M. Olson
Thomas E. Fish	Frank E. Petersen, Jr.
William E. H. Fitch III	Donald R. Reese
Richard N. Gehrsitz	Richard E. Romine
Austin H. Green	Raymond C. Shinkle
Gale Harlan	Don J. Slee
Richard J. Kern	

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-4, in the United States Coast Guard:

Samuel Henson, Jr.	Ralph H. Amon
Birney Fullington	Floyd J. Coulter
Dewey W. Bowling	Donald A. MacLean
Otto A. Tregner	Earl F. Rickman
Bernard S. Loebig	James A. B. May, Jr.
Raymond A. Fraley	Leon R. Duclos
Russell R. Hiatt	George E. Bohannon
Ray E. Brown	Robert M. Bruce
Harold T. Jackson	Peter R. Thompson
John W. Ballman	Julian L. Gray
Charles A. O'Reilly	Earle A. F. Verry
Aubrey Rogers	Philip F. Stone
James Galante	Robert V. McLaughlin
Herbert E. Schwalbe	Arthur W. Cloves
Edward E. Helfst	Lawrence W. Farnsley
Wandelin B. Sonntag	William G. Schaefer
Henry J. Burness	William R. Echols
Anthony M. Spiri	Clemens H. Brendle
Hobart W. Means	Albert D. Stumpf
James W. Winchester	James F. Sandwich
George R. Pearce	Floyd Bieri
Erich Raschack	Alford C. Atkinson
Harry W. Midgett	Bernard S. Koffler
Donald S. Talfourd	George R. Donald
Burt H. Kilmer	David W. Herr
Samuel H. Howell	Ralph A. McCurdie
Sidney F. Schweppe	James Harrison, Jr.
Paul Ward	Jalmar Sortland
Andrew Ramstad	Elif H. Tobiason

George A. Tardif George R. Homan  
Hannibal H. Hilliard Harold E. Major

The following-named person to be a chief warrant officer, W-3, in the United States Coast Guard:

Victor Koll

#### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

James R. Moncus, Birmingham, Ala., in place of A. H. Allbright, resigned.  
Max A. Wilder, Dadeville, Ala., in place of J. B. Tillery, resigned.  
William S. Griffin, Dutton, Ala., in place of R. L. Cothran, retired.  
William Lee Howell, Fairfax, in place of B. S. Combs, retired.  
Daniel R. Tyner, Florala, Ala., in place of E. D. Manning, retired.  
Willis J. Marsh, Gordon, Ala., in place of M. V. Marsh, retired.

##### ARIZONA

Henry L. Worischek, Flagstaff, Ariz., in place of G. G. Babbitt, Jr., resigned.  
Jerome B. Roberts, Parker, Ariz., in place of J. M. Thompson, transferred.  
Theodore Ralph Schmidt, Tolleson, Ariz., in place of E. M. Schmidt, deceased.

##### ARKANSAS

Calvin O. Stevens, Biscoe, Ark., in place of K. B. Farris, removed.  
James S. Rollins, Cotter, Ark., in place of H. S. Evans, deceased.  
Mack Hooper, Glenwood, Ark., in place of Edbert Jessup, removed.  
Alfred T. Smith, Hindsville, Ark., in place of W. C. Mayfield, retired.  
Paul E. Francis, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., in place of S. A. Kemp, deceased.  
William C. Baker, Lowell, Ark., in place of E. R. Tucker, transferred.  
William E. Hodge, Jr., Mineral Springs, Ark., in place of W. H. Bridgeman, resigned.  
Arvie H. West, Mountainburg, Ark., in place of C. A. Lovell, deceased.  
Commie C. Pollard, Oil Trough, Ark., in place of M. M. Saylor, removed.  
Icy M. Wood, Pangburn, Ark., in place of K. W. Crook, retired.  
John J. Mueller, Paragould, Ark., in place of W. A. Branch, removed.  
Richard E. Williams, Rogers, Ark., in place of L. V. Spikes, retired.

##### CALIFORNIA

Paul D. Hickcox, Agnew, Calif., in place of L. L. Allen, retired.  
Windol M. Martin, Bellflower, Calif., in place of D. C. Tierney, resigned.  
Keith D. Rice, Blythe, Calif., in place of F. V. DeDecker, resigned.  
Julius George Ponchak, Bostonia, Calif., in place of E. K. Curran, deceased.  
Paul S. Kinsey, Cloverdale, Calif., in place of F. G. Zittleman, removed.  
Vincent P. Murphy, Daly City, Calif. Office established April 20, 1954.  
Stanley A. Powell, Downey, Calif., in place of J. A. Bryson, resigned.  
Harry B. Woodbury, El Centro, Calif., in place of W. F. Richmond, retired.  
Mary J. Ramos, Farmington, Calif., in place of O. S. Beck, resigned.  
Charles C. Clark, Fullerton, Calif., in place of F. D. Lowrey, removed.  
Winifred B. Thomas, Happy Camp, Calif., in place of E. I. Palmerton, resigned.  
William E. Kester, Independence, Calif., in place of J. H. Brammer, resigned.  
Delpha P. Furgeson, Indio, Calif., in place of R. J. King, transferred.  
Bessie E. Hardy, Inyokern, Calif., in place of W. R. Cox, removed.  
Harvey J. Kohler, Irvington, Calif., in place of M. C. Joseph, retired.  
Marion M. Davis, La Habra, Calif., in place of Bertha Hilbert, retired.

Marion S. Karrh, La Jolla, Calif., in place of N. L. Rannels, retired.

Fred J. Figge, Lockeford, Calif., in place of J. L. McKindley, resigned.  
Rocco V. Pernetti, Los Banos, Calif., in place of W. J. Degregori, removed.  
Robert V. Ely, Lucerne Valley, Calif., in place of F. A. Clark, removed.  
Leland C. Barnard, Lynwood, Calif., in place of H. C. Coe, retired.  
Lewis W. Hartwell, Madera, Calif., in place of E. V. Murphy, retired.  
Evelyn O. Lesley, Mt. Baldy, Calif., in place of A. H. Bradhurst, deceased.  
Everett T. Carpenter, North Hollywood, Calif., in place of B. W. Harris, removed.  
Bernard P. Piotrowski, Northridge, Calif., in place of D. I. Love, removed.  
Norman Elwood Case, Orange, Calif., in place of Vera Wettlin, retired.  
Burnice C. Wellband, Pine Valley, Calif., in place of B. D. Schlegel, deceased.  
Constance H. Post, Randsburg, Calif., in place of R. M. Rinaldi, retired.  
Phillip R. Freer, Rocklin, Calif., in place of A. L. West, retired.  
Wilma E. Graham, Sloat, Calif., in place of B. J. Gilliam, resigned.  
Samuel G. Andersen, Stateline, Calif., in place of J. A. Caple, resigned.  
Joseph Beeson, Sunnymead, Calif., in place of F. J. Ishoy, resigned.  
Ralph A. McWald, Twentynine Palms, Calif., in place of B. H. Steeg, retired.  
Frank B. Johnson, Westmorland, Calif., in place of E. H. Cain, resigned.  
Walter J. Fitzpatrick, Yosemite National Park, Calif., in place of F. C. Alexander, retired.

##### COLORADO

Richard D. Nelson, Lafayette, Colo., in place of D. W. Kelly, deceased.  
Millard E. Ryan, Rocky Ford, Colo., in place of J. F. North, retired.

##### CONNECTICUT

Roger H. Clark, Cobalt, Conn., in place of Sol Adler, resigned.  
Joseph Rocco Ferrigno, Meriden, Conn., in place of J. F. Scanlon, resigned.  
Benjamin F. Wells, Shelton, Conn., in place of Joseph Stewart, retired.  
Fred H. Grimshaw, Windsor, Conn., in place of E. G. Donegan, resigned.

##### DELAWARE

Clarence A. Willis, Jr., Laurel, Del., in place of H. R. Elliott, resigned.  
David W. Steele, Ocean View, Del., in place of A. A. Anderson, deceased.

##### FLORIDA

Echo C. Beall, Campbellton, Fla., in place of J. E. Woodham, retired.  
Floyd B. Schneider, Dover, Fla., in place of R. B. Renfro, resigned.  
Clyde P. Stickney, Key West, Fla., in place of H. R. Bervaldi, retired.  
James L. Ennis, Merritt Island, Fla., in place of W. F. LaRoche, resigned.

##### GEORGIA

George W. Greene, Bluffton, Ga., in place of W. B. King, transferred.  
Marian L. DeLoach, Clio, Ga., in place of F. L. Dekle, deceased.  
Mathew H. Stevens, Jr., Danville, Ga., in place of L. W. Maxwell, retired.  
Ora W. Adams, Dewey Rose, Ga., in place of B. B. Adams, resigned.  
Carl V. Ivey, Lincolnton, Ga., in place of N. C. Wilkes, resigned.  
Clara B. Kilpatrick, Midway, Ga., in place of C. L. Browning, retired.  
Horace L. Fletcher, Mount Berry, Ga., in place of M. G. Keown, retired.  
William H. Marshall, Parrott, Ga., in place of M. L. Webb, resigned.  
Shelby Deck, Rocky Face, Ga., in place of J. H. Wood, deceased.  
Paul P. Hunt, Silver Creek, Ga., in place of R. S. Porter, retired.

Leon C. Lewis, Twin City, Ga., in place of C. M. Proctor, deceased.  
Mildred B. Pierce, Waverly Hall, Ga., in place of G. L. Sinclair, retired.

## IDAHO

Richard P. Swanstrum, Ashton, Idaho, in place of J. A. Hargis, resigned.  
Taylor R. Bowlden, Cascade, Idaho, in place of I. F. Madden, retired.

## ILLINOIS

Vernon L. Wilking, Chebanse, Ill., in place of J. L. Brown, removed.  
Carl D. Roadarmel, Cowden, Ill., in place of Meda Lorton, retired.  
John Edwin Mickens, Danvers, Ill., in place of H. R. Daniel, removed.  
Edward J. Kleen, Elmwood, Ill., in place of C. R. Bowers, retired.  
Edward J. Hickey, Fox River Grove, Ill., in place of C. L. Kampert, resigned.  
Lester T. Peacock, Harvard, Ill., in place of D. E. Palmer, removed.  
Walter Lueking, Hoffman, Ill., in place of Q. J. Meyer, resigned.  
Richard C. Atwood, Hutsonville, Ill., in place of M. E. Conrad, resigned.  
Mary E. Burleigh, Ingleside, Ill., in place of E. J. Ambacher, removed.  
George C. Bryce, Irving, Ill., in place of W. A. Cook, deceased.  
Vincent E. Cyrier, Manteno, Ill., in place of F. J. Keigher, resigned.  
William Harold McCreery, Mason City, Ill., in place of J. A. Peters, removed.  
Cuma F. Holtzclaw, Maunie, Ill., in place of J. W. Scamahorn, resigned.  
Justus A. Gibson, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.  
Merlyn Reatherford, Moweaqua, Ill., in place of H. R. Richardson, removed.  
Warren S. Plant, National Stock Yards, Ill., in place of G. F. Bennett, retired.  
Earl J. Thompson, O'Fallon, Ill., in place of J. L. Anheuser, resigned.  
Warren G. Hess, Ontarioville, Ill., in place of W. G. Whitham, retired.  
Sidney L. Shaw, Petersburg, Ill., in place of P. R. Smoot, retired.  
Erwin H. Brandt, Saint Peter, Ill., in place of H. B. Reiss, retired.  
John R. Evans, South Beloit, Ill., in place of L. J. Walsh, retired.  
Ronald E. Shawger, Sterling, Ill., in place of J. M. Ward, removed.  
Delbert R. Britt, Ullin, Ill., in place of Parke Burnham, removed.  
Arnold C. Lapsansky, Witt, Ill., in place of R. M. Short, retired.  
Arthur Hay, Wonder Lake, Ill. Office established July 1, 1951.

## INDIANA

Gordon L. Schaefer, Andrews, Ind., in place of J. J. Wintrod, resigned.  
Reuben Leon Ridenour, Angola, Ind., in place of F. B. Faulkerson, retired.  
Hiram J. Shepherd, Butlerville, Ind., in place of P. L. Hyden, resigned.  
Maude Kendall, Cannelton, Ind., in place of E. A. Hemphill, deceased.  
Byron V. Hoover, Carlisle, Ind., in place of Ozro Latshaw, deceased.  
Gilbert C. Gerster, Dillsboro, Ind., in place of A. E. Pate, retired.  
Rollo M. Swaim, Frankfort, Ind., in place of J. W. Shafor, resigned.  
Thomas R. Spence, Galveston, Ind., in place of A. R. Wilson, retired.  
Ruth L. Wilson, Hartsville, Ind., in place of B. B. Finley, retired.  
Edmund G. Sollman, Haubstadt, Ind., in place of Matthew Halbig, retired.  
Lester J. Britton, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of B. H. Pierson, resigned.  
Martin H. McNeelan, Holton, Ind., in place of O. J. Montgomery, resigned.  
Clifford K. Smith, Leesburg, Ind., in place of B. L. Anglin, retired.  
Lloyd D. Spann, Madison, Ind., in place of Stella Cisco, retired.

Don P. Guild, Medaryville, Ind., in place of Lowell Odom, deceased.  
Rex E. Daugherty, Merom, Ind., in place of B. E. Leach, retired.  
John L. Lontz, Morocco, Ind., in place of G. H. Clarkson, retired.  
Joseph S. Dean, Napoleon, Ind., in place of E. A. Behlmer, retired.  
Robert Craig Dillon, New Augusta, Ind., in place of R. A. Shaw, removed.  
Armin F. Schramm, New Palestine, Ind., in place of Udell Smith, transferred.  
Arthur Helny, Noblesville, Ind., in place of G. B. Olvey, retired.  
Donald J. Mustard, Poland, Ind., in place of M. A. Sendmeyer, resigned.  
Franklin O. Rarick, Warsaw, Ind., in place of R. E. K. Bowen, deceased.  
Vera G. Wilkins, Wolflake, Ind., in place of Z. M. Miller, retired.

## IOWA

Ray L. Haefner, Arthur, Iowa, in place of A. C. Watts, retired.  
Oscar J. Hertel, Burlington, Iowa, in place of K. W. Baxter, resigned.  
Allan H. Rohrer, Dixon, Iowa, in place of E. H. Engel, retired.  
Duane V. Clow, Gladbrook, Iowa, in place of A. T. Wieland, deceased.  
Clarence A. Forslund, Harcourt, Iowa, in place of C. V. Nordblom, transferred.  
Evaadne V. Fehrer, Lacona, Iowa, in place of F. F. Konrad, retired.  
Alvin J. Goemaat, Leighton, Iowa, in place of T. D. Beintema, retired.  
Mary E. Colwell, Livermore, Iowa, in place of F. W. Baumgardner, deceased.  
Sylvia M. Raecker, Meservey, Iowa, in place of A. N. Wendel, resigned.  
Doris M. Beaman, Mondamin, Iowa, in place of H. H. Johnson, resigned.  
Thelma A. Godfredsen, Ringsted, Iowa, in place of A. L. Anderson, retired.  
Louis F. Clay, Rudd, Iowa, in place of C. A. Baber, retired.  
Robert E. Lathrum, Saint Charles, Iowa, in place of H. V. Brooks, retired.  
William D. Parker, Stanhope, Iowa, in place of W. L. Hurd, retired.  
Orlyn M. Enabnit, Swaledale, Iowa, in place of Edward Moroney, retired.  
Sigfred M. Johnson, Swea City, Iowa, in place of I. E. Larson, retired.

## KANSAS

John H. Leach, Arlington, Kans., in place of H. P. Hinshaw, transferred.  
Melvin E. Decker, Bison, Kans., in place of Clara Sainer, removed.  
Clarence W. Taylor, Chapman, Kans., in place of J. W. O'Connor, retired.  
Melvin L. Butler, Fulton, Kans., in place of E. C. Keating, retired.  
Irvin L. Wagner, Galesburg, Kans., in place of C. S. Duecy, resigned.  
Alfred H. Martens, Hepler, Kans., in place of H. L. Hanson, removed.  
Arthur H. Penner, Hillsboro, Kans., in place of H. D. Cornelsen, deceased.  
Jacob C. Gaeddert, Inman, Kans., in place of J. F. Lambert, transferred.  
Harry W. Arnold, Le Roy, Kans., in place of W. A. Harris, retired.  
Kenneth D. Bretz, Lucas, Kans., in place of Elizabeth Mansfield, retired.  
Cleo L. Greenfield, Melvern, Kans., in place of J. S. Dooty, retired.  
Herman F. Kiesow, Osage City, Kans., in place of E. F. Hammond, resigned.  
Julian S. Forrer, Ulysses, Kans., in place of J. R. Fogleman, resigned.

## KENTUCKY

Escar O. Coe, Burkesville, Ky., in place of J. G. Talbot, resigned.  
Clark N. Scott, Crab Orchard, Ky., in place of W. H. Pettus, resigned.  
Roy C. Lutes, Florence, Ky., in place of L. L. Aylor, deceased.

Roy Burl Phillips, Grahn, Ky., in place of J. T. Powell, retired.  
Orville Edwards, Gravel Switch, Ky., in place of R. O. Harmon, retired.  
Mattie F. Cole, Louellen, Ky., in place of M. B. Vaughn, retired.  
Clarence B. Howard, Loyall, Ky., in place of H. F. Saulinas, resigned.  
Paul D. Fowler, Saint Mary, Ky., in place of W. R. Logsdon, retired.

## LOUISIANA

Benjamin J. Haygood, Jr., Belcher, La., in place of M. M. Gleason, retired.  
Erma E. Poland, Bienville, La., in place of W. L. Huckabay, retired.  
James F. Roberts, Downsville, La., in place of M. P. Jones, retired.  
Merlin A. Hymel, Edgard, La., in place of B. J. Jacobs, retired.  
William T. Thurmond, Gibsland, La., in place of A. D. Williams, retired.  
Howard P. Bullock, Greenwell Springs, La., in place of A. B. Meador, resigned.  
Carl D. Walker, Lena, La., in place of R. R. Wilson, removed.  
Melva E. Robinson, Mandeville, La., in place of H. J. Smith, deceased.  
Milford L. Green, Natchitoches, La., in place of P. M. Potts, deceased.  
Malin A. Mary, Pleasant Hill, La., in place of L. O. Ramsey, retired.  
Mary B. Farmer, Princeton, La., in place of Lena Rushing, retired.  
Robert Mitchell, Jr., Ringgold, La., in place of M. J. Perry, resigned.  
Ione M. Estopinal, Saint Bernard, La., in place of E. M. Serpas, retired.  
Arthur L. Layton, Shreveport, La., in place of R. H. Nelson, retired.

## MAINE

Joseph S. Dinsmore, Bangor, Maine, in place of J. G. O'Connor, retired.  
Snowdell M. Holden, Jackman, Maine, in place of H. L. Holden, retired.  
Homer C. Woodward, Newport, Maine, in place of G. L. Murray, retired.  
Raymond P. Salls, York Beach, Maine, in place of T. J. Donohue, deceased.

## MARYLAND

Pierson M. Roe, Cordova, Md., in place of G. L. Hopkins, resigned.  
Josephine P. Allison, Deale, Md., in place of W. W. Nihiser, resigned.  
Ernest C. Zebuhr, Jr., Derwood, Md., in place of E. P. Ganley, deceased.  
Elizabeth H. Roberson, Dickerson, Md., in place of R. W. Swank, deceased.  
Norman J. Schnepfe, Edgewood, Md., in place of J. C. Frasca, retired.  
John Russell Carroll, Federalsburg, Md., in place of F. S. Bradley, retired.  
Margaret R. Randall, Glen Echo, Md., in place of D. B. Canada, deceased.  
Marion E. Slingluff, Mitchellville, Md., in place of Harold Slingluff, retired.  
John D. Mumford, Vienna, Md., in place of H. W. Hurst, retired.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Marshall E. Carroll, Chilmark, Mass., in place of R. E. Weeks, removed.  
Carl H. Carlson, Franklin, Mass., in place of M. J. Costello, retired.  
Jerome A. Gallant, Jr., Green Harbor, Mass., in place of S. G. Sampson, deceased.  
John S. Burnett, Housatonic, Mass., in place of J. F. Mack, retired.  
Frances V. Conley, Manchaug, Mass., in place of G. E. Plante, removed.  
Carroll A. Stryko, Montague, Mass., in place of D. J. Newton, retired.  
William R. Richmond, Jr., North Wilbraham, Mass., in place of J. B. Logan, retired.  
Donald M. Lincoln, Rutland, Mass., in place of T. F. Welch, retired.  
Laurence J. Stange, South Deerfield, Mass., in place of H. J. Cuff, deceased.  
Rosamond T. Marshall, Sterling, Mass., in place of Alice Fitzgerald, retired.



Robert L. McCarthy, Warren, Mass., in place of J. E. Madigan, removed.  
Robert P. McMahon, Westfield, Mass., in place of G. E. Brady, retired.

## MICHIGAN

Julie M. Frick, Atlas, Mich., in place of Jessie Evans, resigned.  
Jean N. Carruthers, Bancroft, Mich., in place of E. H. Shelp, transferred.  
Roland W. Reese, Birmingham, Mich., in place of B. E. Fowler, removed.  
Ronald C. Cheever, Britton, Mich., in place of B. J. Beasley, retired.  
Robert J. Terrell, Byron Center, Mich., in place of M. G. Wells, deceased.  
Chester V. Muntz, Cass City, Mich., in place of A. M. Bigelow, resigned.  
Olga L. Thoms, Centreville, Mich., in place of Frank Mandigo, retired.  
Wynne Vanderkarr, Corunna, Mich., in place of C. S. Carland, retired.  
Clayton P. Anderson, Crosswell, Mich., in place of W. D. McCaughey, removed.  
Donovan E. Springsteen, Fenwick, Mich., in place of G. S. Ehle, retired.  
Carl F. Riebow, Harrisville, Mich., in place of S. B. Pizer, retired.  
Charles H. Hinman, Hastings, Mich., in place of R. G. Hubbard, retired.  
Wilbur T. McLane, Lake, Mich., in place of C. C. Malosh, retired.  
Leslie B. Palmer, Mason, Mich., in place of W. J. Barber, resigned.  
George D. Smith, Morenci, Mich., in place of H. F. Clark, resigned.  
Ralph H. Jokipii, Pelkie, Mich., in place of M. H. Oja, retired.  
Robert J. McIntosh, Port Huron, Mich., in place of L. C. Sellers, deceased.  
Chester J. Orr, Standish, Mich., in place of A. M. Rokosz, removed.  
Myrtle E. Kennedy, Topinabee, Mich., in place of L. W. Kennedy, resigned.  
Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.

## MINNESOTA

George Ralph Laniel, Brooks, Minn., in place of Arthur Laniel, retired.  
Eugene C. Wensman, Chokio, Minn., in place of A. L. Nelson, resigned.  
Raymond O. Johnson, Cloquet, Minn., in place of C. E. Scheibe, retired.  
Donald J. Bode, Courtland, Minn., in place of F. A. Heidemann, deceased.  
Celia M. Mattinen, Esko, Minn., in place of H. J. Mattinen, deceased.  
Walfred R. Wicklund, Isanti, Minn., in place of K. W. Oleson, transferred.  
Irvn J. Kopschke, Janesville, Minn., in place of R. P. Nolan, retired.  
Dale A. Lahti, Kelly Lake, Minn., in place of I. A. Gonsolin, retired.  
Edward C. Distel, Lakeland, Minn., in place of R. E. Sanderson, deceased.  
Melvin J. Moravec, Lonsdale, Minn., in place of Charles Mechura, transferred.  
Verlyn F. Cornelius, Medford, Minn., in place of R. W. Corchran, resigned.  
Martha M. Freer, Oak Park, Minn., in place of E. J. Finden, retired.  
Felix J. Eggen, Underwood, Minn., in place of Alfred Gronner, retired.  
Walter A. Lienke, Windom, Minn., in place of E. C. Ebert, removed.

## MISSISSIPPI

Luther V. Taylor, Sr., Belmont, Miss., in place of L. C. Davis, retired.  
Philip E. Swayze, Benton, Miss., in place of C. R. Berry, retired.  
Dora F. Lynd, Escatawpa, Miss., in place of L. J. Megehee, retired.  
William D. Kenneday, Meridian, Miss., in place of B. K. Culpepper, retired.  
Joseph B. Pickett, Pope, Miss., in place of A. L. Robertson, deceased.

Carroll M. Butler, Raleigh, Miss., in place of F. J. Robinson, retired.  
Elizabeth H. Branch, Shelby, Miss., in place of H. E. Wilkinson, deceased.  
Roy A. Schmidt, Sontag, Miss., in place of E. A. Douglas, transferred.  
Rufus A. Ware, Stringer, Miss., in place of J. G. Ishee, retired.

## MISSOURI

Gene D. Callison, Barnett, Mo., in place of H. C. Gunn, transferred.  
Charles E. Jones, Burlington Junction, Mo., in place of A. B. House, retired.  
Theodore R. Shell, De Soto, Mo., in place of H. W. Ames, transferred.  
Perry M. Sprague, Fair Play, Mo., in place of Raymond Nickles, transferred.  
George W. Lowrance, Golden City, Mo., in place of M. E. Woody, retired.  
William H. Lovell, Henrietta, Mo., in place of W. E. Sisk, resigned.  
John R. Smith, Jameson, Mo., in place of M. H. Reed, retired.  
Cyrenius J. Jones, Jonesburg, Mo., in place of J. B. Diggs, resigned.  
William H. Adams, Memphis, Mo., in place of A. O. Hendrickson, deceased.  
Fred W. Aderhold, Purdy, Mo., in place of H. W. Harter, resigned.  
Robert E. Nichols, Seymour, Mo., in place of Raymond Carrick, transferred.  
Raymond M. Buckley, Warsaw, Mo., in place of P. M. Blanchard, removed.

## MONTANA

Ruth Ish, Chester, Mont., in place of Shebel Rehal, retired.  
Clifford V. Long, Frazer, Mont., in place of G. N. Westland, removed.  
Elizabeth L. Calvert, Lima, Mont., in place of O. M. Cantrell, resigned.  
Olga Strand, Reserve, Mont., in place of E. K. Riley, retired.  
Alma E. Fischer, Somers, Mont., in place of Ralph Drew, deceased.

## NEBRASKA

Bernard J. Holen, Bertrand, Nebr., in place of C. E. Opitz, removed.  
Harold D. Lessig, Gurley, Nebr., in place of A. O. Kruger, transferred.  
Duane M. Vannice, Halsey, Nebr., in place of L. F. Besley, retired.  
Edwin A. Misegadis, Lodgepole, Nebr., in place of G. E. Minshall, retired.  
Harley G. Lofton, McCook, Nebr., in place of R. E. Scott, resigned.  
Lois J. Larson, Macy, Nebr., in place of Donald Maslonka, resigned.  
Elet M. Wagner, Roseland, Nebr., in place of R. G. Lynch, retired.  
Anton F. Fisher, Weston, Nebr., in place of I. M. Davis, removed.

## NEVADA

Norma N. Blanchini, Beawawe, Nev., in place of T. A. Mahoney, resigned.  
James Donald Morrison, Eureka, Nev., in place of J. V. Hooper, removed.  
Anna M. Houck, Weed Heights, Nev. Office established March 16, 1953.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Thomas W. Golden, Hinsdale, N. H., in place of F. J. Young, retired.

## NEW JERSEY

Elmer Stanton Holmes, Jr., Avalon, N. J., in place of M. F. Locke, declined.  
J. Ward Johnson, Belford, N. J., in place of J. P. Euler, retired.  
Lyman H. Graham, Bradley Beach, N. J., in place of J. M. Timcoe, retired.  
Joseph J. Kelly, Coytesville, N. J., in place of G. D. Drums, deceased.  
George E. Cusick, Demarest, N. J., in place of A. T. Heus, retired.  
Anna P. MacGill, Lafayette, N. J., in place of J. D. Treible, retired.

Dorothy L. Curley, Lyons, N. J., in place of E. B. Egan, resigned.  
Ralph G. Shreve, Moorestown, N. J., in place of A. B. Nixon, deceased.  
Ruth E. Alt, Morganville, N. J., in place of L. F. Slover, removed.  
Edna I. McTamney, Neshanic Station, N. J., in place of E. W. Hoagland, retired.  
Henry J. Formon, Ridgefield, N. J., in place of C. A. Hildebrand, retired.  
Amelia S. Applegate, South River, N. J., in place of C. F. Hausermann, removed.  
Philip N. Mazziotto, Towaco, N. J., in place of J. N. Rumley, deceased.

## NEW MEXICO

Lucille G. Salazar, Dulce, N. Mex., in place of I. H. Hobgood, resigned.  
Charles Earnest Cooper, Melrose, N. Mex., in place of G. E. White, retired.

## NEW YORK

Florence M. Drankhan, Boston, N. Y., in place of S. H. Dye, retired.  
George A. Moses, Brushton, N. Y., in place of C. H. Hamlin, deceased.  
John Wesley Sinnickson, Center Moriches, N. Y., in place of T. E. Havens, resigned.  
Ida Mae Hopkins, Cincinnati, N. Y., in place of L. H. Ingersoll, retired.  
Marjorie S. Mann, Clyde, N. Y., in place of W. A. Bramer, resigned.  
Joseph Del Giudice, Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y., in place of E. L. Van Tassell, removed.  
Kenneth C. Lasher, Dover Plains, N. Y., in place of E. A. Wyman, retired.  
Eva H. Chambers, Dresden, N. Y., in place of M. D. Leach, retired.  
Ignatius Fafinski, Dunkirk, N. Y., in place of D. P. Scannell, resigned.  
Donald R. Young, East Branch, N. Y., in place of F. A. Yager, resigned.  
Richard S. Laing, Eden, N. Y., in place of A. H. Flint, removed.  
W. Arthur Lewis, Fishers, N. Y., in place of H. A. Barry, resigned.  
Amelia L. Donovan, Forestport, N. Y., in place of M. A. Murphy, retired.  
Ralph L. Marshall, Freeport, N. Y., in place of E. A. Rice, retired.  
Florence Thompson, Harriman, N. Y., in place of F. L. Brady, deceased.  
William F. Pfarrer, Hilton, N. Y., in place of B. C. Randall, resigned.  
Fred A. Griffin, Holtsville, N. Y., in place of W. L. Lester, removed.  
Howard W. Wheeler, Kinderhook, N. Y., in place of C. M. Magee, retired.  
Joyce K. Holmes, Lindley, N. Y., in place of M. A. Cobb, retired.  
Revelon M. Wimmer, Marilla, N. Y., in place of Clifford Veeder, retired.  
Donald M. Baker, Moriah, N. Y., in place of W. L. Pepper, retired.  
Russell A. Southard, Otego, N. Y., in place of D. L. Palmer, retired.  
Rudolph H. Reed, Painted Post, N. Y., in place of C. L. Wright, deceased.  
Leonard Lincoln Hunt, Piermont, N. Y., in place of M. T. Scott, removed.  
Gordon E. Fahey, Port Leyden, N. Y., in place of E. J. Claffey, retired.  
Jack A. Follis, Pound Ridge, N. Y. Office established November 16, 1953.  
Richard I. Gates, Redwood, N. Y., in place of L. S. Martin, retired.  
Joseph Huber, Rockville Centre, N. Y., in place of W. J. Murray, resigned.  
Henry M. Engelmann, Round Top, N. Y., in place of C. O. Alberga, retired.  
Madelein W. Matthews, Russell, N. Y., in place of H. J. Dygert, retired.  
Lloyd A. Carter, Saranac, N. Y., in place of A. E. Pellerin, transferred.  
Ely E. Mulliken, Savona, N. Y., in place of J. W. Moore, retired.  
John L. Button, South New Berlin, N. Y., in place of Josephine Westphall, resigned.

John Wesley Pullman, Tappan, N. Y., in place of E. C. Jones, retired.  
 Edmon L. Sowers, Thiells, N. Y., in place of Walter Stanhope, retired.  
 Berta L. Wixom, Trumansburg, N. Y., in place of M. E. Fausette, retired.  
 Donald M. Tobey, Victor, N. Y., in place of F. B. Mead, retired.  
 Urban W. Newman, Westmoreland, N. Y., in place of H. K. Morrison, resigned.  
 John A. Harrington, West Oneonta, N. Y., in place of S. A. Gregory, resigned.  
 Margaret C. Wilcox, Whitney Point, N. Y., in place of A. D. Driscoll, retired.  
 Leon P. Carey, Woodstock, N. Y., in place of Howard Bell, resigned.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Harry C. Robbins, Blowing Rock, N. C., in place of G. M. Sudderth, retired.  
 Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N. C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.  
 James L. Chestnutt, Edenton, N. C., in place of R. D. Dixon, deceased.  
 Lee G. Phipps, Grassy Creek, N. C., in place of E. R. Duval, retired.  
 Victor F. Harris, Harrisburg, N. C., in place of W. D. Sloop, retired.  
 John F. Drake, Holly Springs, N. C., in place of Beulah Paxton, retired.  
 Kathryn H. Perry, Kitty Hawk, N. C., in place of H. M. Baum, retired.  
 Numa D. Redmon, Jr., Leaksville, N. C., in place of W. W. Hampton, retired.  
 Robert Duke Tutterow, Mocksville, N. C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.  
 James L. Oakley, Providence, N. C. Office established September 1, 1953.  
 Neil D. Shively, Spray, N. C., in place of O. H. Hodges, retired.  
 James D. Glisson, Stokes, N. C., in place of G. L. Clark, resigned.  
 John H. Norton, Stony Point, N. C., in place of D. F. Cockrell, removed.  
 Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N. C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.  
 Iris S. Powell, Wentworth, N. C., in place of J. G. Wilson, deceased.  
 Hugh D. Bradner, Yanceyville, N. C., in place of T. D. Boswell, retired.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Pearl E. Taylor, Alexander, N. Dak., in place of B. K. Jenner, removed.  
 John B. Williams, Barney, N. Dak., in place of R. A. Halvorson, resigned.  
 Agnes E. Butts, Big Bend, N. Dak., in place of A. J. Irwin, resigned.  
 Anna E. Schlabach, Driscoll, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bruschwein, retired.  
 LeRoy B. Wentz, Elgin, N. Dak., in place of M. C. Rausch, retired.  
 Eugene M. Shea, Hazelton, N. Dak., in place of A. H. Simpkins, removed.  
 Lyle A. Opdahl, Litchville, N. Dak., in place of M. G. McGregor, transferred.  
 James Wallace Scott, Manning, N. Dak., in place of Helen Morton, retired.  
 Mildred L. Knudsen, Marion, N. Dak., in place of Cleo Flugge, transferred.  
 Orris K. Rowe, New Leipzig, N. Dak., in place of H. T. Storm, deceased.  
 Esther Ward, Palermo, N. Dak., in place of H. D. Ward, deceased.  
 Joseph A. Scholand, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of D. F. McMenamy, transferred.  
 Franklin V. Frykman, Souris, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Sletten, transferred.  
 Harold W. Bachman, Streeter, N. Dak., in place of Paul Kietzke, deceased.  
 Herman C. Becker, Wahpeton, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Hawes, retired.  
 Lawrence W. Grahm, Walhalla, N. Dak., in place of W. S. McCabe, deceased.  
 Robert G. Brown, Wimbeldon, N. Dak., in place of L. E. Peterson, resigned.

## OHIO

Dorothy S. Hagelberger, Anna, Ohio, in place of W. D. Day, transferred.

Smith B. Applegarth, Barton, Ohio, in place of M. I. Timko, resigned.  
 Harry M. Hollerbach, Batavia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Coyle, deceased.  
 Keith W. Lowery, Buckeye Lake, Ohio, in place of L. G. McKnight, retired.  
 Jean Ray Swihart, Eldorado, Ohio, in place of C. V. Stayton, removed.  
 Jack Richard Turner, Forest, Ohio, in place of B. A. Fishburn, retired.  
 Helen M. Hall, Fredericksburg, Ohio, in place of G. R. Spencer, removed.  
 Earl G. Golliver, Grover Hill, Ohio, in place of J. H. Kohn, retired.  
 Olive G. Spangler, Harrisburg, Ohio, in place of M. G. Liff, resigned.  
 Walter Thomas Woolard, Hebron, Ohio, in place of M. J. Rosebraugh, retired.  
 Verne A. Miner, Lodi, Ohio, in place of E. A. Rowland, retired.  
 Robert H. Shafer, McComb, Ohio, in place of R. H. Strouse, retired.  
 Billy A. Calendine, McConnelsville, Ohio, in place of H. W. Gordon, retired.  
 Ralph M. Hardy, Mansfield, Ohio, in place of C. L. Ford, removed.  
 Veryl D. Rodocker, Mount Eaton, Ohio, in place of H. M. Rodocker, deceased.  
 Phillip H. Gifford, Urbana, Ohio, in place of W. A. Strapp, deceased.  
 Barras George Birkbeck, Wadsworth, Ohio, in place of W. I. Dague, retired.  
 Ben S. Daniels, Willoughby, Ohio, in place of J. D. Ryan, retired.

## OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Stanley, Alma, Okla., in place of J. Y. Elmore, transferred.  
 Hobart F. R. Higdon, Avant, Okla., in place of E. V. Hamrick, deceased.  
 J. T. Haney, Jr., Big Cabin, Okla., in place of Verdia Comer, resigned.  
 Jack J. Higgins, Blackwell, Okla., in place of C. H. McMullan, removed.  
 Margaret Marie Duel, Carmen, Okla., in place of E. D. Peck, retired.  
 Martha C. Roach, Chelsea, Okla., in place of N. I. McHenry, retired.  
 Loetta Jo Condit, Countyline, Okla., in place of Grady Gossett, deceased.  
 Phil H. Underwood, Custer, Okla., in place of E. R. Cunningham, retired.  
 Floyd P. Johnson, Davis, Okla., in place of O. V. Lowther, removed.  
 Grady V. Duncan, Durant, Okla., in place of B. W. Johnson, deceased.  
 Agnes V. Peer, Gage, Okla., in place of F. L. Burrow, removed.  
 Gerald L. Riddle, Gracemont, Okla., in place of E. L. Hatchett, resigned.  
 Velma D. Wilkins, Grant, Okla., in place of H. E. Hathaway, resigned.  
 Harvey Bowen, Jr., Meeker, Okla., in place of T. F. Green, deceased.  
 Glenn M. Moore, Morris, Okla., in place of C. W. Jeffress, removed.  
 Carson Scott, Okmulgee, Okla., in place of H. B. Torbett, removed.  
 Joseph T. Courts, Quinton, Okla., in place of F. R. Hendrickson, retired.  
 George W. Sewell, Sayre, Okla., in place of Oscar Speed, deceased.  
 John Masino, Schuler, Okla., in place of A. B. Swan, resigned.  
 William L. Bozeman, Soper, Okla., in place of C. C. Sanders, resigned.  
 Everette E. Johnson, Stillwater, Okla., in place of H. A. McNutt, resigned.  
 Thomas J. Winters, Jr., Stringtown, Okla., in place of Eleanor Barnhill, resigned.  
 Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.  
 Blanche D. Browning, Wynona, Okla., in place of Roy Broadus, retired.

## OREGON

Neil L. Morfitt, Astoria, Oreg., in place of E. P. Burke, retired.

Flossie M. Coats, Boardman, Oreg., in place of Florence Root, retired.  
 Thomas M. Biggar, Jr., Canyon City, Oreg., in place of E. E. Mulcare, transferred.  
 Julia H. Decker, Island City, Oreg., in place of S. E. Hyde, deceased.  
 Leon M. Matheny, Jacksonville, Oreg., in place of M. R. Christean, resigned.  
 David I. Hoover, Mapleton, Oreg., in place of L. A. Wheeler, resigned.  
 E. Marjorie Ogan, Marcola, Oreg., in place of N. J. Nell, retired.  
 Glen R. Sandford, North Plains, Oreg., in place of J. R. Sandford, retired.  
 Francis G. Petrie, Rogue River, Oreg., in place of H. M. Laws, retired.  
 Nellie A. Bembry, Sisters, Oreg., in place of S. J. May, resigned.  
 Ray Kurz, Umatilla, Oreg., in place of T. G. Tucker, deceased.  
 Doris H. Weaver, Valsetz, Oreg., in place of E. C. Blaisdell, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Edna M. Darragh, Amity, Pa., in place of C. T. Darragh, deceased.  
 Bernard E. O'Connor, Bainbridge, Pa., in place of J. H. Bryan, resigned.  
 Evert L. Ervin, Beaver, Pa., in place of J. P. Bryan, retired.  
 Walter L. Stuart, Brownsville, Pa., in place of W. C. Storer, retired.  
 Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.  
 Bertha E. Snyder, Dickerson Run, Pa., in place of O. K. Weise, resigned.  
 Catharine B. Shultz, Dublin, Pa., in place of P. G. Shultz, deceased.  
 Kenneth H. Williamson, Edgemont, Pa., in place of M. P. Smith, retired.  
 Frank L. Bucko, Ford City, Pa., in place of M. J. Glenn, retired.  
 Clayton E. Hollinger, Lebanon, Pa., in place of D. E. Walter, removed.  
 Bruce B. DeLong, Mertztown, Pa., in place of E. F. Fox, retired.  
 William Jerome McMullin, Millhelm, Pa., in place of C. E. Musser, retired.  
 Joshua J. Baker, Mineral Point, Pa., in place of M. J. O'Connor, retired.  
 Elmer L. Zerphey, Mount Joy, Pa., in place of C. J. Bennett, Jr., resigned.  
 Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.  
 Blain B. Walker, Jr., Mount Pocono, Pa., in place of L. J. DePaul, resigned.  
 Fred D. Starr, Muncy Valley, Pa., in place of H. W. Bender, retired.  
 Ward O. Sharpe, Murrysburg, Pa., in place of H. S. Welsh, resigned.  
 Rita P. Ritchie, Prospect, Pa., in place of R. K. Humphrey, resigned.  
 James M. Dougherty, Ralston, Pa., in place of H. L. Schaefer, declined.  
 Ralph H. Landes, Royersford, Pa., in place of M. S. Anderson, retired.  
 Arthur Mosteller, Shawnee on Delaware, Pa., in place of A. B. Smith, resigned.  
 Harold E. Walters, Sidman, Pa., in place of A. A. Plummer, retired.  
 Demetrius Gula, Southwest, Pa., in place of W. A. Bailey, retired.  
 Marie H. McDannell, Spartansburg, Pa., in place of W. L. Blakeslee, resigned.  
 C. Lyman Sturgis, Uniontown, Pa., in place of J. A. Reilly, removed.  
 Jane E. McKenry, West Bridgewater, Pa., in place of N. K. McKean, resigned.  
 David L. Dickson, West Monterey, Pa., in place of B. M. Logan, resigned.  
 Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.

## RHODE ISLAND

Amelia M. Bottomley, Greystone, R. I., in place of Frederick Malone, deceased.  
 Earle W. Belknap, Wakefield, R. I., in place of E. F. McCarthy, retired.



## SOUTH CAROLINA

Lucille G. Heyward, Bluffton, S. C., in place of G. P. Harrison, retired.  
 Elizabeth Y. Curran, Brunson, S. C., in place of Pearl Youmans, retired.  
 Floyd C. Hammond, Myrtle Beach, S. C., in place of G. S. Beard, retired.  
 William W. Cone, Saluda, S. C., in place of A. J. Nicholson, transferred.  
 Lee M. Blanchett, Summerville, S. C., in place of E. O. Reynolds, retired.  
 Arace M. Crouch, Wallace, S. C. Office established September 1, 1950.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Shabino, Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of Gwynneath Field, deceased.  
 Eunice A. Sjerven, Bristol, S. Dak., in place of V. A. Sjerven, deceased.  
 Randal A. Bishop, Hurley, S. Dak., in place of S. P. Hutchinson, resigned.  
 Russell G. Dupic, Lesterville, S. Dak., in place of George Kremer, retired.  
 William L. Truex, Montrose, S. Dak., in place of T. W. Lalley, deceased.  
 Thomas V. Niederman, Morrilton, S. Dak., in place of M. F. McGrath, resigned.  
 Matthew Voigt, Spencer, S. Dak., in place of Ross Bennett, transferred.  
 Harold J. Engel, Wagner, S. Dak., in place of R. C. Hoyer, removed.

## TENNESSEE

Jim N. Bone, Cumberland Furnace, Tenn., in place of E. L. Smith, deceased.

## TEXAS

Edward A. Buffington, Anderson, Tex., in place of T. L. McDougald, deceased.  
 Wesley M. Robbins, Aspermont, Tex., in place of M. N. Guest, resigned.  
 William J. Foxworth, Cisco, Tex., in place of L. H. McCrea, resigned.  
 Bernice F. Hines, Diboll, Tex., in place of Zettie Kelley, retired.  
 Hal E. Hanson, Dickinson, Tex., in place of M. S. Walters, resigned.  
 Conrad H. Starr, Elkhart, Tex., in place of B. F. Weatherford, retired.  
 Edmund F. Jendrusch, Jr., Falls City, Tex., in place of S. F. Labus, retired.  
 Emory D. Estes, Jr., Hawkins, Tex., in place of H. E. Minshew, removed.  
 Irving M. Horton, Humble, Tex., in place of W. J. Reeves, deceased.  
 Martin B. Glasscock, La Feria, Tex., in place of A. L. Allen, retired.  
 Raymond E. Jones, Livingston, Tex., in place of J. T. Coleman, retired.  
 Samuel S. Williams, Marshall, Tex., in place of T. J. Agnor, deceased.  
 Eleanore L. Walston, Nome, Tex., in place of B. O. Collins, resigned.  
 James Everett, Jr., Oglesby, Tex., in place of I. A. Stockburger, deceased.  
 Howard G. Turner, Orange, Tex., in place of C. R. Coale, resigned.  
 Gerald J. Shipp, Ore City, Tex., in place of C. C. Coppedge, retired.  
 Odie K. Gaylor, Pampa, Tex., in place of W. B. Weathered, transferred.  
 Billy N. Fine, Petrolia, Tex., in place of M. A. Price, removed.  
 Grace Roach, Rankin, Tex., in place of M. J. Edwards, deceased.  
 Evelyn Neale Walker, Robstown, Tex., in place of R. B. Horney, resigned.  
 Claud M. Erwin, Rocksprings, Tex., in place of M. S. Henry, deceased.  
 William W. Schulz, Schertz, Tex., in place of G. J. Bolton, retired.  
 Oscar C. Hope, Jr., Scottsville, Tex., in place of O. C. Hope, retired.  
 Mattie K. Elmore, Shepherd, Tex., in place of P. H. Fuller, resigned.  
 Paeder T. Hoovestol, South Houston, Tex., in place of I. M. Meador, resigned.

Donald H. Smith, Spearman, Tex., in place of M. S. Chambers, resigned.  
 Ruth Brown, Sylveste, Tex., in place of M. S. McHaney, resigned.  
 Leila D. Kelley, Valentine, Tex., in place of J. J. Williams, removed.  
 Miller E. Herrington, Whitney, Tex., in place of J. W. Hardison, transferred.  
 Esta L. Matson, Zephyr, Tex., in place of M. L. Cobb, retired.

## UTAH

Donald F. Keele, Dugway, Utah. Office established December 1, 1953.  
 Byron L. Huish, Magna, Utah, in place of V. A. Haws, removed.

## VERMONT

Gaylord C. Gale, Stowe, Vt., in place of H. J. Bashaw, deceased.

## VIRGINIA

Robert A. Wilkinson, Arrington, Va., in place of W. A. White, deceased.  
 Theodore Reese Hall, Callao, Va., in place of G. M. Sandy, resigned.  
 Silverius C. Churn, Cape Charles, Va., in place of S. T. Nottingham, retired.  
 Homer J. Amos, Chatham, Va., in place of J. J. Patterson, retired.  
 Walter H. Sealock, Falls Church, Va., in place of B. F. May, retired.  
 Robert K. Drumwright, Jr., Fork Union, Va., in place of B. S. Weaver, retired.  
 Jerry W. Alford, Glasgow, Va., in place of L. B. Peak, retired.

## WASHINGTON

William A. Penn, Bothell, Wash., in place of A. D. Hannan, deceased.  
 Daun Ringer, Bridgeport, Wash., in place of M. S. Willms, resigned.  
 Gilbert E. Manuel, College Place, Wash., in place of E. H. Davis, retired.  
 Loring E. Bundy, Edwall, Wash., in place of M. P. Hutton, resigned.  
 Willis E. Goodwin, Houghton, Wash., in place of W. E. Jones, retired.  
 Walter E. Soehl, La Center, Wash., in place of Edna Smith, retired.  
 Samuel E. Edwards, Ritzville, Wash., in place of Henry Thom, retired.  
 James T. Likes, Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts, retired.  
 Wanda G. Wyatt, Union, Wash., in place of H. G. Anderson, retired.  
 George A. Morrison, Vashon, Wash., in place of J. E. Ober, deceased.  
 Bertha L. Mills, Vaughn, Wash., in place of R. A. Stratford, resigned.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Paul F. Sheets, Clarksburg, W. Va., in place of W. H. Garrett, resigned.  
 Mary M. Leslie, Cowen, W. Va., in place of W. O. Starcher, resigned.  
 Jesse J. Martin, Ethel, W. Va., in place of C. T. Lee, removed.  
 Glen R. Dial, Harts, W. Va., in place of Herbert Adkins, retired.  
 Howard L. Carpenter, Hepzibah, W. Va., in place of C. A. Lyon, retired.  
 William D. Workman, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of C. H. Callison, resigned.

## WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.  
 Marvin W. Babbitt, Bloomer, Wis., in place of E. R. Kranzfelder, retired.  
 Raymond T. Huinker, Cato, Wis., in place of A. M. Pritzl, retired.  
 Lester V. Gilbertson, Coon Valley, Wis., in place of N. O. Neprud, retired.  
 Archie W. Christman, Darien, Wis., in place of J. E. Thorpe, resigned.  
 Wendell G. Williams, Elcho, Wis., in place of T. W. Schuh, resigned.  
 Arthur L. Ewen, Francis Creek, Wis., in place of C. J. Hessel, retired.

Floyd A. Fralick, Glen Haven, Wis., in place of D. L. Bennett, removed.  
 DuWayne J. Bloch, Green Lake, Wis., in place of M. R. Alling, deceased.  
 Robley H. Evans, Hawthorne, Wis., in place of F. W. Thoms, deceased.  
 Edward C. Hammer, Hillsboro, Wis., in place of S. E. Ferriter, retired.  
 Richard C. Cross, Larsen, Wis., in place of G. J. Cross, resigned.  
 Dan H. Kimball, Marengo, Wis., in place of J. F. Kohn, retired.  
 Arnold L. Peters, Marinette, Wis., in place of W. F. Coffey, resigned.  
 William A. Knoll, Mayville, Wis., in place of M. J. Bachhuber, retired.  
 DeWayne W. Jensen, Minong, Wis., in place of N. H. Adams, resigned.  
 Julius C. Sarafolean, Portage, Wis., in place of C. J. Rubin, deceased.  
 Arthur E. Bauer, Sussex, Wis., in place of P. E. Boots, retired.  
 Lloyd W. Bryant, Waterford, Wis., in place of G. W. Shenkenberg, retired.  
 Gordon A. Peterson, Waupaca, Wis., in place of J. W. Carew, retired.  
 Ernest M. Iverson, Williams Bay, Wis., in place of S. V. Johnson, removed.  
 Leo J. Verhasselt, Wrightstown, Wis., in place of T. C. Buboltz, retired.

## WYOMING

Charles F. Hessenthaler, Byron, Wyo., in place of M. B. Cozzens, retired.  
 Anthony M. Ries, Cheyenne, Wyo., in place of Hugh Coffman, retired.  
 Allen L. Swan, Douglas, Wyo., in place of J. L. Downs, resigned.  
 Robert A. Lowham, Evanston, Wyo., in place of F. P. Nelson, resigned.  
 Walter S. Brown, Jr., Pine Bluffs, Wyo., in place of A. D. Keenan, retired.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1955:

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

## UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 27, 1958, AND UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSOR HAS BEEN APPOINTED AND QUALIFIED

Philip D. Reed, of New York.

Erwin D. Canham, of Massachusetts.

## SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

## BOARD OF PAROLE

George Glenn Killinger, of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1960.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward J. Devitt, of Minnesota, to be United States district judge for the district of Minnesota.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.