## The National Cotton Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANK E. SMITH**
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 29, 1955*

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the National Cotton Council met in Washington last month to discuss the council's position in regard to the cotton export trade. The leaders of the council decided that this organization could not properly become involved in a controversy involving export price policy for cotton.

At the same time the council reaffirmed its belief that maintaining a high level of international trade and a wider distribution of goods and services throughout the world is vital to the continued prosperity of the cotton industry and to the national economy, as well as to the security of the free world. The council recognizes that the greatest opportunity to expand United States exports of cotton and cotton products is through increased per capita consumption of cotton goods over the world.

The National Cotton Council represents all segments of the cotton industry—producers, ginners, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers, merchants, and spinners. Naturally conflicts of interest develop among these groups and differences over price policy can never be satisfactorily reconciled. President W. T. Wynn and the other leaders of the council were wise in their decision to avoid involvement in such conflicts.

The basic purpose of the council is to help increase the efficient production of cotton. Under Mr. Wynn's leadership the council expects to expand its efforts to encourage general economic development, advertising, and sales promotion, market research and development, and more efficient production and distribution of cotton products throughout the world. Such a program will be of primary benefit to the American cotton producer.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial concerning the work of the cotton council from the March 1955 issue of the Progressive Farmer, the South's outstanding farm publication:

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE COTTON COUNCIL

In 1939 when the National Cotton Council was organized, cotton was a sick industry. It was losing out to its competitors. Rayon, the first of the synthetic fibers, was capturing its markets. In United States stores, cotton goods had been pushed into the bargain basements. On the farm, both cotton yields and quality were unsatisfactory; production costs were excessively high, due to heavy use of hand labor. All in all, the outlook for cotton was dismal.

Once organized, the council had to choose between two broad objectives. It could follow the lead of the butter industry, which for many years sought a way out of its troubles by imposing Government restrictions on its competitor. Or it could meet competition (1) by promoting a program of better cotton at lower cost, and (2) by developing new uses and new markets. Fortunately, it chose a constructive program of building up cotton in preference to one of tearing down rayon and other synthetic fibers. This basic choice has set the pattern for its program over the years. And with such a program the council has developed a proved formula for success.

Now, 16 years later, what is the situation? Cotton has a new outlook. It has confidence in a bright and shining future. It believes that it has no problem that can't be whipped by the industry cooperation in a program of research, education, and promotion.

Summing up its regeneration, cotton can point proudly to these accomplishments:

1. It has expanded its domestic market by 50 percent in the face of ever-increasing competition from synthetics. Losing heavily in some uses, such as bags and tires, it has more than offset these losses by large gains in wearing apparel and other fields. It has triumphed because it has won more market battles than it has lost. Cotton, once considered the poor man's fiber, is now equally at home in high society.
2. It has stopped the downward trend in exports that started in the middle twenties, and hopes to turn exports upward.
3. United States farmers have outdistanced foreign competitors in improving production practices.
4. The quality of United States cotton has been improving constantly. Fiber strength has increased 13 percent.
5. Man-hour requirements, for producing cotton have been cut in half; lint yields increased 30 percent.
6. Mechanization has come so fast that 22 percent of the 1954 crop was harvested with machines.
7. The cotton industry, from farmer to spinner, has a vastly improved spirit of mutual understanding. Its leaders have been meeting around conference tables for 16 years and have developed an immense stockpile of know-how.

The council would be among the first to admit that it cannot claim credit for all that has happened in the world of cotton during the last 16 years. Its first duty has been to get others to work harder and more enthusiastically for cotton—and to help them work more effectively. The council does not operate its own research laboratories. It investigates to see what research is needed. Then it works to obtain the needed expansion in research. And it follows a similar strategy to obtain needed educational work for getting research findings into use.

The cotton council is the joint effort of six groups—growers, ginners, cottonseed crushers, warehousemen, merchants, and spinners. Most outstanding is the success of the council in getting the majority of people in each of these groups to contribute to its financial support. On an average, about 70 percent of all 6 branches of the cotton industry is now making a financial contribution to the council.

## Knocking Ike Is Grist for GOP Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. PAUL B. DAGUE**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 29, 1955*

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the admirers of President Eisenhower in both parties will resent the attacks on our present Chief Executive, particularly when they center on wholesome diversions like fishing and golfing—as distinguished from poker-playing, weekend cruises—which are about the only relaxation a hard-working President can count on.

And when such partisan attacks bring the President's wife into the picture and include their religious devotions, then it is generally agreed that the American electorate will simply bide their time until such ill-mannered diatribes can be repudiated at the polls.

The attitude of the average Republican is to wait with bated breath for fear that the opposition will realize the mistake they are making and call off the attack before it can be of benefit to the GOP next year. And it can only be presumed that they have forgotten just how much the Republicans served the cause of Franklin Delano Roosevelt by making him the object of their partisan tirades each time he ran and thereby assuring his reelection.

# SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1955

*(Legislative day of Thursday, March 10, 1955)*

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

Elder Everett H. Shull, of the Potomac Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, offered the following prayer:

Loving Father in Heaven, we sense our complete dependence upon Thee for qualifications commensurate to the task before us. In this atomic age of great issues, of shadow and perplexity, we are thankful for men—"Men who in their inmost souls are true and honest; men who do not fear to call sin by its right name; men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole; men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall."

Wilt Thou, Father, the source of Daniel's and Joseph's wisdom and unrivaled statesmanship, bless our President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and each individual Senator, with wisdom, courage, and Thy presence, to the extent that their deliberations and decisions may be the outworking of Thy will. We ask it in the worthy name of Jesus. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, D. C., March 30, 1955.*

*To the Senate:*

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
*President pro tempore.*

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 28, 1955, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 465. An act for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; and

S. 632. An act for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski.

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

H. R. 122. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act;

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez;

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Justin G. Maile and Theodore R. Hilbig;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Kyung Ho Park (Syung Sil Park) and his wife, Mrs. Young Sil Lee;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly;

H. R. 1044. An act for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend;

H. R. 1045. An act for the relief of Rolf Peter Weber;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of Luigi Cianci;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Hussein Kamel Moustafa;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman;

H. R. 1086. An act for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum;

H. R. 1108. An act for the relief of Rose Mazur;

H. R. 1146. An act for the relief of the Pacific Music Supply Co.;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1165. An act for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child, Maria Anastasia Reinhardt;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of Joaquin Rivademar;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Leong Ding Foon Quon and Ken C. Quon;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Casey;

H. R. 1656. An act for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui;

H. R. 1660. An act for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Henry L. Stamm, Sr.;

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson;

H. R. 3020. An act for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone;

H. R. 3338. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 3661. An act to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene;

H. R. 3885. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts;

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of John J. Braund;

H. R. 4642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Aldridge;

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) establishing that when the two Houses adjourn Monday, April 4, 1955, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 13, 1955, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 122. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act; and

H. R. 1831. An act to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 891. An act for the relief of Alberto Cortez Cortez;

H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Justin G. Maile and Theodore R. Hilbig;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildegard Noble;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Kyung Ho Park (Syung Sil Park) and his wife, Mrs. Young Sil Lee;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Franciska Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly;

H. R. 1044. An act for the relief of Teresa Alice Townsend;

H. R. 1045. An act for the relief of Rolf Peter Weber;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of Luigi Cianci;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Hussein Kamel Moustafa;

H. R. 1081. An act for the relief of Anna Tokatlian Gulezian;

H. R. 1085. An act for the relief of Moses Aaron Butterman;

H. R. 1086. An act for the relief of Mayer Rothbaum;

H. R. 1108. An act for the relief of Rose Mazur;

H. R. 1146. An act for the relief of the Pacific Music Supply Co.;

H. R. 1163. An act for the relief of Lee Houn and Lily Ho Lee Houn;

H. R. 1165. An act for the relief of Maria Theresia Reinhardt and her child Maria Anastasia Reinhardt;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of Joaquin Rivademar;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Leong Ding Foon Quon and Ken C. Quon;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandes Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Casey;

H. R. 1656. An act for the relief of Chen Chih-Keui;

H. R. 1660. An act for the relief of Wencenty Peter Winiarski;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Henry L. Stamm, Sr.;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambauske;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of Col. McFarland Cockrill;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson;

H. R. 3020. An act for the relief of Buonaventura Giannone;

H. R. 3338. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914;

H. R. 3526. An act for the relief of the estate of Neil McLeod Smith;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act;

H. R. 3661. An act to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3738. An act for the relief of Roy M. Hofheinz and wife Irene;

H. R. 3885. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts;

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachell Luyse Kubicek;

H. R. 4051. An act to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of John J. Braund;

H. R. 4642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Aldridge; and

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 28, 1955,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, on March 29, 1955, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances, and submitted a report (No. 125) thereon.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

## EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the date for filing the report of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Banking and Currency authorized by Senate Resolution 254 of the 83d Congress be extended until April 30, 1955.

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

## DEATH OF HAROLD BECKLEY, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE SENATE PRESS GALLERY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, late yesterday I first heard the melancholy news of the passing of one of our most beloved Senate officials, Harold R. Beckley.

For nearly a quarter of a century Harold Beckley has been the friend and confidant of Senators and members of the press. For 15 of those years he was the Superintendent of the Press Gallery, a loyal and devoted public servant who smoothed out many of the rough spots in the daily routine of this body.

"Beck," as he was known to all of us, was intimately acquainted with most of the great national figures of our times. He was an indispensable part of the national conventions of both great political parties, and he is a man who will be sorely missed by all of us.

I know that I can speak for every Member of the Senate when I say that our thoughts are with his family on this sad day. We have all lost a good and faithful friend.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the article about Harold Beckley which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

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

HAROLD R. BECKLEY, SENATE GALLERY CHIEF

Harold R. Beckley, Superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery, died yesterday at Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md. He was 57.

Mr. Beckley in nearly a quarter of a century of work in the press gallery helped thousands of correspondents in and out of Washington to cover the news.

He had been superintendent of the Senate gallery since 1940, and an assistant superintendent for 9 years before that.

Among the many key tasks he performed for newspapers were helping to set up press coverage arrangements for national political conventions, for campaign tours of the candidates, and for major congressional hearings and press conferences.

Mr. Beckley was admitted to Suburban Hospital Sunday after a brief period of illness at his home, 7 Normandy Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Dr. Philip H. Varner, the attending physician, said Mr. Beckley died of heart failure, induced by bronchial pneumonia.

Although he never worked for a newspaper, Mr. Beckley developed a keen sense of news, and a keener taste for a good story. He was an expert at giving a quick fill-in on a news development, and a master at recounting a good yarn.

He was the third superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery. The job is filled by the Standing Committee on Correspondents, a five-member group elected by the gallery members. He worked closely with the committee in planning the details of press arrangements for numerous major public events, here and elsewhere.

As a press liaison man, Mr. Beckley was an intimate of many national figures. He was president of the Hard Rock Club, founded by former President Truman with the group that accompanied him on his Vice Presidential campaign tour in 1944. The club's name recalled a visit into a mine.

In 1952, Mr. Beckley served as press liaison man on Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S campaign tour.

NIXON issued a statement saying: "There was not a Member of the Senate nor the Senate press corps who did not value the friendship of Harold Beckley." He said Beckley was a "quiet, unassuming, friendly man" who set a standard in his job "which may be equaled but which can never be excelled."

A native of Wilmington, Del., Mr. Beckley first came to Washington in 1925. He worked in the House and Senate document rooms before becoming assistant superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery in 1931.

After he won promotion to the position of gallery superintendent, Mr. Beckley often said "I wouldn't change jobs with anyone under the sun."

For many years his chief hobby was golf. More recently his favorite recreation was fishing in the lower Potomac River, at Cobb Island, where he and his wife had a summer

cottage with several of their Washington newspaper friends as near neighbors.

He is survived by his wife, the former Nellie Fuhr; his father, John R. Beckley, a retired railroad engineer, of Wilmington, and five sisters, Mrs. Ben Caplon, of Chevy Chase, Md.; Mrs. Don Womack, of Arlington, Va.; Mrs. Morton Sylvester, of Washington; Mrs. Ruth Nielson, of West Palm Beach, Fla., and Mrs. Hoyt Ellingsworth, of Wilmington.

The National Press Club named a 12-member committee to represent the club at the funeral, for which arrangements are to be announced later. The committee is headed by Lucian Warren, president of the club.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in expressing the profound regret of all of us on this side of the aisle, and I know that of the entire Senate, at the passing of Harold Beckley. He certainly had been most courteous in his dealings with Senators, both in our official duties in the Senate and in the two great national political conventions.

He acted as liaison man between those of us on the floor and the Press Gallery, and was permitted to come to the floor when the Senate was in session. Much of the business which the Senate conducts is known to the country only through the activities of the American press, and, of course, radio and television. In that great arm of public information represented by the press and those who serve in the Press Gallery, Harold Beckley played an important part, and he will be missed by all of us.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that all of the Members of the Senate heard with deep regret the news of the untimely passing of the Superintendent of the Press Gallery, Mr. Harold Beckley.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the men who serve in connection with the work of the Congress is that so many of them have devoted virtually lifetimes to their tasks, tasks which, I may say, usually are largely unknown to the American public.

Harold Beckley first came to Capitol Hill in 1925 in connection with the work of the Senate document rooms, under the sponsorship of Senator Theodore Burton, of Ohio. Between 1931 and 1940 he served as second assistant superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery. Then in September 1940 he became the Superintendent, the third individual to hold this important office.

Only those of us who are privileged to work day in and day out in the Capitol can appreciate the thousand and one hectic cares and burdens of a man in his position. The ladies and gentlemen of the fourth estate can particularly well appreciate the heavy tasks which he accomplished so well. But those of us who are not members of the press, as such, but who come in contact with it in all our work, can understand, too, the industry, the resourcefulness, the ability to perform the job under all sorts of deadline pressures and strains, which marked Harold Beckley's successful quarter of a century of work in the Press Gallery.

Mr. Beckley has served the American press, and thereby the American people, as well, in connection with numerous political conventions, international conferences, indeed, in many other types of places where American correspondents are called upon to report the political news of our country.

I may say that the press coverage of the National Legislature of the United States is the finest, fastest, freest such coverage in the world. And it is thanks to high-caliber men, such as "Beck," that this job—often difficult and always complex—is so successfully performed.

I know my colleagues join with me in expressing sincerest condolences to his widow, his father, and his sisters.

## UNJUSTIFIED CRITICISM OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with the greatest problems facing our Nation, foreign and domestic, the recent attacks upon President Eisenhower are petty and carping.

First, we had Democratic Chairman Butler raising questions regarding the health of the President's wife.

Next, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] attempted to become the leader of the White House squirrels by unfairly ridiculing the President in a matter our Chief Executive did not originate. I dare say that, with the vast burdens of his office, the President would have been happy to have the freedom of Rock Creek Park, which the three former residents of the White House lawn are alleged to have had made available to them.

However, the most shocking personal attack on the President during my 10 years in the Senate was the speech of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] before the CIO, in which he reflected upon Dwight Eisenhower's personal sincerity and religious belief. I believe that all people of faith, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, will resent this uncalled-for attack.

It is my hope that the Senators across the aisle, who operate on a high level, will publicly repudiate such statements. I believe that they must regret them as much as we on this side of the aisle do. Certainly, the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of party affiliation, will resent such personal abuse of our Chief Executive.

The New Deal-ADA wing of the Democratic Party has certainly shown its bankrupt state by such carping criticism.

Mr. BUSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The personal attack by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] on the President's sincerity and church habits is highly offensive. And the chiming in of ADA spokesmen in defense of the Senator from West Virginia is worse. How dare anyone speak for ADA concerning such a personal matter, such a vicious personal attack?

The Senator from West Virginia and his friends should thank God that in these days of imminent peril, with cleavages in both great parties creating constant uncertainties and divisions among our people, we are blessed with a President who is the greatest spiritual leader we have seen since Abraham Lincoln. By his example of tolerance and patience, and by his acknowledged dependence on God's guidance, he has constantly given our people hope and faith in a future which cynics paint in darkest colors.

## ORDER FOR TRANSACTING OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REVISION OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, PAYMENT OF CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 25)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $3,234,377, in the amount necessary for payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 26)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Tax Court of the United States, in the amount of $135,000, for the fiscal year 1956, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 27)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriation for the Treasury Department, in the amount of $85,000, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 and prior fiscal years, in the amount of $996,889, together with a proposed legislative provision, for the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CONSOLIDATION OF HATCH ACT OF 1887 AND LAWS SUPPLEMENTARY THERETO

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

Two letters from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration entitled "Grants to the Republic

of the Philippines," and the appropriation to the Treasury Department entitled "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Accounts" had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act entitled, "An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 720) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Department of Justice, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Public Housing Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OR PLEDGE OF POSTAGE STAMPS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

*"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 33d session, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the building of the unfinished link in what is known as the Lewis and Clark Highway, popularly known as the Wash-Ho-Tana Link, over the Bitterroot Mountains, joining Washington, Idaho and Montana, is vitally essential to the defense of the Pacific Northwest in the event a mass evacuation becomes necessary because of an enemy attack on the strategic defense installations in this area; and

"Whereas the building of this link of approximately 30 miles on the transcontinental highway would bolster the economy of this region, by providing better transportation for its vast lumber, mining, and agricultural products; and

"Whereas said Lewis and Clark Highway, with its wealth of historical landmarks, can become one of the great tourist attractions of the North American Continent, attracting thousands of visitors annually; and

"Whereas the completion of this highway would be a fitting tribute, by the people of this generation, to the heroic trail-blazers, Lewis and Clark and their immortal Indian guide, Sacajawea, who opened up to exploration and settlement the great Northwest Territory of the United States exactly 150 years ago; and

"Whereas the sesquicentennial celebration of this historic event will take place on said trail within the State of Idaho during the present year: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1955, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we do most earnestly request the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient moneys to provide for the construction of said unfinished link in said Lewis and Clark Highway; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 22d day of February 1955.

"J. BERKELEY LARSEN,
*"President of the Senate.*

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 4th day of March 1955.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

*"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session duly and regularly assembled, do respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the base metal mining industry and the wool-growing industry of the United States have suffered serious curtailment, and are threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead, zinc, and wool from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho, and many other sections of the United States, are to a great extent dependent upon the mining industry and the wool-growing industry for the maintenance of their economy, and unless satisfactory relief can be obtained the present existing serious situation will rapidly become intolerable; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local county and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the executive department of the United States Government has not seen fit over the past years to adhere to the purposes of the escape-clause and peril-point provisions of the Trade Agreement Act: Now, therefore, be it jointly

*"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 33d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the Governor of the State of Idaho concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and is, hereby memorialized to approve legislation, as follows:

"To enact an excise tax on imports of wool, lead, and zinc, as well as other products, metals and minerals with similar problems which may be suspended whenever prices are at an economic level that will permit the domestic mining and wool-growing industries to maintain an adequate mobilization base for national security.

"To remove the authority of the executive department to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations, and to place such responsibility for approving or disapproving such recommendations in the hands of Congress where the constitutional authority rests.

"To allow the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as extended, to expire on June 12, 1955; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and is hereby directed, to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate, and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in Congress of the United States.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 25th day of February 1955.

"J. BERKELEY LARSEN,
*"President of the Senate.*

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 3d day of March 1955.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 2

*"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

"Whereas the Nez Perce Indian Tribe has been taking fish and game pursuant to the Nez Perce Treaties of 1855 and 1863, at any time of the year, and at any place their ancestors were accustomed to hunt and fish; and

"Whereas the Nez Perce Indian Tribe maintains that it is not accountable to the State of Idaho, and need not heed the laws, rules, and regulations of the State of Idaho pertaining to the taking of fish and game within the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas the natural resources of the State of Idaho will not stand the drain imposed upon them by this wanton killing without regard to seasons and bag limits: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring)*, That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the Nez Perce Treaties of 1855 and 1863 be reviewed, and that the hunting and fishing privileges of the Nez Perce Indians be made to conform with the laws, rules, and regulations governing the taking of fish and game within the State of Idaho, and that the Nez Perce Indian Tribe be duly compensated for any loss which might occur as a result of a change in the aforementioned treaties; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State and from the States of Oregon, Washington, and Montana.

"This house joint memorial passed the house on the 9th day of February 1955.

"R. W. YOUNG, Jr.,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 22d day of February 1955.

"J. BERKELEY LARSEN,
*"President of the Senate."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

*"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in this its 33d session, do respectfully petition and represent that

"Whereas the welfare and rehabilitation of sick and disabled veterans of all wars of the United States, is of the utmost importance to the people of the several States; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has assumed the responsibility of providing hospitalization for all veterans with service-connected disability or disease or chronic illnesses; and

"Whereas the national welfare will be promoted by maintaining a minimum of one veterans' hospital in every State of the Union, in recognition of the contribution of each State in the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1955, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we most earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to support and maintain not less than one veterans' hospital in each and every State of the United States, in order to more effectively carry out the Government's established policy toward veterans; be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Director of the Veterans' Administration, and to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 1st day of March 1955.

"J. BERKELEY LARSEN,
*"President of the Senate.*

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 4th day of March 1955.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
*"Speaker of the House of Representatives."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

*"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska; to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; and to James Farley, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the people of Alaska in a free expression of opinion at their general election on October 12, 1946, did by the unprecedented majority of 19,712 to 2,624 vote to abolish fish traps from the waters of this Territory; and

"Whereas in the months prior to the time this overwhelming expression of dissatisfaction with fish traps was registered at the polls, the people of Alaska had engaged in a full and complete debate on the subject; and

"Whereas the elimination of fish traps in the Province of British Columbia and from all coastal waters of the Pacific coast except in Alaska, has resulted in an ever-increasing stabilization of the fisheries resource in British Columbia and on the Pacific coast; and

"Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has, over the past 2 years, instituted a stringently regulated salmon conservation program throughout the salmon fisheries areas of Alaska; and

"Whereas the taking of salmon for commercial uses has, in some areas, been completely disallowed in an attempt to conserve the valuable fisheries resource; and

"Whereas the vast majority of Alaskans, after many decades of firsthand experience and study, are convinced that no salmon conservation program can achieve lasting effect unless salmon fish traps are abolished immediately, forever, from Alaskan waters.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges and requests that immediate legislation be enacted abolishing fish traps from the waters of the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 13, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house March 18, 1955.

"WENDELL F. KAY,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
*"Chief Clerk of the House."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 12

*"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Richard Nixon, President of the Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is considered to be within the United States for purposes of the internal revenue laws of the United States; and

"Whereas Alaska residents therefore pay all Federal taxes levied upon residents of the United States; and

"Whereas, for purposes of the McCarran Immigration Act Alaska is considered to be outside the United States; and

"Whereas the difference in treatment of Alaskans under the internal revenue laws and immigration laws is not in keeping with the equal protection of law that is a basic part of the American heritage.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the McCarran Act be amended to insure that Alaskans are afforded the rights and responsibilities which are due loyal American citizens.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 7, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house March 18, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
*"Chief Clerk of the House."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 15

*"To the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable James Murray, Chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the United States Senate; the Honorable Clair Engle, Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Felix Wormser, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals; the Honorable R. Frank Heintzleman, Governor of Alaska; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska; and to the United States Congress:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas there is located on the highly mineralized Seward peninsula of northwestern Alaska over 1,000 square miles that are considered by the United States Geological Survey and the United States Bureau of Mines, commercial tin possibilities; and

"Whereas World War II spotlighted the appalling lack of tin in the United States, either stockpiled, or in the ground as known reserves; and

"Whereas two-thirds of the world supply of tin is produced in those countries now under the influence of, and dominated by, communism; and

"Whereas Asia, and particularly Malaya, Indonesia, and Thailand, the chief source of supply would immediately be cut off in case of war; and

"Whereas Bolivia, the remaining chief source of supply, has through expropriation and nationalization of tin rendered the industry extremely unstable and precarious; and

"Whereas a dependable supply of tin is an absolute essential to our ever expanding economy and to our national security, both in time of war and peace.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, urges that the Congress of the United States enact legislation to bring domestic tin into the same category as tungsten and other strategic metals, extending over a period of years sufficient to allow ample time for privately financed exploration, and thereafter development and production from the existing domestic deposits, and those which may be discovered.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate March 9, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the house March 18, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"JOHN T. MCLAUGHLIN,
*"Chief Clerk of the House."*

The petition of John P. McGrath, and sundry other citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Twentynine Palms (Calif.) Realty Board, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient appropriations to establish an independent Federal Housing Administration Office in San Bernardino, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Alameda, County Wine Growers Association, Alameda, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of House bill 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Thomas Goodwell, and sundry other citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to include Federal court reporters in the bill to increase the salaries of classified Federal employees; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by Rockaway Council No. 2672, Knights of Columbus, Rockaway Beach, Long Island, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Annual State Conference, Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution, Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the Constitution and world government, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, from Henry C. Einolf, Jr., Commander, Catholic War Veterans, Department of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., relating to the Prayer Room in the rotunda of the Capitol; ordered to lie on the table.

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

Twelve joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the compact commission approach to the solution to the need for greater coordination and integration of development of land and water resources of regional watersheds

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming recognize the need for greater coordination and integration of the water-development program of various State and Federal agencies operating within regional watersheds than at present prevails; and

"Whereas a satisfactory precedent for accomplishing this goal has been established in the upper Colorado River Basin, wherein the four States involved have each one vote and the Federal Government one vote; and

"Whereas a planning and operating commission set up in this manner provides the necessary coordination and integration of the State and Federal agencies and at the same time assures the protection of the rights, laws, customs, powers, and sovereignty of the States involved; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments and other groups of public-spirited and practical westerners, after exhaustive study, have recommended variations of this solution to the need for greater coordination and integration in regional watershed development: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to diligently and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor such planning and operating commissions in broad outline similar to the Upper Colorado River Basin Commission, along the lines recommended by the Council of State Governments for other regional watersheds lying partly in the State of Wyoming, to be set up by compact between the States involved and the Federal Government; be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 8, 1955.

"MILLARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to proceeding with the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States by authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects

"Whereas the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States, consisting of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, is of foremost importance to the future development and general welfare of said States and of the Western United States; and

"Whereas the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact has been amicably settled by and between the above States; and

"Whereas the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, comprising one member each from the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and the Federal Government is a functioning body and has already completed a dynamic plan for the development of the project; and

"Whereas a report of the participating projects has been compiled by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, approved, with modifications, by the Secretary of the Interior, and submitted by him to the Congress of the United States, and

"Whereas this desirable development cannot be commenced without the authorization of the Congress of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.

"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 10, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to recognition by all Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming

"Whereas the recognition by the Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the State relating to the control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the State's boundaries was one of the fundamental concepts of Wyoming law and of the reclamation law as stated in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902; and

"Whereas in recent years certain Federal agencies have either forgotten about this provision or have chosen to ignore it: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming requesting restatement and enforcement of the principle of recognizing the rights and laws of the State relating to the use and control of their waters; be it further

*"Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON.

"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 10, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any form of Federal, regional, or watershed rules or regulations set up either by legislative act or Executive order, in which the States involved would have no real voice in administration thereof

"Whereas any such Federal authority would supersede and nullify existing State laws under which water users have acquired water rights and by which these rights have been protected and administered; and

"Whereas existing water rights established under Wyoming State law would be subject to condemnation proceedings under provisions of acts creating such Federal authority; and

"Whereas the citizens of Wyoming would have no voice in the selection of the directors of the Federal authority, who would have unlimited control over the development of their land and water resources; and

"Whereas under a Federal authority the only voice permitted the people of the State of Wyoming and their local and State officials would be of an advisory nature; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would place exclusive jurisdiction over water litigation involving the Federal authority in the Federal courts; and

"Whereas such Federal authority would tend to create a Federal power monopoly; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would to a large extent reduce the States to mere geographical entities, replacing the present powers of local and State governments with a superstate in which the final control is vested in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such Federal legislation would add nothing to the program of development of land and water resources which is not already available through existing State and Federal agencies, except better coordination, which could be accomplished through more democratic means: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to consider against any proposed legislation or Executive order setting up any form of Federal, regional, or watershed authority, however disguised, the strong, unequivocal and unalterable opposition of the people of the State of Wyoming to any such proposition and their determination to resist by every device at their command any such usurpation of the rights, laws, customs, powers, and sovereignty of their local and State governments; be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 8, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior to investigate conditions in the Yellowstone National Park and to implement action to improve the same

"Whereas the Yellowstone Park is the greatest of all national playgrounds wherein thousands of citizens of every State of the Union seek and obtain summer recreation; and

"Whereas the facilities in the park are inadequate, old, and worn out; and

"Whereas the camp sites and sanitary facilities throughout the park are so poor and so overcrowded that their condition verges on a national scandal; and

"Whereas the operators of the various concessions in the park lack the necessary incentive to improve the conditions because of the absence of competition: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the Senate of the State of Wyoming, the House concurring, hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States of America and the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior to investigate said conditions and immediately initiate the necessary action to enlarge and expand facilities of the park and to renovate those now existing; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Chief of the National Park Service, and to our congressional delegates, Senators FRANK A. BARRETT and JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and Congressman E. KEITH THOMSON.

"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 10, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation granting to the State of Wyoming all of the land and minerals within the confines of its borders, with the exception of the national parks and national monuments, national forests, and lands for national defense and promotion of aviation and agriculture

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of Wyoming recognizing that the United States of America owns over 51 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 73 percent of the minerals on, in, or under the lands of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Wyoming have long been aware of the inequitable lack of sovereignty and loss of revenue from the lands and minerals aforesaid; and

"Whereas the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 in its preamble states that its purpose is to 'promote the highest use of the public lands pending its final disposal'; and

"Whereas the right of coastal States to ownership of tidelands oil has been recognized by act of Congress with presidential affirmation; and

"Whereas by act of admission of 1890, 'the State of Wyoming is hereby declared admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever,' which is not the case in fact when the Federal Government owns the majority of Wyoming's surface lands and mineral rights; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has attempted to take more of the land and minerals in addition to those already owned by it, and thus deprive the State of Wyoming and its citizens further from the benefits of such lands and minerals: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring),* That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to grant to the State of Wyoming and its citizens title to all of the lands and minerals presently owned by the Government of the United States of America within the borders of the State of Wyoming, with the exception of national parks and national monuments, national forests and lands for national defense, and promotion of aviation and agriculture; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative E. KEITH THOMSON, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States; Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 5, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects

"Whereas the 160-acre limitation upon farm units involving federally financed reclamation projects is based upon an outworn concept and has become a serious hindrance to the development of the West through reclamation; and

"Whereas in the case of presently irrigated private lands which need supplemental irrigation, the proper economic size of farm units has already been determined, as a result of decades of trial and error; and

"Whereas there exist in the West many areas which are naturally less favored than others, by reason of short growing seasons due to high elevation, northern latitude, or otherwise; and

"Whereas such less-favored areas cannot be reclaimed under the present land limitation provisions because they can be made productive only by the use of machinery, the cost of which is not warranted if the farm is limited to 160 acres or less: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring),* That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to modernize the acreage limitation in the following manner:

"1. Removal of the limitation in the case of lands to which supplemental water is to be supplied; and

"2. Determination of the economic size of farm units in a new land project by the appropriate State official or agency; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator J. C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the Governors and Legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 1, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to nonreimbursable costs in water development

"Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursables; and

"Whereas many water development and reclamation projects provide recreational, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health, promotion of national defense, and fulfillment of international obligation benefits which are of more value to a river basin and the Nation as a whole, than they are to the irrigation water users under the projects; and

"Whereas it is no more logical to make the local irrigation water users pay for these benefits to the region and the Nation than it would be to make them pay for flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits which are now nonreimbursables: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the House of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming and the Senate of such Legislature concurring that the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation designed to include: (1) Recreation, (2) salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) public transportation, (5) protection of public health, (6) promotion of national defense, (7) fulfillment of international obligation benefits as nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 5, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects

"Whereas within the boundaries of the Western States, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of lands that could be provided either an original or supplemental water supply through so-called small projects; and

"Whereas there are approximately 400,000 acres of land in Wyoming that would be benefitted under this type of project; and

"Whereas the development of these projects is essential to the full utilization of the West's limited water supplies; and

"Whereas many of these smaller projects could feasibly be developed under construction standards which would not meet those required by the United States Bureau of Reclamation for the larger projects: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation to amend and supplement the reclamation laws to provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 1, 1955.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to the continued recognition of the use of power and other revenues for reclamation projects to aid in the repayment of irrigation costs

"Whereas the complicated and costly multipurpose projects are essential today to the fullest utilization of Wyoming's and the West's limited water supplies, and that power is a more and more important paying partner in reclamation development; and

"Whereas the use of power revenues to aid in the repayment of irrigation costs is almost as old as the Federal reclamation program: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (and the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming who consider that the use of power and other revenues from reclamation projects to aid reclamation development is essential to the future development and full utilization of water resources, and that they thereby endorse the principle and the use of said power revenues for said purposes; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, to the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Reclamation.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved, February 10, 1955.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

---

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to Senate bill 627, introduced in the 83d Congress, 1st session, providing for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands

"Whereas the State of Wyoming has entered upon a noxious-weed-control program on land owned by it and its citizens; and

"Whereas more than 50 percent of all the land within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming are federally owned or controlled; and

"Whereas, in an effort to facilitate the work of the various States in their programs of noxious-weed control, Senate bill 627 was introduced in the 83d Congress, January 26, 1953, by Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, providing 'That every department, agency, and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government having control of or jurisdiction over land located in any State shall hereafter comply with all laws and all rules and regulations of such State providing for the control of noxious weeds'; and

"Whereas the said Senate bill 627 failed to pass the Senate and House of Representatives and become law; and

"Whereas no matter how efficiently and carefully the principles of noxious-weed control are applied on all the land owned by the State of Wyoming, and its citizens, unless the Federal agencies concerned with the ownership and control of federally owned lands in Wyoming, cooperate with the State of Wyoming, the program as established by the State of Wyoming is less than 50 percent effective: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (and the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider the sentiment of the people of the State of Wyoming, who consider noxious-weed control one of the most essential programs to the development of the lands in the State of Wyoming, and that they thereby enact into law such legislation as is necessary to enable Federal agencies to participate in the noxious-weed-control program in Wyoming so that it may be as fully effective as though the State of Wyoming and its citizens owned all the lands within its boundaries; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON and to the Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the Governors and Legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 5, 1955.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to study the problem of individuals in the State of Wyoming, who own the surface estate of their lands, with the United States holding ownership of the mineral estate; and to pass and enact such legislation as will provide equitably for such individuals whose land or operation is diminished by mineral activity on their surface lands, by a mineral lessee of the United States

"Whereas over 20 percent of the surface of the land of the State of Wyoming is owned by its citizens; and

"Whereas on these lands the United States Government owns the mineral estate thereto; and

"Whereas the surface estate value and in other cases the farm or ranch operation is diminished as a result of exploration or mineral activity on the part of a mineral lessee of the United States on said lands: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States pass and enact such legislation as will provide equitably for the owners of the surface estate of lands where the United States owns the mineral estate and such mineral estate is leased for mineral exploration or activity; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President, Vice President, Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 19, 1955.
"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate 12 joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

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

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

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to making adequate appropriations for stream measurement, ground water investigations, and mapping

"Whereas the future agricultural and industrial progress of Wyoming is dependent in large measure on the wise conservation and proper utilization of her limited water resources both surface and underground; and

"Whereas the determination of the water resources of the State requires continuous and expanding scientific study of the variations in water supply from year to year and of the areal distribution of available water supplies: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to appropriate funds adequate to carry on a direct program of stream measurement, ground water investigations, and mapping; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON,

Secretary of the Interior, and the Director of the Geological Survey.

"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*
"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 5, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation eliminating the tax on transportation of freight persons and accommodations

"Whereas recreational travel is of utmost importance to the State of Wyoming, being its third largest industry; and

"Whereas the tourist industry in Wyoming produces thousands of vacationists each year who are using the common-carrier method of transportation in ever increasing numbers; and

"Whereas all such persons are subjected to the 10-percent tax on the total cost of such transportation in traveling to Wyoming as well as to any other point in the United States; and

"Whereas such tax does not apply to travel to any other point in the world, outside the United States, which is discriminatory, unfair, and unwarranted; and

"Whereas all freight shipments are subject to a 3-percent excise tax which is unfair and unwarranted; and

"Whereas such taxes were originated as a war measure to curtail civilian travel during the last war and was never intended to be a revenue-producing measure: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to enact legislation eliminating the tax on the amount paid within the United States for the transportation of property and persons by rail, motor vehicle, water, or air and the tax paid upon the amount paid for seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with such transportation; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to United States Senators FRANK A. BARRETT and JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and to Congressman KEITH THOMSON.

"R. L. GREENE,
*"President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 10, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*"Governor."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

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

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States on the 50th anniversary of the establishment of Devil's Tower Memorial Monument to commemorate the occasion by a postal stamp depicting Devil's Tower and to provide adequate public facilities

"Whereas Devil's Tower National Monument, located in the center of Crook County in northeastern Wyoming, has the distinction of being the first national monument created within the United States; and

"Whereas Devil's Tower National Monument was established by proclamation of President Theodore Roosevelt in the year 1906; and

"Whereas Devil's Tower National Monument is a unique geological phenomenon which attracts an increasing number of thousands of visitors annually to the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas Devil's Tower National Monument is one of the areas of the National Parks System owned by the people of the United States and administered for them by the National Park Service: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 33d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and are hereby memorialized to proclaim the year 1956, being the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of our first National Monument, as a year for commemorating Devil's Tower National Monument, particularly through the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp, depicting the Devil's Tower; be it further

*"Resolved,* That sufficient funds be provided to the National Park Service to provide adequate public facilities at the Devil's Tower National Monument; be it further

*"Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and Representative in Congress E. KEITH THOMSON, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Postmaster General.

"R. L. GREENE,
*President of the Senate.*
"T. C. DANIELS,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 8, 1955.

"MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
*Governor."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

*"To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the United States, by and through its Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, has constructed more than 40 dams in the Columbia River watershed since 1902; and

"Whereas the fishery resource of the Columbia River has already received severe damage as a result of such dams; and

"Whereas it is evident that the river development projects referred to herein are prime factors in the depletion of the said fishery resource and that the river development projects should pay from their earnings the continuing operation and maintenance costs of the fishery rehabilitation program presently in progress for the Columbia River watershed; and

"Whereas the United States, acting by and through the director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in June 1948 entered into a signed agreement with the fish and game departments of the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho for a program of conservation and rehabilitation of the salmon fishery of the Columbia River by authority of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345), as amended August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 932); and

"Whereas the agreement of June 1948 provided for construction of fishways, salmon hatcheries, and other improvements by the signatory States with Federal funds released through the Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas many of these structures and improvements have now been completed; and

"Whereas the agreement providing for the creation of these structures and facilities does not provide for their permanent operation and maintenance with Federal funds; and

"Whereas it is evident that the depletion of the fishery resource of the Columbia River watershed caused by Federal irrigation, power, and navigation projects in the said watershed will be to some degree a continuous depletion which will necessitate a permanent operation and maintenance of these facilities: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein)*, That your memorialists earnestly petition that the President and the Congress of the United States do recognize that the permanent maintenance and operation of these facilities are a Federal responsibility and that moneys for their operation and maintenance should become a continuing part of Federal appropriations, to be allocated to the State agencies responsible for such operation and maintenance through the Fish and Wildlife Service; be it further

*"Resolved,* That your memorialists earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to establish a permanent means of financing the maintenance and operation of these facilities by appropriate legislation making the costs of such operation and maintenance a charge against funds received by the United States and its agencies in payment for electrical energy generated at Federal hydroelectric powerplants in the Columbia River basin; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to each Member of the Congress from the State of Oregon, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of the Army, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

"Adopted by senate March 3, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
*"President of Senate.*
"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
*"Chief Clerk of Senate.*

"Adopted by house March 10, 1955.

"E. R. GEARY,
*"Speaker of House."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

"House Joint Memorial 11

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

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas Federal funds are appropriated annually to the United States Geological Survey for a program of cooperative investigation of water resources, wherein the Federal allotment matches the State allotment in amount; and

"Whereas cooperative agreements for water resource studies are in effect between the United States Geological Survey and the Oregon State engineer, the Oregon State Highway Commission, and the water departments of Coos Bay-North Bend, Eugene, McMinnville, and Portland, and negotiations are proceeding to effectuate a similar agreement with the county court of Douglas County; and

"Whereas in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the Federal appropriation was not adequate to match all cooperative offerings with the result that each agreement was in the ratio of $97.50 Federal to $100 State; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, the agreements must be further reduced to the ratio of $95 Federal to $100 State; and

"Whereas still further reductions are in prospect, with a probable ratio of $85 Federal to $100 State for fiscal year 1955–56 unless the Congress appropriates an adequate amount, and these deficiencies will result in discontinuance of some streamflow measuring stations and inadequate rehabilitation and maintenance of existing stations: 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 hereby is requested to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Geological Survey to carry out the traditional practice of 100-percent matching of all State offerings for the purpose of continuing the program of cooperative investigation of water resources; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by house March 9, 1955.

"E. W. GEARY,
*"Speaker of House.*
"EDITH EYNON LAW,
*"Chief Clerk.*

"Adopted by senate March 14, 1955.

"ELMO E. SMITH,
*"President of Senate."*

---

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

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

"We, your memorialists, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill for a public law, H. R. 1, which if enacted would give the executive branch of the Federal Government extended and broad new authority to reduce United States import duties and regulations without further congressional action and possibly contrary to express findings and recommendations of the expert United States Tariff Commission; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is sympathetic to the declared purposes of the present Federal trade agreements legislation and the continuance of such legislation as will further the interests of the domestic economy of the United States through expansion of reciprocal world trade, with fair and adequate means of protecting domestic workers, producers and industries against excessive tariff reductions, but this legislative assembly opposes so changing the existing legislation as to make the tariff policy and rates of the United States primarily instruments of international politics; and

"Whereas this legislative assembly is gravely concerned by the adverse effects which substantial tariff reductions already made are having upon important industries of this State, such as the caneberry, cherry, crab, dairy, filbert, fish, grass seeds, hops, lumber, mint, mushroom, walnut and wool industries, and by the failure of the trade agreements program to obtain effective reciprocal concessions for United States products, such as Oregon apples and pears which continue to be virtually barred from their former normal world markets by various arbitrary foreign import restrictions; and

"Whereas provisions of H. R. 1 go far beyond the present trade agreements legislation, and offer less, rather than more, promise of recovery and expansion of export markets for domestic products, and if enacted would threaten the possible destruction or substantial curtailment of agricultural and other industries which are vital to the economy of the State of Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein)*, That this, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in regular session assembled, hereby does memorialize the Congress of the United States not to pass H. R. 1, or any legislation which would similarly add to and change the existing trade agreements legislation; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to United States Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Representatives WALTER NORBLAD, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, SAM COON and EDITH GREEN, of Oregon.

"Adopted by senate February 18, 1955.

"ZYLPHA ZELL BURNS,
*"Chief Clerk of Senate.*
"ELMO E. SMITH,
*"President of Senate.*

"Adopted by house March 11, 1955.

"E. A. GEARY,
*"Speaker of House."*

---

## CONSTRUCTION OF OOLOGAH RESERVOIR ON VERDIGRIS RIVER IN ROGERS COUNTY, OKLA.—RESOLUTION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa, Okla., with respect to the construction of the Oologah Reservoir on the Verdigris River in Rogers County, Okla., and requesting the allocation to the city of Tulsa of storage space in that reservoir.

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

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to the construction of the proposed and authorized Oologah Reservoir on the Verdigris River in Rogers County, State of Oklahoma; requesting the allocation to the city of Tulsa of storage space in the Oologah Reservoir sufficient to provide an ultimate 200 million gallons of water per day for municipal water-supply purposes; and declaring an emergency

Whereas the projected growth curve of water consumption in the city of Tulsa and the immediately adjacent areas demonstrate that an additional source of water supply will be necessary to meet the needs of this community for municipal and industrial water before the year 1958; and

Whereas by reason of its close proximity, the water stored in the proposed and authorized Ooologah Reservoir on the Verdigris River in Rogers County, Okla., would provide to the city of Tulsa and its metropolitan trade area such needed additional source of water; and

Whereas under present plans for operation of the Oologah Reservoir in order to permit final recovery of near depleted oil from secondary recovery wells located in the reservoir area, provision for 25,000 acre-feet of water storage in the 2,800-acre preliminary conservation pool would be sufficient to supply 20 million gallons of water daily for municipal and industrial purposes; and

Whereas during the first few years of operation of Oologah, assuming early construction thereof, the need for water by the city of Tulsa from this source will be less than 20 million gallons daily and the known depletion curve of the oil wells now under secondary recovery indicates that the water conservation pool can be progressively increased to meet growing water-storage demand as it develops without loss in the recovery of crude oil; and

Whereas the present plan of development for the Oologah Reservoir as proposed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, will permit the recovery of the largest profitable production from the depleting oil wells within the reservoir area, provide for much needed flood control and at the same time provide an economically feasible source of municipal and industrial water to meet the area's vastly increased and increasing water requirements; and

Whereas it is recognized that the city of Tulsa, for itself and its metropolitan trade area, will be required to expend substantial sums for the reservation to it of space in the said Oologah Reservoir, said sum to represent a fair and equitable portion of the cost of construction, operation, and maintenance of said project commensurate with the value of said water or storage space to the city of Tulsa: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa, Okla., as follows:*

SECTION 1. That the city of Tulsa, acting by and through its duly elected mayor and board of commissioners, for itself and on behalf of the residents in the Tulsa metropolitan area, respectfully requests and urges that the Congress of the United States appropriate sufficient funds to construct the Oologah Reservoir project and direct that the construction thereof be resumed as soon as possible.

SEC. 2. That the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, set aside and reserve to the city of Tulsa sufficient storage space in the conservation pool as now planned to supply the city of Tulsa and its metropolitan trade area at least 20,000,000 gallons of water per day not later than the year 1958 and that such space be progressively enlarged and increased in keeping with the needs of the city of Tulsa up to a space sufficient to provide a maximum of 200,000,000 gallons per day of water for municipal and industrial purposes, said increased storage space to be provided as and when the depletion of secondary recovery oil wells in the reservoir basin permits.

SEC. 3. That upon the appropriation of said funds by the Congress of the United States, the proper administrative officers of the city of Tulsa are hereby authorized and directed to enter into negotiation with the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, or such other Federal agency as may have jurisdiction over the construction of said reservoir, for the acquisition by the city of Tulsa of either reserved storage space in said reservoir or a contract for the supply of water commensurate with the city's needs up to a maximum of 200,000,000 gallons of water per day and if said negotiations disclose that such supply of water may be obtained for a reasonable expenditure, the city of Tulsa will

take such steps as may be necessary and insofar as it is legally able to provide such funds either by the submission of a bond issue for said purposes or the appropriation of funds for the purchase of such water as may be needed by said city.

SEC. 4. That the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, the Honorable MIKE MONRONEY, United States Senators, and the Honorable PAGE BELCHER, the Honorable ED EDMONDSON, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, the Honorable TOM STEED, the Honorable JOHN JARMAN, the Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Congressmen, be and they are hereby respectfully requested to use their best efforts in the Congress of the United States to obtain the appropriation of the necessary funds for the completion of the Oologah project and to further use their good offices in securing the allocation of the requisite storage space or water from the Oologah Reservoir to the city of Tulsa.

SEC. 5. That the city auditor be and she is hereby authorized and directed to transmit executed originals of this resolution to each of the following persons: Senator Robert S. Kerr, Senator Mike Monroney, Congressman Page Belcher, Congressman Ed Edmondson, Congressman Carl Albert, Congressman Tom Steed, Congressman John Jarman, Congressman Victor Wickersham, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Col. Stanley G. Reiff, commanding officer, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Tulsa District.

SEC. 6. That an emergency exists for the preservation of the public peace, health, and safety, by reason whereof this resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption and approval.

Passed, and the emergency clause ruled upon separately and approved this 25th day of March 1955.

Approved this 25th day of March 1955.

L. C. CLARK,
*Mayor.*

Attest:

ELIZABETH STOWELL ANDERSON,
*City auditor.*

Approved:

T. A. LANDRETH, Jr.,
*City attorney.*

## UNITED NATIONS EXPANDED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the Church Peace Union endorsing continued support by the United States for the United Nations expanded technical assistance program be printed in the RECORD.

I sincerely hope that our Government will increase its support of this highly significant United Nations program, which already has done so much to alleviate sickness and hunger in the world. The Church Peace Union, under the presidency of Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, is to be commended for its work in support of this highly important program.

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

MARCH 15, 1955.

The Church Peace Union executive committee unanimously approved the following resolution:

"The United States can view with gratification its record in recent years of aiding peoples less fortunate than ourselves. Through our voluntary agencies, through forward-looking corporations operating in foreign lands and through our governmental technical assistance program, we have helped the poor, the uneducated, the diseased. We have given generously realizing that peace depends to a large degree on satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of underdeveloped areas for a better life. As a religious nation we have felt that we could not in conscience stand by and ignore the plight of millions of fellow human beings.

"In the early stages of the development of the United Nations it was the United States that urged an international technical assistance program to help the two-thirds of the world that is underdeveloped. In the past the United States has supported this program. As the chief contributor, the United States has earned the gratitude and respect of many of the member nations of the United Nations, particularly those who have directly benefited.

"The United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program has achieved results which should give the United States and the United Nations a deep sense of accomplishment. Working with recipient countries who meet at least half the cost of given projects, the United Nations has made great strides in increasing food production, in reducing disease and in developing more efficient government administrations in underdeveloped areas. In such countries as Indonesia where there is 1 doctor to every 75,000 inhabitants, international cooperation has reduced the incident of yaws measurably and in the near future can all but eradicate it. In Greece, our stout ally, malaria, the world's No. 1 killer, has been all but eliminated. In India, Asia's first penicillin factory has been built by a United Nations agency in cooperation with the Indian Government. Many other dramatic examples of the effectiveness of the international effort might be cited. The record is clear for those who wish to examine it.

"A basic tenet of all the world's religions is that each man is his brother's keeper. The Church Peace Union, a foundation dedicated to educating for peace through all religious groups, feels impelled to take an unequivocal stand in favor of continued international cooperation by the Government of the United States in such efforts as the United Nations expanded technical assistance program.

"We, the trustees of the Church Peace Union, strongly urge that—

"1. That the United States contribution of $8 million to the United Nations expanded technical assistance program for the period of January 1–June 30, 1955, approved by the Congress in 1954, be immediately appropriated.

"2. That a contribution of approximately $25 million be appropriated to the United Nations expanded technical assistance program to cover the 18 months' period from July 1, 1955, to December 31, 1956, so that efficient long-range projects and plans can be effectively executed.

"At this juncture in world affairs the United States can neither risk loss of access to essential raw materials found in underdeveloped areas nor dissipate the good will built to a large degree on our record of helping others. Both our national interest and development of a freer more peaceful world require the continuation of United States participation in international technical assistance."

## CLOSING OF CERTAIN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS—RESOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, there is continuing concern about the recommendations of the Hoover Commission task force to close certain Veterans' Administration hospitals.

This concern is particularly evident from those who live in the area of these hospitals and have knowledge of the important function these facilities are providing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point for the attention of the Senate a resolution, adopted by the Warren Post No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, regarding the Outwood Veterans' Hospital at Dawson Springs, Ky., one of the hospitals mentioned in the Hoover Commission report, and be appropriately referred.

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

Warren Post, No. 23, American Legion, by and through its duly authorized committee on resolutions and pursuant to motion duly passed in a regular meeting of said organization on the 8th day of March 1955 adopts the following resolution:

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of Warren Post, No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, that the Hoover Commission has made a report to the United States Congress in which it is recommended that a number of veterans' hospitals be closed because there are many beds and in some instances complete wards empty and not in use and that the small number of patients actually receiving treatment in these hospitals does not justify the expense to which the Government is put to keep said hospitals properly staffed and in operation; and

"Whereas Outwood facility, a veterans' hospital for the treatment of tuberculosis located near Dawson Springs, Ky., and being the hospital to which veterans from this area are sent, is one of the hospitals recommended by the Hoover Commission to be discontinued; and

"Whereas the members of Warren Post No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, individually, and as a body through the report of the chairman of their service committee, are reliably informed and have reason to believe that instead of being empty for nonuse and lack of patients, this said hospital is overcrowded and there is now and for some time has been a waiting list for the admission of veterans who need treatment for tubercular conditions; and

"Whereas the report of the Hoover Commission to Congress is erroneous and does not set forth the true condition of the said Outwood facility; and

"Whereas, if Congress adopts the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and closes the said Outwood facility injustice and great and irreparable damage will result to the veterans of this area, and particularly to those veterans now on the waiting list awaiting their turn to be admitted to said hospital for treatment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of Warren Post, No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, do by these presents express our indignation for the recommendation of the Hoover Commission to the United States Congress, and do hereby endorse the action of the National Rehabilitation Conference of the American Legion in taking steps to counteract the recommendation of that committee and to present the true facts to the United States Congress; and it is further

"*Resolved*, That the members of Warren Post No. 23 American Legion, Department of Kentucky, offer their grateful thanks in appreciation of the courtesy and cooperation of Hon EARL C. CLEMENTS, United States Senator for the State of Kentucky, and Hon.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Congressman for the Second Congressional District, State of Kentucky, extended to the commander of the American Legion of the Department of Kentucky, Rodney Brown, and his staff while they were in Washington, D. C., engaged in negotiations concerning the report of the Hoover Commission; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the members of Warren Post No. 23, American Legion, Department of Kentucky, request of the United States Congress that the recommendation of the Hoover Commission be rejected insofar as it relates to the closing of Outwood Facility."

AARON F. OUERFELT,
*Commander.*

Attest:

E. DAUGHERTY,
*Adjutant.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1217. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., for the sale of water from Clark Hill Reservoir; with an amendment (Rept. No. 126).

## CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 128)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably with amendments the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee be given 10 days in which to file its report recommending that the bill, as amended, be passed, together with the minority views of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the separate views of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

## AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 4941) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 127) thereon. The bill has passed the House without amendment, and the Committee on Foreign Relations has unanimously reported it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

## ADDITIONAL 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 February 1955 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY AND JANUARY 1955, AND PAY, JANUARY 1955 AND DECEMBER 1954

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for February 1955 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

| Total and major categories | Civilian personnel in executive branch | | | Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In February numbered— | In January numbered— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) | In January was— | In December was— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
| Total [1] | 2,353,900 | 2,353,588 | +312 | $779,256 | $904,338 | −$125,082 |
| Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense | 1,171,474 | 1,170,203 | +1,271 | 392,765 | 485,997 | −93 232 |
| Department of Defense | 1,182,426 | 1,183,385 | −959 | 386,491 | 418,341 | −31,850 |
| Inside continental United States | 2,129,229 | 2,126,018 | +3,211 | | | |
| Outside continental United States | 224,671 | 227,567 | −2,896 | | | |
| Industrial employment | 721,739 | 725,588 | −3,849 | | | |
| Foreign nationals | 339,857 | 339,710 | +147 | 25,780 | 26,394 | −614 |

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

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 February 1955, and comparison with January 1955, and pay for January 1955, and comparison with December 1954*

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands of dollars) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | February | January | Increase | Decrease | January | December | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 71,330 | 70,920 | 410 | | 21,967 | 24,053 | | 2,086 |
| Commerce [1] | 43,816 | 44,466 | | 650 | 16,886 | 22,579 | | 5,693 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 38,450 | 37,918 | 532 | | 13,439 | 14,257 | | 818 |
| Interior | 49,992 | 49,543 | 449 | | 18,105 | 19,590 | | 1,485 |
| Justice | 30,256 | 30,303 | | 47 | 12,684 | 13,806 | | 1,121 |
| Labor | 4,913 | 4,891 | 22 | | 2,024 | 2,215 | | 197 |
| Post Office | 506,090 | 507,129 | | 1,039 | 164,164 | 232,031 | | 67,862 |
| State | 20,740 | 20,825 | | 85 | 6,713 | 7,264 | | 551 |
| Treasury | 82,182 | 80,418 | 1,764 | | 30,095 | 33,316 | | 3,221 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 270 | 267 | 3 | | 140 | 145 | | 5 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 425 | 428 | | 3 | 260 | 273 | | 13 |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 32 | 35 | | 3 | 26 | 25 | $1 | |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 68 | 68 | | | 21 | 25 | | 4 |
| National Security Council [2] | 27 | 27 | | | 15 | 16 | | 1 |
| Office of Defense Mobilization | 296 | 292 | 4 | | 145 | 152 | | 7 |
| President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization | 5 | 5 | | | 3 | 3 | | |

[1] February figure includes 493 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1955, and comparison with January 1955, and pay for January 1955, and comparison with December 1954*—Continued

| Department or agency | Personnel | | | | Pay (in thousands of dollars) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | February | January | Increase | Decrease | January | December | Increase | Decrease |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control | 11 | 20 | | 9 | 5 | 3 | 2 | |
| Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission [3] | 4 | | 4 | | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 795 | 790 | 5 | | 99 | 118 | | 19 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 6,040 | 6,012 | 28 | | 2,861 | 2,933 | | 72 |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 586 | 582 | 4 | | 243 | 269 | | 26 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 534 | 532 | 2 | | 272 | 291 | | 19 |
| Civil Service Commission | 3,938 | 4,051 | | 113 | 1,617 | 1,772 | | 155 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 3 | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Commission on Intergovernmental Relations | 61 | [4] 63 | | 2 | 26 | 31 | | 5 |
| Defense Transport Administration | 16 | 17 | | 1 | 8 | 11 | | 3 |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 137 | 135 | 2 | | 74 | 77 | | 3 |
| Farm Credit Administration | 1,088 | 1,092 | | 4 | 497 | 541 | | 44 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 700 | 698 | 2 | | 319 | 363 | | 44 |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 8 | 8 | | | 7 | 5 | 2 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,079 | 1,088 | | 9 | 522 | 566 | | 44 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,084 | 1,085 | | 1 | 450 | 486 | | 36 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 354 | 356 | | 2 | 215 | 233 | | 18 |
| Federal Power Commission | 626 | 625 | 1 | | 303 | 331 | | 28 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 587 | 591 | | 4 | 306 | 328 | | 22 |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 176 | 175 | 1 | | 77 | 105 | | 28 |
| Foreign Operations Administration | 6,290 | [4] 6,265 | 25 | | 2,871 | 2,734 | 137 | |
| General Accounting Office | 5,773 | 5,771 | 2 | | 2,313 | 2,524 | | 211 |
| General Services Administration | 25,786 | 25,869 | | 83 | 8,000 | 8,683 | | 683 |
| Government Contract Committee | 10 | 14 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | |
| Government Printing Office | 6,785 | 6,749 | 36 | | 2,678 | 2,883 | | 205 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 10,504 | 10,393 | 111 | | 4,340 | 4,773 | | 433 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 14 | 14 | | | 9 | 10 | | 1 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 1,810 | 1,822 | | 12 | 838 | 912 | | 74 |
| Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission | 3 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,238 | 7,188 | 50 | | 3,049 | 3,308 | | 259 |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 283 | 285 | | 2 | 92 | 92 | | |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 21 | 21 | | | 9 | 10 | | 1 |
| National Gallery of Art | 311 | 313 | | 2 | 90 | 104 | | 14 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,149 | 1,150 | | 1 | 575 | 623 | | 48 |
| National Mediation Board | 111 | 115 | | 4 | 72 | 68 | 4 | |
| National Science Foundation | 175 | 178 | | 3 | 81 | 88 | | 7 |
| National Security Training Commission | 8 | 7 | 1 | | 4 | 5 | | 1 |
| Panama Canal | 15,618 | 15,638 | | 20 | 3,398 | 3,480 | | 82 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,438 | 2,445 | | 7 | 829 | 927 | | 98 |
| Renegotiation Board | 584 | 596 | | 12 | 335 | 369 | | 34 |
| Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission | 21 | 21 | | | 13 | 15 | | 2 |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 20 | 18 | 2 | | 11 | 11 | | |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 689 | 691 | | 2 | 359 | 397 | | 38 |
| Selective Service System | 7,136 | 7,146 | | 10 | 1,564 | 1,730 | | 166 |
| Small Business Administration | 749 | 757 | | 8 | 368 | 413 | | 45 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 640 | 633 | 7 | | 209 | 236 | | 27 |
| Soldiers' Home | 973 | 969 | 4 | | 183 | 209 | | 26 |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 36 | 35 | 1 | | 20 | 23 | | 3 |
| Tariff Commission | 197 | 198 | | 1 | 102 | 110 | | 8 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 141 | 141 | | | 71 | 76 | | 5 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 21,379 | 21,824 | | 445 | 9,599 | 10,594 | | 995 |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| United States Information Agency | 9,811 | 9,671 | 140 | | 2,267 | 2,457 | | 190 |
| Veterans' Administration | 178,052 | 177,806 | 246 | | 53,822 | 59,915 | | 6,093 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,171,474 | 1,170,203 | 3,859 | 2,588 | 392,765 | 485,997 | 147 | 93,379 |
| Net change excluding Department of Defense | | | 1,271 | | | | 93,232 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,906 | 1,920 | | 14 | 953 | 1,055 | | 102 |
| Department of the Army | 463,105 | 465,473 | | 2,368 | 142,993 | 153,512 | | 10,519 |
| Department of the Navy | 409,211 | 409,520 | | 309 | 143,605 | 156,501 | | 12,896 |
| Department of the Air Force | 308,204 | 306,472 | 1,732 | | 98,940 | 107,273 | | 8,333 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 1,182,426 | 1,183,385 | 1,732 | 2,691 | 386,491 | 418,341 | | 31,850 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 959 | | | | 31,850 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,353,900 | 2,353,588 | 5,591 | 5,279 | 779,256 | 904,338 | 147 | 125,229 |
| Net change, including Department of Defense | | | 312 | | | | 125,082 | |

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 601, 83d Cong.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1955, and comparison with January 1955*

| Department or agency | February | January | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 70,178 | 69,761 | 417 | |
| Commerce [1] | 40,927 | 41,584 | | 657 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 37,909 | 37,392 | 517 | |
| Interior | 44,227 | 43,926 | 301 | |
| Justice | 29,749 | 29,791 | | 42 |
| Labor | 4,810 | 4,787 | 23 | |
| Post Office | 503,746 | 504,785 | | 1,039 |
| State | 5,854 | 5,835 | 19 | |
| Treasury | 81,182 | 79,429 | 1,753 | |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | |
| White House Office | 270 | 267 | 3 | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 425 | 428 | | 3 |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 32 | 35 | | 3 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 68 | 68 | | |
| National Security Council [2] | 27 | 27 | | |
| Office of Defense Mobilization | 296 | 292 | 4 | |
| President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization | 5 | 5 | | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Advisory Committee on Weather Control | 11 | 20 | | 9 |
| Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission [3] | 4 | | 4 | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 16 | 18 | | 2 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 6,023 | 5,996 | 27 | |
| Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System | 586 | 582 | 4 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 530 | 528 | 2 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 3,928 | 4,041 | | 113 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 3 | 3 | | |
| Commission on Intergovernmental Relations | 61 | [4] 63 | | 2 |
| Defense Transport Administration | 16 | 17 | | 1 |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 137 | 135 | 2 | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 1,076 | 1,081 | | 5 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 700 | 698 | 2 | |
| Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review | 8 | 8 | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,052 | 1,061 | | 6 |

[1] February figure includes 493 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[2] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 601, 83d Cong.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1955, and comparison with January 1955*—Continued

| Department or agency | February | January | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,083 | 1,084 | | 1 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 354 | 356 | | 2 |
| Federal Power Commission | 626 | 625 | 1 | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 587 | 591 | | 4 |
| Foreign Claims Settlement Commission | 176 | 175 | 1 | |
| Foreign Operations Administration | 1,660 | 1,651 | 9 | |
| General Accounting Office | 5,724 | 5,722 | 2 | |
| General Services Administration | 25,681 | 25,760 | | 79 |
| Government Contract Committee | 10 | 14 | | 4 |
| Government Printing Office | 6,785 | 6,749 | 36 | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 10,372 | 10,267 | 105 | |
| Indians Claims Commission | 14 | 14 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 1,810 | 1,822 | | 12 |
| Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,238 | 7,188 | 50 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 283 | 285 | | 2 |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 21 | 21 | | |
| National Gallery of Art | 311 | 313 | | 2 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,127 | 1,128 | | 1 |
| National Mediation Board | 111 | 115 | | 4 |
| National Science Foundation | 175 | 178 | | 3 |
| National Security Training Commission | 8 | 7 | 1 | |
| Panama Canal | 542 | 543 | | 1 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,438 | 2,445 | | 7 |
| Renegotiation Board | 584 | 596 | | 12 |
| Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission | 21 | 21 | | |
| St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation | 20 | 18 | 2 | |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 689 | 691 | | 2 |
| Selective Service System | 6,935 | 6,947 | | 12 |
| Small Business Administration | 749 | 757 | | 8 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 638 | 631 | 7 | |
| Soldiers' Home | 973 | 969 | 4 | |
| Subversive Activities Control Board | 36 | 35 | 1 | |
| Tariff Commission | 197 | 198 | | 1 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 141 | 141 | | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 21,379 | 21,824 | | 445 |
| United States Information Agency | 2,267 | 2,210 | 57 | |
| Veterans' Administration | 176,748 | 176,531 | 217 | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 1,112,372 | 1,111,287 | 3,572 | 2,487 |
| Net increase, excluding Department of Defense | | | 1,085 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,852 | 1,866 | | 14 |
| Department of the Army | 373,550 | [4] 373,362 | 188 | |
| Department of the Navy | 378,241 | 377,977 | 264 | |
| Department of the Air Force | 263,214 | 261,529 | 1,685 | |
| Total, Department of Defense | 1,016,857 | 1,014,734 | 2,137 | 14 |
| Net increase, Department of Defense | | | 2,123 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 2,129,229 | 2,126,021 | 5,709 | 2,501 |
| Net increase, including Department of Defense | | | 3,208 | |

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1955, and comparison with January 1955*

| Department or agency | February | January | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 1,152 | 1,159 | | 7 |
| Commerce | 2,889 | 2,882 | 7 | |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 541 | 526 | 15 | |
| Interior | 5,765 | 5,617 | 148 | |
| Justice | 507 | 512 | | 5 |
| Labor | 103 | 104 | | 1 |
| Post Office | 2,344 | 2,344 | | |
| State | 14,886 | 14,990 | | 104 |
| Treasury | 1,000 | 989 | 11 | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 779 | 772 | 7 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 17 | 16 | 1 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 4 | 4 | | |
| Civil Service Commission | 10 | 10 | | |
| Farm Credit Administration | 12 | 11 | 1 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 27 | 27 | | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1 | 1 | | |
| Foreign Operations Administration | 4,630 | [1] 4,614 | 16 | |
| General Accounting Office | 49 | 49 | | |
| General Services Administration | 105 | 109 | | 4 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 132 | 126 | 6 | |
| National Labor Relations Board | 22 | 22 | | |
| Panama Canal | 15,076 | 15,095 | | 19 |
| Selective Service System | 201 | 199 | 2 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 2 | 2 | | |
| United States Information Agency | 7,544 | 7,461 | 83 | |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,304 | 1,275 | 29 | |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 59,102 | 58,916 | 326 | 140 |
| Net increase, excluding Department of Defense | | | 186 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 54 | 54 | | |
| Department of the Army | 89,555 | 92,111 | | 2,556 |
| Department of the Navy | 30,970 | 31,543 | | 573 |
| Department of the Air Force | 44,990 | 44,943 | 47 | |
| Total, Department of Defense | 165,569 | 168,651 | 47 | 3,129 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 3,082 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 224,671 | 227,567 | 373 | 3,269 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 2,896 | |

[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 February 1955, and comparison with January 1955*

| Department or agency | February | January | Increase | Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except Department of Defense): | | | | |
| Agriculture | 2,825 | 2,778 | 47 | |
| Commerce | 2,160 | 2,130 | 30 | |
| Interior | 8,087 | 7,755 | 332 | |
| Treasury | 6,396 | 6,473 | | 77 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 137 | 135 | 2 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 13 | 14 | | 1 |
| General Services Administration | 875 | 900 | | 25 |
| Government Printing Office | 6,785 | 6,749 | 36 | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,238 | 7,188 | 50 | |
| Panama Canal | 7,615 | 7,636 | | 21 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 18,168 | 18,592 | | 424 |
| Total, excluding Department of Defense | 60,299 | 60,350 | 497 | 548 |
| Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense | | | 51 | |
| Department of Defense: | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | [1] 208,000 | [2] 208,014 | | 14 |
| Outside continental United States | [1] 45,675 | [2] 46,978 | | 1,303 |
| Department of the Navy: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 237,693 | 237,220 | 473 | |
| Outside continental United States | 6,929 | 6,894 | 35 | |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 154,968 | 154,418 | 550 | |
| Outside continental United States | 8,175 | 11,714 | | 3,539 |
| Total, Department of Defense | 661,440 | 665,238 | 1,058 | 4,856 |
| Net decrease, Department of Defense | | | 3,798 | |
| Grand total, including Department of Defense | 721,739 | 725,588 | 1,555 | 5,404 |
| Net decrease, including Department of Defense | | | 3,849 | |

[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 February 1955, and comparison with January 1955*

| Country | Total | | Army | | Navy | | Air Force | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | February | January | February | January | February | January | February | January |
| Austria | 171 | 171 | | | | | 171 | 171 |
| England | 7,441 | 7,290 | | | | | 7,441 | 7,290 |
| France | 21,539 | 20,884 | 14,883 | 14,503 | | | 6,656 | 6,381 |
| French Morocco | 756 | | | | 756 | | | |
| Germany | 125,291 | 124,804 | 101,707 | 101,871 | 1,969 | 1,972 | 21,615 | 20,961 |
| Japan | 155,120 | 155,421 | 93,974 | [1] 93,974 | 18,457 | 18,543 | 42,689 | 42,904 |
| Korea | 26,824 | 28,431 | 26,824 | 28,431 | | | | |
| Lybia | 1,048 | 1,050 | | | | | 1,048 | 1,050 |
| Ryukyus | 228 | 223 | | | 228 | 223 | | |
| Saudi Arabia | 702 | 698 | | | | | 702 | 698 |
| Spain | 96 | 96 | | | | | 96 | 96 |
| Trinidad | 641 | 642 | | | 641 | 642 | | |
| Total | 339,857 | 339,710 | 237,388 | 238,779 | 22,051 | 21,380 | 80,418 | 79,551 |

[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 February totaling 2,353,900. This was a net increase of 312 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of January.

This was the fourth monthly increase in 31 months since July 1952. The other monthly increases were in June, October and November 1954. The net increase in February was due largely to seasonal employment in the Departments of Interior and Treasury.

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 | 2,368,072 | | 16,952 |
| January | 2,353,588 | | 14,484 |
| February | 2,353,900 | 312 | |

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of February was 1,171,474, an increase of 1,271 over the January total of 1,170,203. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in February was 1,182,426. This was a net decrease of 959 as compared with 1,183,385 in January.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were the Department of the Treasury with an increase of 1,764, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with an increase of 532, the Department of the Interior with an increase of 449, and the Department of Agriculture with an increase of 410. Decreases were reported by the Post Office Department with a decrease of 1,039, the Department of Commerce with a decrease of 650, and the Tennessee Valley Authority with a decrease of 445.

While the Air Force reported an increase of 1,732 in civilian employment during February, the Army reported a decrease of 2,368, and the Navy reported a decrease of 309.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 3,208, and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 2,896.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in February totaled 721,739, a decrease of 3,849 as compared with January.

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 2,353,900 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 339,857 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of February who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in January was 339,710. A breakdown of this employment for February follows:

| Country | Total | Army | Navy | Air Force |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Austria | 171 | | | 171 |
| England | 7,441 | | | 7,441 |
| France | 21,539 | 14,883 | | 6,656 |
| French Morocco | 756 | | 756 | |
| Germany | 125,291 | 101,707 | 1,969 | 21,615 |
| Japan | 155,120 | 93,974 | 18,457 | 42,689 |
| Korea | 26,824 | 26,824 | | |
| Lybia | 1,048 | | | 1,048 |
| Ryukyus | 228 | | 228 | |
| Saudi Arabia | 702 | | | 702 |
| Spain | 96 | | | 96 |
| Trinidad | 641 | | 641 | |
| Total | 339,857 | 237,388 | 22,051 | 80,418 |

## ANNUAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. 129)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit the annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed, with illustrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the filing of the annual report of the Committee on Small Business, I should like to say that it represents the story of the work of the Committee on Small Business during the past year, when the very able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] was chairman of the committee.

I wish to commend him and the committee under him for the excellent work that was done during that year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama has referred to the Committee on Small Business and to its annual report, which he has filed with the Senate. He mentioned the fact that I acted as chairman of the committee during the past year. In that connection I should like to say that I had splendid cooperation from the then ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and from all members of the committee. They displayed a truly nonpartisan attitude in dealing with the subjects that came before the committee during my service as chairman of the committee.

I believe the committee's work was of great help to the small-business men of our country.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I prepared on the work of the committee during the past year.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

During the past year the work of the Small Business Committee extended into many different fields of activity. The committee had dealings with nearly every Government agency and was confronted with problems ranging from the simple to the complex. Underlying all of the committee's work was the firm belief of the members that if we are to maintain a healthy free enterprise economic system, and if we are to build a solid mobilization base for defense purposes, we will need the ingenuity and resources of the small-business firms.

I am deeply concerned about trends which indicate any threat to the position of small business. The recent pattern of mergers of large and powerful corporations within certain fields could have an adverse affect upon the competitive position of small business. Price wars in the petroleum field have proved to be disastrous to the small, independent operators. Unrealistic regulation by Government regulatory bodies has proved to be a problem with small firms. These are just a few of the problems which must be dealt with if small business is to enjoy a sound life in our economy.

We did find many signs of encouragement during the past year. A review of the activities of the Small Business Administration revealed that the agency is doing an effective job in the areas of financial assistance, production, and management counseling, and technical help to small firms throughout the Nation.

Small business firms have also stated that they are encouraged by the work of the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice.

In the field of military procurement we have found many difficult problems which must be constantly watched in order that small firms may receive a fair share of prime contracts. I would like to see the military departments do more of their buying according to the advertised method of procurement and less on a negotiated basis. The military will also have to become more aggressive in establishing a successful subcontracting program with the prime contractors.

Another problem of great concern is that of Government competition with private enterprise. During the past year more agencies, and more members of the legislative branch have taken an active interest in this matter. It is of real concern to the smaller firms who are faced with Government competition. This competition exists in over 150 areas of business activity. I intend to pursue this matter until such time as the competing agencies take concrete and sincere steps to remove themselves from competitive activities which are unreasonable and unjustified.

It has been encouraging to me during the past year to receive correspondence from every State in the Union urging the committee to continue its vigorous stand to insure an important future for small-business firms.

## 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 (S. 632) for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 30, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 632) for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Burma, vice William J. Sebald, resigned; and

Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

J. Reuel Armstrong, of Wyoming, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brig. Gen. Andrew Thomas McNamara, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. John Hamilton Hinds, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

George A. Parkinson, of the Reserve of the United States Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in line;

Reginald H. Ridgely, Jr., and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps.

## 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. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1576. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, and its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1577. A bill to enable the State of Connecticut to proceed with its program of highway modernization; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1578. A bill to amend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, so as to provide for increased payments to needy individuals thereunder and for the removal of certain restrictions on their eligibility for such payments; and

S. 1579. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age for women from 65 to 60, to eliminate remarriage as a bar to widow's and parent's benefits, and to provide that widows with minor children may in certain cases become entitled to widow's benefits before attaining retirement age; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1580. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 1581. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1582. A bill to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1583. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen the national defense and 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. NEELY:

S. 1584. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1585. A bill to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital and which is no longer needed for such purpose; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1586. A bill for the relief of Dr. David Pyong Wha Min, his wife, Yong Hi Min, and their minor child, Arnold Choong Ki Min; and

S. 1587. A bill for the relief of Francisco Salinas (also known as Daniel Castro Quilantan) and his wife Graciela de Jesus Garza Salinas (also known as Graciela de Jesus Garza Quilantan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Shamail Shamilzadeh, Shoushan Shamilzadeh, and David Shamilzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. FREAR, Mr. BEALL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. NEELY, Mr. IVES, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1589. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1590. A bill to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1591. A bill relating to the payment of judgments by the Post Office Department; and

S. 1592. A bill for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1593. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended, in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States by including probation officers of United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Dosinda Gonzalez Mendez;

S. 1595. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Homayssi; and

S. 1596. A bill to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1597. A bill to establish a commission and advisory committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 1598. A bill to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., any right,

title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to certain land in such city; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

S. 1600. A bill to provide that leave accrued by members of the Armed Forces while held as prisoners of war in Korea shall not be counted in determining the maximum amount of leave which they may accumulate or have to their credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1601. A bill for the relief of the Felix Long Memorial Hospital, Dr. Henry Lee, Dr. R. S. Ellis, and Ruth White Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1602. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1603. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1604. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; and

S. 1605. A bill to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1606. A bill to amend the provisions of law added to the United States Code by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1607. A bill to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1608. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the construction, in cooperation with local authorities, of a hospital at Onamia, Minn.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1609. A bill for the relief of Toribia Basterrechea (Arrola); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1610. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, so as to provide for the continued operation of certain schools on military installations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1611. A bill for the relief of Tai Sung Chung; and

S. 1612. A bill for the relief of Miss Young Hi Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1613. A bill to provide for the disposition of Camp Pickett, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1614. A bill to amend "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids," (21 U. S. Code, sec. 321c); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1615. A bill for the relief of Hilde Schiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

## DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION OF FLUORSPAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, and its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for the remainder of the day, so that Senators who would like to cosponsor it may add their names.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for the remainder of the day, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 1576) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, and its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## HIGHWAY MODERNIZATION IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable the State of Connecticut to proceed with its program of highway modernization. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, describing the purposes of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1577) to enable the State of Connecticut to proceed with its program of highway modernization, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding any time or other limitation on the collection of tolls prescribed by any act heretofore enacted by the Congress relating to the construction, acquisition, maintenance, or operation of any bridge constructed or acquired by the State of Connecticut or any agency or commission thereof, the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, is hereby authorized—

(1) to fix, charge, and collect tolls or other charges for the use of any bridge or tunnel heretofore or hereafter established, controlled, constructed, or acquired by or on behalf of said State;

(2) to combine any 2 or more of such bridges or tunnels, or to combine any 1 or more of such bridges or tunnels with any road, highway, transit system, or other properties or facilities for transportation, terminal, parking, or traffic facilitation purposes (each such bridge, tunnel, road, highway, transit system, or other property or facility being hereinafter referred to as "facility") heretofore or hereafter established, controlled, constructed, or acquired by or on behalf of said State; and to combine the tolls or revenues from any facilities so combined;

(3) to fix, charge, and collect tolls or other charges for the use of any facilities so combined; and

(4) to use or pledge any tolls, charges, or other revenues from any facilities for purposes of financing, acquiring, constructing, operating, or maintaining any facility or facilities.

Nothing in this section shall apply to any interstate bridge or tunnel.

SEC. 2. (a) It is hereby declared that the incorporation into any expressway now or hereafter authorized by or in accordance with chapter 107, part IV, General Statutes of Connecticut, 1953 Supplement, of any section of any highway or road in such State upon which Federal-aid road funds have been expended or are programed for expenditure will not violate any provision of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder, if such expressway is so designed and planned as to permit unrestricted use of such section without payment of toll.

(b) In any case in which the State of Connecticut has determined that it will incorporate into any expressway so authorized any section of any highway or road in such State upon which Federal-aid road funds have been expended or are programed for expenditure and has determined that it will impose tolls upon or for the use of such section, such State is authorized—

(1) to repay to the United States amounts equal to the Federal-aid road funds paid to such State as the Federal share of the cost of construction or reconstruction of such section; or

(2) to request the Secretary of Commerce to transfer, and the Secretary of Commerce when so requested is authorized and directed to transfer, for programing and expenditure any Federal-aid road funds theretofore paid as the Federal share of the cost of construction or reconstruction of such section or programed for expenditure as the Federal share of the cost of construction or reconstruction of such section.

Any amounts so repaid shall be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States and shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways. At the time of any such repayment or transfer, any project agreement in effect with respect to the section of highway or road to which such repayment or transfer relates shall be canceled. Any amounts so repaid, together with the unpaid balance (if any) of any amount programed for expenditure on the section of highway or road to which the repayment relates, and any amounts so transferred, shall be credited to the unprogramed balance of Federal-aid road funds of the same class last apportioned to the State of Connecticut. Any amounts so credited shall be in addition to all other funds then apportioned to such State and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of

the Federal Highway Act, as now or hereafter amended and supplemented.

(c) Upon the repayment or transfer of any Federal-aid road funds under the provisions of this section, any section of highway or road to which the repayment or transfer relates shall become and be free from any and all restrictions contained in the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, or any regulation thereunder, with respect to the imposition and collection of tolls or other charges thereon or for the use thereof.

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

I am introducing in the Senate today, a bill intended to give the State of Connecticut freedom it requires in rearranging its system of roads and bridges so that a portion of the revenues needed for the construction and maintenance of highways and other transportation facilities may be derived from tolls.

Introduction of this bill has been requested by Governor Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut and a bipartisan group of members of the Connecticut General Assembly.

The problem of financing urgently needed highway construction is one of staggering proportions. The best available estimates indicate that the Nation's needs will require an expenditure of $101 billion on all levels of government in the 10-year period ahead.

In Connecticut alone, it has been estimated that approximately $2 billion is needed to overcome critical deficiencies in our road network.

In limited areas, toll financing can be used to good advantage in meeting part of this heavy expense. At present, Connecticut operates two toll parkways, the Merritt and Wilbur Cross parkways, and has begun construction of a toll expressway, extending from the New York State line at Greenwich to the Rhode Island border at Killingly.

The Highway Act of 1954, adopted by the 83d Congress, included provisions which enabled the State to incorporate into the Greenwich-Killingly expressway several sections of highway on which Federal-aid funds had been expended or programed. This eliminated the necessity of bypassing these sections, saving the State an estimated $17 million.

Section 2 of the bill follows the pattern established by the Congress in the Highway Act of 1954. It would enable the State to include in toll expressways sections of Federally aided highways provided that unrestricted use of such sections without payment of toll is made possible. If the State should desire to impose tolls on any Federally aided section incorporated into an expressway, it would be authorized to repay or transfer Federal-aid funds. Funds so repaid or transferred would be made available for use on other Federal-aid highways in the State, and would be in addition to all other funds apportioned to Connecticut. This arrangement is fair to the State and fair to the Federal Government. Connecticut's total share of Federal-aid funds remains the same; the Federal Government's interest in having highways built or improved on the toll-free Federal-aid system is promoted.

Section 1 of the bill would eliminate a limitation upon the time period in which tolls may be collected upon the Charter Oak bridge at Hartford, Conn., and such limitations as may exist in Federal law on other bridges and facilities within Connecticut. It would permit the pooling of toll revenues from these sources for use in improving means of transportation in our State.

I have been provided with the following information in regard to the present Congressional limitation on the Charter Oak bridge, the reasons why it is considered desirable to remove the restrictions of the present act, and precedents for the authority now requested by the State of Connecticut.

1. Present congressional limitation on Charter Oak Bridge: Public Law No. 301 of 1939, granted the consent of Congress to Connecticut to construct, maintain, and operate the Charter Oak Bridge at Hartford. The act granted permission for tolls to be charged sufficient to pay the operating and maintenance costs and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge within 25 years. The act further provides, however, that the bridge shall be operated free of charge after a sinking fund has been accumulated sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge.

2. Desirability of removing restrictions of present act: There were outstanding on June 30, 1954, $2,880,000 of the bonds issued to pay the cost of the Charter Oak Bridge. These bonds are due serially in annual installments until 1971. The bonds maturing in the years 1968 to 1971, inclusive, are callable in 1965. The interest due on the noncallable bonds (until 1967) and on the callable bonds to the call date (1965) aggregates $370,000. The total interest and principal payments necessary to amortize the cost of the bridge therefore totals $3,250,000.

As of June 30, 1954 the sinking fund totalled $2,475,000 leaving only a difference of $775,000 to be placed into the sinking fund which would amortize the cost and free the bridge from tolls. The net revenue of the bridge for the year ended June 30, 1954 was $561,000. Therefore, under the existing congressional act the bridge would have to be toll-free in about 1½ years.

The Charter Oak Bridge is heavily congested and an additional crossing is or will soon be needed. Furthermore, the State is considering a plan of pooling all vehicular toll facilities in the State together as a base of credit for necessary additional highway or bridge projects in the State. Unless congressional consent is obtained for the removal of the toll limitation, this source of revenue will be lost to the State. Connecticut has already passed legislation permitting the extension of tolls on the Charter Oak Bridge.

3. Precedent for removal of toll limitations in present congressional act: Under the 1946 General Bridge Act, Congress has determined that there shall be no toll limitation on intrastate bridges. Even prior to 1946 many intrastate bridges were built without any limitation on tolls.

The New York State Bridge Authority operates three intrastate bridges across the Hudson River, the Bear Mountain, and Rip Van Winkle Bridges. All of these bridges were completed prior to 1946. The authority recently financed the cost of a new bridge from Kingston to Rhinebeck. There is no limitation as to the time that this authority may collect tolls. Furthermore, the toll revenue derived from all the bridges is pooled and pledged for the new bonds issued for the Kingston Bridge.

The Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority operates several intrastate bridges, the Triborough Bridge, Bronx-Whitestone Bridge, Henry Hudson Bridge, Marine Parkway Bridge and the Cross Bay Parkway Bridge. There is no toll limitations as to the length of time tolls may be charged on these bridges and furthermore the tolls of all facilities are pooled and pledged to the bonds of this authority.

The State of Maryland recently financed a tunnel in Baltimore (Patapsco Tunnel) and as security for the bonds pooled the revenues of three intrastate bridges, the Susquehanna River Bridge, the Chesapeake Bay Bridge and the Potomac River Bridge. There is no limitation as to the period of tolls on any of these bridges.

Even on interstate bridges, Congress has in the past consented to the removal of a toll limitation period and permitted the pooling of several facilities together. For example, this consent was granted by Congress for the Port of New York Authority which operates, in addition to other facilities, several interstate bridges, the George Washington Bridge, the Bayonne Bridge, the Goethals Bridge, and the Outerbridge Crossing. Another example of congressional consent is the Delaware River Port Authority, which operates the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge and is presently constructing the Philadelphia-Gloucester Bridge with the revenues of both facilities pooled.

This bill is needed so that Connecticut may go forward as rapidly as possible with its program of highway development. Nothing in it would require the imposition of tolls. It simply gives our State a home-rule option to collect tolls if that course seems wise in assessing our overall needs for revenues to be used in improving our highway transportation system.

## AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Social Security Act. These are companion bills to ones introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative ROOSEVELT, of California.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1578. A bill to amend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, so as to provide for increased payments to needy individuals thereunder and for the removal of certain restrictions on their eligibility for such payments; and

S. 1579. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age for women from 65 to 60, to eliminate remarriage as a bar to widow's and parent's benefits, and to provide that widows with minor children may in certain cases become entitled to widow's benefits before attaining retirement age.

## AMENDMENT OF DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1953

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen national defense and to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, pertaining to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING 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. 1583) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen national defense and to further extend the pro-

gram to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

I send to the desk for introduction and appropriate reference a bill "to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to strengthen national defense and to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals."

Primary purpose of my bill is to encourage the discovery, development, and domestic production of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, beryl, and columbium-tantalum-bearing ores and concentrates pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1946, as amended.

Certainly, it behooves the Congress to afford American producers of tungsten, manganese, chromite, and other strategic and critical minerals set forth in this bill a period of certainty during which they can plan and invest in a businesslike manner toward achievement of the production goals set for them. To accomplish this purpose, my bill would extend the programs established under the Defense Production Act, as amended, a period of 7 years or until June 30, 1962, a date corresponding with the expiration of the Defense Production Act.

My bill does not concern the overall quantity of minerals to be obtained since those quotas are within the prerogative of the executive agencies charged with this responsibility.

This bill will permit the establishment of such additional purchasing depots as may be found necessary to carry out the policies of the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act. It likewise will not limit or restrict the administering executive agencies from increasing the quantity of or the price paid for the minerals.

Extension of this purchase program will definitely serve as an incentive to the domestic mining industry which is staggering under record high foreign imports of cheaply produced minerals. All of the minerals included in this bill are vital to the welfare of the United States, both for defense and for peacetime industrial uses. Our dependence upon foreign sources clearly stands as a great peril to our national security. Continuation of this domestic purchase program will develop our minerals here at home for any eventuality.

## BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills for consideration by the Judiciary Committee. The bills have been recommended by the Postmaster General, the Department of the Army, and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. I ask unanimous consent that the letters accompanying the bills may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1591. A bill relating to the payment of judgments by the Post Office Department.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1591 is as follows:)

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., March 8, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*Prsident of the United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for consideration by the Congress proposed legislation relating to the payment of judgments by the Post Office Department.

Judgments against the United States in cases involving agencies other than the Post Office Department are paid out of general funds of the Treasury. Such judgments in cases involving this Department, however, are paid out of postal revenues.

There is an unavoidable lapse of time between the award of the judgments and the appropriation of funds for the payment of these judgments. Subsections (b) of section 2411 of title 28, United States Code, provides that "(b) except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section, on all final judgments rendered against the United States in actions instituted under section 1346 of this title interest shall be computed at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the judgment up to, but not exceeding, 30 days after the date of approval of any appropriation act providing for payment of the judgment."

Inasmuch as the payment of interest on judgments so rendered increases the deficit of this Department, it is believed that authority should be granted to the Postmaster General to make prompt payment of these judgments. During the past fiscal year, the interest alone on judgments rendered against the United States in cases involving this Department amounted to $7,000. If legislation such as is transmitted herewith had been in effect, the postal deficit could have been reduced by this amount.

The enactment of legislation such as is here proposed would provide better service to those persons in whose favor judgments have been renderd against the United States in cases involving this Department. They would receive prompt payment of the amount due them under the judgment.

It is believed that legislation such as is transmitted herewith will accomplish the desired results, and its early enactment is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
*Postmaster General.*

S. 1592. A bill for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1592 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington, D. C., February 18, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill "For the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham," which it is recommended be enacted into law. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purposes of this legislation are (1) to compensate Mr. William Henry Diment and Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, who are residents of England, for the loss of support sustained by them on account of the death of their son, W. H. Diment, who was shot and killed by a soldier of the United States Army acting within the scope of his employment as a sentry; (2) to compensate Mrs. Gladys Everingham, who is a resident of England, individually and as natural guardian of her two minor children, for the loss of support sustained by them on account of the death of her husband, Sgt. Ronald Everingham, of the British Army, who was shot and killed by a soldier of the United States Army acting outside the scope of his employment; and (3) to insure the payment of the sum of $12,000 by the Government of the United Kingdom to Mrs. Gabrielle Evans, a resident of France, in settlement of her claim against the Government of the United Kingdom for damages on account of the death of her husband, Mr. LeRoy R. Evans, a citizen of the United States, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him in an accident involving a British Army vehicle.

The records of the Department of the Army show that W. H. Diment, a 19-year-old British citizen, was employed as a seaman on the steamship *Mafuta*, a ship of Belgian registry. On the evening of January 22, 1946, the steamship *Mafuta* was anchored in the port of Antwerp, Belgium, and some of the members of the crew, including W. H. Diment, were granted shore leave. W. H. Diment visited a waterfront cafe in Antwerp in the company of some of his fellow crew members, where they consumed some alcoholic beverages, and at 11:30 p. m. he left the cafe with a fellow seaman to return to the ship. Shortly after leaving the cafe, he and his companion entered the main entrance to the United States Army Engineer Depot in Antwerp, apparently intending to take a shortcut to their ship. An enlisted man of the United States Army was on duty as a sentry at the gate to the depot, but did not observe the two seamen as they entered, inasmuch as he was facing away from the entrance and was talking with the corporal of the guard, who had just arrived there in an Army vehicle.

The sentry turned, and seeing the two civilians walking through the depot, ordered them to halt. The first order to halt was unheeded by the seamen, and the sentry twice again ordered them to halt. These orders were also disregarded. The sentry then fired twice over the heads of the seamen, but inasmuch as they continued to walk, he then shot to stop them. The first shot missed, but the second shot struck W. H. Diment in the abdomen, and he died on January 28, 1946, as the result of the injuries so received.

Although his orders that the seamen halt were disregarded, the action of the sentry in shooting the trespassing seaman in the abdomen is regarded as the use of excessive force under the circumstances, inasmuch as the corporal of the guard then present in an Army vehicle could easily have assisted the sentry in detaining the trespassers.

Before the death of W. H. Diment, he had been contributing to his parents, Mr. William Henry Diment and Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, then residing at 242 Grand Avenue, Ely, Cardiff, England, the sum of £5 per month, and it appears that he occasionally contributed further sums to their support. At the time of W. H. Diment's death, his mother was 50 years of age, and his father was 43 years of age. The Department of the Army has been advised that the parents of W. H. Diment incurred no medical, hospital, or burial expenses in connection with his injury and death. The Department has been further advised that the parents of W. H. Diment were not eligible to receive any pension on account of the death of their son.

On March 7, 1949, the parents of W. H. Diment filed with the Department of the Army a claim in the amount of £5,000, for their loss of support resulting from the death of their son. That claim could not be

considered under the provisions of the Foreign Claims Act (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, for the reason that the deceased was not an inhabitant of Belgium, the foreign country where the claim arose. The claim could not be paid under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended, which act limits recovery in the case of a claim for death or personal injury to the reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred. There is no other statute or appropriation available to the Department of the Army for the payment of this claim. It is the view of the Department that, in view of the respective ages of the parents of W. H. Diment and the amount contributed by him to their support, the sum of $5,000 is a fair and reasonable award to them for the loss of their son's support.

In the case of the death of Sgt. Ronald Everingham, the records of the Department of the Army show that on April 27, 1946, he was then 23 years of age and a resident of England on duty with the British Army in Belgium; that on the evening of that date, Sergeant Everingham and several other British soldiers not engaged in official business were in a small cafe in Antwerp, Belgium, when two soldiers of the United States Army came into the cafe together, neither of them being on any official mission; that thereafter, one of the British soldiers and one of the United States soldiers became engaged in an argument over a seat at the bar of the cafe, and in the course of the argument, the United States soldier struck the British soldier; that when the argument resulted in violence, several of the British soldiers, including Sergeant Everingham, began to move toward the two United States soldiers; that the second United States soldier then drew a pistol from his jacket and shot Sergeant Everingham; and that Sergeant Everingham was taken to a British Army hospital nearby, where he died on May 17, 1946, as the result of the wound inflicted by the United States soldier. On September 4, 1946, the United States soldier who shot Sergeant Everingham was tried and convicted by a general court-martial on a charge of murder, and was sentenced to confinement at hard labor for the term of his natural life. Sergeant Everingham was survived by his wife, Mrs. Gladys Everingham, then 23 years of age, and his two minor children, Michael Ronald Everingham, then 2 years of age, and Maureen Everingham, then 1 year of age. It appears that, had Sergeant Everingham not been killed, he would have returned to civilian life where he would have earned a salary of approximately £6 per week. The medical and burial expenses for Sergeant Everingham were paid by the British Government. The Department was advised in May 1947 by the British Ministry of Pensions that Mrs. Everingham was then receiving a weekly pension on account of the death of her husband, in the total amount of £3.2 (£1.17 as a widow's pension, 11 shillings for each of the 2 children, and 3 shillings as a rental allowance). The Department was further advised that any other award made to Mrs. Everingham on account of the death of her husband may result in a reduction of the amount of the weekly pension, but to an amount not less than £1.4 (13 shillings as a widow's pension, 8 shillings for the 2 children, and 3 shillings as a rental allowance).

On September 5, 1946, Mrs. Gladys Everingham submitted to the United States Army authorities a claim in the amount of £10,000 for damages on account of the death of her husband. The claim could not be considered under the provisions of the Foreign Claims Act (55 Stat. 880; 31 U. S. C. 224d), as amended, for the reason that Sergeant Everingham was not an inhabitant of Belgium, the foreign country where the claim arose; nor could it be considered under the provisions of the Act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended, for the reason that the United States soldier was not acting within the scope of his office or employment at the time he shot Sergeant Everingham. There is no other statute or appropriation available to the Department of the Army for the payment of this claim. It is the view of the Department that, in view of the respective ages of Sergeant Everingham and his dependents, and the earning capacity of Sergeant Everingham, the sum of $12,000 is a fair and reasonable award to Mrs. Everingham individually, and as natural guardian of the two minor children, for their loss of support resulting from Sergeant Everingham's death.

The records of the Department of the Army show that LeRoy Robert Evans, a citizen of the United States, was born on February 9, 1912, at Allentown, Pa.; that he thereafter moved to California; that in December 1945, he was on active duty in the Army of the United States, serving in France, in the grade of technician fifth grade; that he was honorably discharged from the Army on December 4, 1945, at Camp Roosevelt, France; that on December 6, 1945, he received an excepted appointment as a civilian employee of the Army, in the position of Mess Inspector, CAF–6, at a base salary of $2,650 per annum, plus 25 percent overseas differential, for service in France with Headquarters, Seine Section, United States Army. Mr. Evans was married in France on November 6, 1946, to Gabrielle Purcey, who was born at Langres, France, on December 23, 1918, and it appears that they thereafter resided at 85 Rue Olivier de Serres, Paris (15) Seine, France. Mr. Evans continued in his employment as a civilian employee of the United States Army.

The records of the Department further show that at about 1:30 a. m. on January 1, 1949, Mr. Evans' automobile was parked along the curb of Rue Aristide Briand near a street light, in Fontainebleu, France; that Mr. Evans was having difficulty in starting his automobile, and had been standing in front of the car attempting to crank it; that while he was so engaged, a British Army truck traveling along the said street at a high rate of speed and operated in a grossly negligent manner, struck the rear end of Mr. Evans' car, apparently forcing the car across Mr. Evans' body; that the British Army truck was being operated without official authority by a soldier of the British Army; and that the British soldier involved was later convicted by a military court of using the said truck without authority. As a result of the above-described accident, Mr. Evans was severely injured, and was rushed to a French hospital. The following day, he was removed to a United States Army hospital in Paris, and later was returned to the United States for further hospitalization. Effective February 28, 1949, Mr. Evans was separated from his employment with the Army by reason of his disability. The hospitalization of Mr. Evans continued until June 5, 1950, on which date he died at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Richmond, Va., as the result of the injuries received in the accident. At the time of Mr. Evans' injury on January 1, 1949, he was a civilian employee of the Army, serving with the Fontainebleu Depot, American Graves Registration Command, European Area, and was receiving a total annual salary of $3,718.50. The British Government refused to accept any liability for the death of Mr. Evans for the reason that the British soldier involved was not acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the accident. Mr. Evans and his widow were ineligible to receive benefits provided in the case of a Federal employee who is injured in the course of his employment, inasmuch as he was not engaged in such employment at the time of his injury. It appears that Mrs. Evans incurred little or no expense for the medical care and burial of LeRoy Evans, inasmuch as such expenses were borne by the United States. In view of the ages of Mr. Evans and his wife, respectively, and the earning capacity of Mr. Evans at the time of his death, it is the opinion of this Department that the sum of $12,000 would constitute fair and reasonable compensation to Mrs. Evans on account of the injury and death of her husband.

After the Department of the Army had denied liability in the cases of W. H. Diment and Sergeant Everingham, discussed above, the British Government, through diplomatic channels, urged that the United States assume liability in the said cases. In response to an inquiry from the Department of State, the Department of the Army expressed its opinion that no executive agency of the United States should recommend private relief legislation in the aforesaid cases until assurance should be received from the British Government that said Government would make provision for the payment of the claim of Mrs. Evans for damages on account of the death of her husband. On April 17, 1953 the British Ambassador transmitted to the Department of State the following communication:

"Her Majesty's Government have carefully considered the proposals of the Department of the Army as set out in the Aide Memoire and are of the opinion that they represent an equitable method of settlement of the three cases. Accordingly, Her Majesty's Ambassador is instructed to state that, provided that the Congress of the United States enacts legislation for the payment by the United States Government of $5,000 and $12,000 in the Diment and Everingham cases respectively, Her Majesty's Government undertake to pay to the widow of Mr. Leroy Evans the sum of $12,000 as proposed in the Aide Memoire."

In view of all the facts and circumstances described above, it is the opinion of the Department of the Army that all three of the claims are meritorious. Inasmuch as none of the claims could be paid under applicable laws of the United States or of Great Britain, it is believed that the enclosed draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the aforesaid claimants provides the most appropriate method for a fair and equitable settlement of these claims. Therefore, it is recommended that the attached proposed bill be enacted into law.

This recommendation and a similar report were submitted by the Department of the Army on February 8, 1954, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; however, the proposed legislation was not enacted by the 83d Congress. Because of this situation, the British Ambassador on November 20, 1954, transmitted to the Department of State a communication in which he stated that "Her Majesty's Government hope that action can be taken to bring a similar bill before the new Congress as soon as possible after it assembles." The Department of State in a letter (December 14, 1954) referring this matter to the Department of the Army stated "It would be appreciated if the Secretary of the Army would take appropriate action to insure that the necessary legislation is submitted to the Congress at an early date" and "The Secretary of State trusts that the Secretary of the Army shares his hopes that these two long-standing claims can be settled as a result of favorable consideration by the Congress."

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $17,000.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
*Secretary of the Army.*

S. 1593. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code, as amended, in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States by including probation officers of United States district courts.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1593 is as follows:)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS,
*Washington, D. C., March 14, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
*Vice President of the United States,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft of a bill approved by the conference which would amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code as amended in reference to the protection of officers and employees of the United States, by including probation officers of United States district courts.

Section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code provides that whoever kills any judge of the United States or a considerable number of other specified officers of the United States while the officer is engaged in the performance of his official duties or on account of such performance, shall be punished as provided in sections 1111 and 1112 of the title. These sections define the crimes of murder and manslaughter. The effect of section 1114 is to make a person who kills a Federal judge or any of the other Federal officers enumerated in the section in connection with or on account of performance of his official duties, subject to trial for murder or manslaughter in the appropriate Federal court. Also there is a corollary section, 111, which makes it a Federal offense punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both, to assault, forcibly, resist, oppose, intimidate, or interfere with any person designated in section 1114 while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties. If in any of these acts a deadly or dangerous weapon is used, the fine may be as much as $10,000 and the imprisonment for as long as 10 years.

Section 1114 and by reference section 111 cover in addition to judges of the United States, officers or employees of the United States penal and correctional institutions. Probation officers of the United States district courts are subject in the performance of their duties to similar hazards, and therefore in the opinion of the Judicial Conference of the United States are entitled to the protection of the provisions.

The Federal probation officers are appointed by the United States district courts which they serve (18 U. S. C. 3654). They have two general classes of duties, one the supervision of offenders on probation or parole, and two, the marking of presentence investigations of offenders convicted by the courts for the purpose of furnishing information to the judges which will be helpful to them in determining the sentences. On June 30, 1954, the number of persons under supervision by the probation officers who then numbered 316, was 29,472, of whom 21,915 were probationers, 5,093 were civil parolees, 1,329 were persons on conditional release, and 1,135 were military parolees being supervised for the Army and the Air Force. In the fiscal year 1954 28,349 investigations were made by the probation officers, of which 19,811 were presentence investigations, 7,101 were civil preparole investigations and 1,437 were military preparole investigations.

The duties of supervision and investigation of offenders which devolve upon probation officers, undoubtedly subject them to personal hazards above those of ordinary Government officers and employees. In their investigations they regularly call at the homes and upon the associates of persons guilty of Federal crimes in order to obtain information about them. Although this inquiry is designed only to assist the judges to deal intelligently with the offenders in the matter of sentence, and often works for their benefit by indicating possibilities of rehabilitation on probation which might not otherwise be known, it may nevertheless appear to be hostile. The probation officers are often thought of by the offenders and their relatives and friends as police officers. Also if the facts shown by the presentence reports indicate to the judges that probation cannot prudently be granted and the offenders are sentenced to prison, they may blame the probation officers for the outcome. This tends to make the offenders hostile when they come out. If the probationers or parolees do not conduct themselves properly and commit serious violations of their probation or parole, it is necessary for the probation officers to report the violations to the court or the Board of Parole as the case may be. In fact under section 3653 of title 18 of the United States Code it may be their duty to arrest the offender.

These hazards which are inherent in the work of probation officers are very real. While actual menace does not occur to any individual probation officer often, there are recurring examples of it in experience and there is always the potential danger. A few illustrations may be given.

A former parolee called at the home of a probation officer who had previously supervised him and immediately shot and killed the officer's son, a young man, when he answered the door. A probation officer in a large city detecting on the street a probation violator for whom the police were looking, arrested him and the man was sentenced to 2½ years in prison. He said that when he got out he was going to get the probation officer. Another probation officer going into the woods remote from any settlement to call on a probationer, met a barrage of shotgun fire, and had to take refuge behind some trees. On one occasion a probation violator broke away from a probation officer and was captured by the officer before he had gone far. At a later time the offender shot and killed a policeman for which he was sentenced to be electrocuted. If he had had a weapon on him at the time of his previous attempt to escape, the probation officer might not have come off unscathed.

For the reasons stated it is believed that the Federal probation officers are entitled to the protection given by section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code to other Federal officers exposed to murder by the nature of their work. Also it should be possible to prosecute in the Federal courts under section III of title 18 attempts to interfere by violence or threats of violence with the performance by the probation officers of their duties, as the proposed amendment of section 1114 would permit. I therefore would request that a bill in the form enclosed be introduced and referred to the appropriate committee, and I hope that in due course it may be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER,
*Director.*

## COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure which has been submitted by the Attorney General of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany this bill the letter and explanation forwarded with this proposal by the Attorney General of the United States.

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

The bill (S. 1597) to establish a commission and advisory committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. KILGORE are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., March 15, 1955.*

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

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Attached for your consideration and appropriate reference is a draft of a bill establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure. An explanation of the proposed legislation accompanies the draft.

The Secretary of State joins me in recommending enactment of this bill, the details of which have been agreed upon by the two departments. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the bill from the standpoint of the President's policy.

An identical letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
*Attorney General.*

EXPLANATION TO ACCOMPANY BILL ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

The purpose of the attached bill for the establishment of a Commission and an Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure is to create an agency to study existing practice of international judicial assistance and to make such recommendations as are considered desirable for the improvement of international practice and procedure in civil, criminal, admiralty, and quasi-judicial matters.

The end of hostilities in 1945 brought to our Federal and State courts an unprecedented flood of litigation with international ramifications—cases in which judicial documents must be served abroad, records or witnesses examined within the territory of a foreign state, or in which proof must be offered of the law prevailing in a foreign jurisdiction. These cases pose problems of procedure which are often baffling and sometimes insoluble. They emphasize the need in the international field of the same expert study and codification which have brought about historical reforms of Federal procedure over the last few years. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure became effective in 1938. The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure became law in 1945, and the Administarative Procedure Act became law in 1946. It is appropriate that the benefit of simplified and codified procedure should now be extended to our international practice.

Except for some consular treaties which permit the taking of depositions abroad of American citizens in certain categories of

cases, extraterritorial procedure now depends largely upon usage and custom. It is difficult for the practicing lawyer to ascertain what steps should and can be taken in a given instance. The provisions of the Federal Rules of Civil and Criminal Procedure and of the State practice acts for the taking of evidence abroad are often frustrated by prohibitions and limitations put upon the use of such procedures by foreign governments. For reasons which are not entirely understood by the American bar, many countries either forbid entirely or limit the taking of depositions within their territories. Even where our practice with respect to the taking of depositions is permitted or tolerated, there is no provision in civil-law jurisdictions for obtaining the testimony of an unwilling witness.

When witnesses refuse to testify, or if they are found in a country where our practice with respect to the taking of depositions is forbidden, recourse must be had to letters rogatory. Borrowed from the civil law, a letter rogatory is, in our practice, a request by a domestic court to a court of a foreign country to take evidence. It is executed according to the law of, and in the language of, the foreign country. Procedure in civil law jurisdictions is so different from ours that American lawyers avoid using letters rogatory wherever possible. As now issued, transmitted and executed, they are inefficient, time consuming, and costly. Moreover, the courts of some countries, such as the Netherlands and Germany, are unable to issue compulsory process even to aid in the execution of a letter rogatory issuing from an American court because the United States has not entered into procedural treaties or other arrangements with their governments. Courts of limited and specialized jurisdiction and administrative tribunals which cannot promise reciprocity, a time-honored condition of letters rogatory, are without certain means of obtaining testimony abroad from unwilling witnesses found in civil law countries.

It appears that the provisions of the Federal Judicial Code and of the practice acts of the States for the personal service of judicial documents abroad cannot be utilized in many countries. Inability to serve judicial documents and to take depositions abroad may seriously impede the prosecution of crimes against our internal security. More than in the case of ordinary crime, prosecutions for security violations may require the service of documents and the procuring of evidence abroad. Prosecutions could be impeded or frustrated by any of the following:

1. Lack of agreements with foreign countries for service, under sections 1783 and 1784 of the Judicial Code of subpenas and orders to show cause upon witnesses found in their territory.

2. Prohibitions by certain foreign countries of interviews with or interrogations of prospective witnesses.

3. Prohibitions and limitations by many countries on the taking of depositions under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 15.

4. Lack of means in all civil law countries to compel unwilling witnesses to testify in deposition proceedings and in some civil law countries to compel unwilling witnesses to testify in the execution of letters rogatory from American courts.

5. Difficulty or impossibility of proving foreign public records under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 27 and section 1741 of the Judicial Code.

6. Difficulty or impossibility of proving foreign private records under sections 3491–3494 of the Criminal Code.

Foreign courts are said to find equally unsatisfactory the judicial assistance which American courts render them. Neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure contains any provision relating to assistance to foreign courts. Section 1782 of the Federal Judicial Code relating to the taking of depositions to be used in foreign judicial proceedings is ill adapted to the execution of letters rogatory from courts of the civil-law countries. Neither State nor Federal practice makes any adequate provision for the service of judicial documents on behalf of foreign courts.

Practice can be simplified, expedited, and rendered more certain and less expensive by treaty or other arrangement. Much of Latin America and Europe is covered by a network of procedural treaties. Great Britain has entered into a number of such agreements. This demonstrates that the common-law and the civil-law systems can be coordinated procedurally. An excellent start in drafting has already been made by the Harvard Research in International Law which in 1939 published a Draft Convention on Judicial Assistance. The Inter-American Juridical Committee of the Organization of American States in September 1952 rendered a report on judicial assistance in civil matters. Considerable improvement in practice can probably be effected by informal agreement, or the development of greater uniformity of law in the various countries.

Responsibility for reform must be assumed by the Federal Government because there is little or nothing the individual States can do to improve their international juridical relations.

Reform of international procedure has been urged by many interested organizations. In 1950 the American Bar Association recommended the establishment of a governmental agency for that purpose. Again, in 1953, the association adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of a commission and advisory committee to draft international rules of practice. Joining the American Bar Association with resolutions urging reform of international practice are the American Society of International Law, the American Foreign Law Association, the Consular Law Society, the Maritime Law Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and the Pennsylvania State Bar Association. In the international field the International Bar Association and the Inter-American Bar Association have recommended the negotiation of procedural treaties.

The proposed legislation would combine the techniques of democratic draftsmanship by the joint effort of the bench, bar, and law faculties that proved successful in recent Federal procedural reforms, with certain of the techniques of interdepartmental cooperation utilized in the drafting of treaties for the alleviation of international double taxation.

Effective and uniform reform of international procedures can be brought about only by general international agreement. Any such agreement would set up rules of practice which, in litigation in the Federal courts, would supplement the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The organization contemplated by the proposed legislation has therefore been modeled upon the two Supreme Court Advisory Committees, which, in turn, were established upon the precedent of the American Law Institute.

The requested legislation will not of itself effect any particular reform or change of procedure; it will merely create an agency for the study of existing problems of international judicial assistance. The proposed commission and advisory committee will be authorized to explore, report upon, and make recommendations for the improvement of all aspects of international judicial or quasi-judicial practice and procedure. The commission will itself determine, within broad limits of the subject of judicial assistance, the precise scope and content of its program; and its recommendations, accompanied by draft treaties or other proposed procedures, model conventions, or draft statutes, will be forwarded to the President for appropriate action.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the important bill introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] which will, in my judgment, rank as one of the truly significant efforts in recent times, in the field of international judicial procedure.

The bill proposes to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared with regard to the background of this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am interested in this legislation in a twofold capacity.

First as senior Republican of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am extremely anxious that this legislation be enacted so that it may help establish the basis for achieving at the international level what has long since fortunately been achieved at the national level through the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which became effective 17 years ago, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which became effective a decade ago, and the Administrative Procedures Act 9 years ago.

We will, in effect, be taking the first steps to extend the benefit of simplified and codified procedure to international practice.

I point out, therefore, that this legislation has the strong support of the American Bar Association, the International Bar Association, the American Society of International Law, as well as various other organizations interested in international procedural problems.

The legislation likewise, of course, bears the endorsement of the Attorney General of the United States.

Second, in my capacity as senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am deeply interested in this legislation. I am glad to observe that the Secretary of State of our country endorses it.

As he so well knows, international cooperation is, of course, a two-way street; it is hoped that through this legislation, American Courts will eventually be in a position to render more effective assistance to foreign courts, in such matters, for example, as the taking of depositions to be used in foreign judicial proceedings.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WILL BE HELPED

I point out, however, that this Commission and Advisory Committee will serve vital functions for our own people. Not only will the commission and council be of service to American attorneys who are increasingly concerned with problems in their private practice involving international procedure, but, even more significantly, these new instrumentalities will be of benefit for the effective operation of the agencies of the United States Government.

More and more, our Federal officials are encountering a multitude of problems which derive from the fact that the United States is now the recognized leader among the nations of earth in mankind's search for world peace, freedom, and security.

The Armed Forces of the United States are stationed throughout the globe in defending freedom's ramparts. The United States is the center of international trade with ever-increasing exports and imports. Myriads of problems have arisen in connection with issues which commenced during World War II, notably in relation to the trading-with-the-enemy law.

And in many other connections the United States Government will be aided by the legislation which is being offered today.

PROBLEM IN SECURITY CASES

I cite one particular instance.

It arises in connection with loyalty and security cases. Sometimes testimony of witnesses living abroad and involved in such cases cannot be secured because they are unwilling witnesses and cannot be forced to testify abroad.

Sometimes, however, they are willing witnesses, but local law does not permit their examination by representatives of our Government.

I cite this instance as one of many such problems. I had first publicly focused attention on this type of dilemma in connection with a study of loopholes in our Nation's security laws. This study, entitled "Adequacy of United States Laws With Respect to Offenses Against National Security," was prepared at my direction in cooperation with the Library of Congress. It was issued by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the 83d Congress under my chairmanship.

And so we see how this new Commission and Advisory Committee can help serve the needs of our Federal Government.

We as a nation have obviously advanced so rapidly to the fore that only now are we catching up by devising procedural ways and means of fulfilling our increased global responsibilities.

I am informed, incidentally, that, out of all of the countries in the free world, the United States is the only important nation which has never executed any international agreement with any other country in connection with these problems of international judicial assistance.

BASIC TYPES OF PROBLEMS

The procedural problems confronting us are many, and they are difficult. First, there must be a reconciliation between the Anglo-American common law procedural system and the system of civil law, the law is Islam, and the laws of the Far East.

Secondly, problems raised by our Federal system and the sovereign jurisdiction of our State courts must also be solved.

For this to be achieved, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State have rightly proposed that the problems be tackled by the Federal Government at the highest level.

So, the Commission under this bill will consist of representatives of the Department of Justice and the Department of State. The advisory committee of attorneys, judges, and legal scholars will be appointed to assist the Commission. There is ample precedent in this technique, it having worked successfully in drafting the Federal rules of civil and of criminal procedure.

COMMISSION ADVISORY IN NATURE

And finally lest there be any misinterpretation whatsoever, let me point out quite emphatically that this Commission has, of course, no power whatsoever to reach any binding conclusions, nor to negotiate any treaties, nor to negotiate any international agreement. Its function is basically to advise how best these difficult problems can be solved for the highest interests of our country and its citizens.

CONCLUSION

I trust, therefore, that this legislation will be promptly acted upon by the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and thereafter be speedily approved by both Chambers so that the Commission and advisory committee can rapidly commence their vital work.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO PRICE SUPPORT FOR WHEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to assure price support of whey.

I may say for the benefit of those who are not familiar with this product, that whey is the liquid remaining after the coagulation of the curd in the manufacture of cheese. One hundred pounds of whole milk becomes roughly 90 pounds of whey and 10 pounds of cheese.

The 90 pounds of whey, which remain following the production of cheese, bear the same sort of relation to whole milk as do the 90 pounds of skim milk, which remain after skimming off the cream in the production of butter. Thus, when cream is skimmed for manufacturing butter, 100 pounds of whole milk becomes roughly 10 pounds of cream and 90 pounds of skim milk.

Skim milk is dried into a powder which is known as dry skim milk, or when certain standards are met, nonfat dried milk solids. Whey is also dried into a product known as dried whey. Both skim milk and whey in dry form are used in animal feed. However, the quantity of skim milk used in animal feed is about 2 percent of the total quantity produced. By contrast, the quantity of dried whey used in animal feed is about 90 percent of the total quantity produced.

The price of nonfat dried milk solids is supported under the price-support program by Government purchase. However, the price of dried whey is not supported.

I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference, together with one of many recent messages which have come to my office asking for enactment of this bill, an objective which I previously sought through the introduction of a bill in the last Congress on April 8, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and letter be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

The bill (S. 1607) to amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C., sec. 1446 (c)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "For the purposes of this section, the products of whey shall be considered to be products of milk. Any price-support operations under this program shall be conducted in a manner which will not demoralize or interfere with the production and marketing of the products of whey."

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

WISCONSIN ACCREDITED CHEESE FACTORIES COOPERATIVE,
*Green Bay, Wis., March 29, 1955.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

GENTLEMEN: Owing to the fact that dried or condensed whey products are not under the support program but should be considered part of the dairy industry many cheese factories are unable to dispose of their liquid whey.

This will result in a reduced income to farmers, and will result in a serious whey disposal because the health and conservation departments of the State of Wisconsin are determined that it cannot be disposed of in any streams or in ditches along highways.

Our group of cheese factories would appreciate whatever you can do for us to eliminate this problem by some support for whey products.

Yours very truly,
WISCONSIN ACCREDITED CHEESE FACTORIES,
E. J. SCRAY, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

## DEFINITION OF CERTAIN DRY MILK SOLIDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of Congress defining nonfat dry milk, in order to clarify the name of this milk byproduct.

The amendment I propose to the law would change the name from "nonfat dry milk solids" or "defatted milk solids," as in the existing law, to "nonfat dry milk."

My objective in seeking this change is to encourage efforts to stimulate popular consumption of this nourishing product, which is providing an ever-increasing outlet for our milk and holds promise of becoming an even more important market.

In the years since the enactment of Public Law 244 of the 78th Congress, containing the present definitions, it has been found that the term "defatted milk solids" offered as an alternative designation is not being used.

The use of the word "solids" is redundant when it is a part of a name which also includes the word "dry."

The word "solids" is not generally understood by consumers, and is therefore confusing when found on the label of a food which requires ingredient labeling.

At the time the original designation was made, the market for nonfat dry milk was almost entirely within commercial trade circles such as among bakers. Now, however, this product is on the shelves of nearly every supermarket, and an effort is being made to expand its use in our homes. Both the Dry Milk Institute and the National Federation of Milk Producers feel it would help marketing of this product if it could be legally labeled as "nonfat dry milk," without use of the extra word "solids."

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

The bill (S. 1614) to amend "An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk

solids," title 21, United States Code, section 321c, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## DEDICATION OF LEE MANSION IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY AS A PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee. This is a companion joint resolution to the one introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative BRCYHILL, of Virginia, paying honor and tribute to the memory of Robert E. Lee on the 90th anniversary of the cessation of hostilities in the War Between the States, at Appomatox Courthouse.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) dedicating the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## COMMISSION FOR CELEBRATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. A companion measure is being submitted to the House of Representatives by the distinguished minority leader, Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to take appropriate steps to mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of this great American leader, which will take place in 1958. The Commission which would be established under the joint resolution is directed to prepare plans and a program to signalize this event, including plans for the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River. The Commission is required to report to the Congress by March 1, 1956, to permit further enabling legislation to be enacted if necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks the text of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of 15 Commissioners as follows: The President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all ex officio, and 8 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 2 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 2 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission, after announcement to the American people of its creation and purpose, to prepare plans and a program for signalizing the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt in the year 1958, including plans for the completion of the development of Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River in accordance with the act entitled "An act to establish a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt in the National Capital," approved May 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 163) as amended by the act approved February 11, 1933 (47 Stat. 799). In preparing such plans and program, the Commission shall give due consideration to any plan which may be submitted to it, and shall take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate and correlate its plans with those prepared by State or civic bodies. If the participation of other nations in the commemoration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the State Department.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 216, 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (22 U. S. C. 1584); nor shall any member of the Commission by reason of his status as such be deemed to be an "officer of the Government" within the meaning of the Act of April 27, 1916 (5 U. S. C. 101).

SEC. 4. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

SEC. 5. When the Commission has approved a plan of celebration, it shall submit it, insofar as it relates to the fine arts, to the Commission of Fine Arts for its approval.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, on or before March 1, 1956, make a report to the Congress in order that further enabling legislation may be enacted.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $10,000.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than October 27, 1959.

## WORLD FOOD BANK AND THE INTERNATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF FOOD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which declares that it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States should negotiate with other nations in an endeavor to establish an international agreement for the creation and operation of a World Food Bank.

I also have joined with the Senator from Montana and other Senators in the submission of another resolution, which deals with the overall problem of gearing together production and consumption, through the vehicle or mechanics of international distribution. There is no basic conflict between the two resolutions; only the emphasis and approach are different.

To my mind, Mr. President, no more effective weapon could be forged for use in the battle against the insidious assaults of international communism than the creation of a World Food Bank with facilities for lessening the pangs of hunger that gnaw in the stomachs of hundreds of millions of people.

All the evidence points to the inescapable conclusion that international communism sprouts quicker, and grows faster, in lands where hunger stalks and the shadow of starvation is the companion of the masses.

We have learned—all the world has leaned—that an international bank, conceived and operated along democratic lines, can and will operate successfully for the mutual benefit of all participating nations. I refer directly and specifically to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

This institution for the betterment of mankind and for the promotion of peace and amity among nations grew out of the Bretton Woods Conference held in July of 1944. Its creation and the building of the machinery for its successful operation constitute a major accomplishment of the Democratic Party, but I hasten to add that bipartisan support was not lacking.

Today, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has 56 members, and its balance sheet—the measure of the peaceful services it is rendering in a world torn with strife—tells a graphic story of what nations can accomplish when they work together toward a common goal.

Mr. President, I wish at this point to draw particular attention to the fact that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is not a charitable organization engaged in a giveaway program, just as the World Food Bank proposed by this resolution will not operate as a giveaway institution.

No; the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development definitely is not a charity or giveaway organization as is shown by the fact that its net income for the 9-month period ended March 31, 1954, was $15,006,000.

The World Food Bank, as proposed by this resolution, will serve as a medium of distribution for the effective and businesslike disposal and utilization of so-called surplus food, fiber, and other agricultural products which have or may accumulate or be needed in this and other participating nations. And, I submit, sir, that in view of the fact that it is costing the American taxpayer in excess of half a million dollars a day in warehouse and storage fees alone to carry our excess stocks, it is high time that something be done to put these

stores into humanitarian use, without loss to the taxpayer, through the medium of a World Food Bank.

We have learned by experience that an international bank can operate successfully in the development of electric power, transportation, communications, forestry, industrial expansion, and in many other fields. The same overall principles will work just as successfully in providing machinery for the distribution of food, fiber, and other agricultural products, to bring nearer into balance world production and consumption of these commodities.

It is my sincere hope that Members on both sides of the aisle, and the executive branch of the Government also, will join in this effort to solve the problem of excess food and fiber stocks on one hand—and hunger, starvation, and sometimes even famine on the other—a solution which also will strike a lethal blow to the expansion hopes of those who crouch in the Kremlin and scheme against the individual freedoms of mankind.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 85), submitted by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was received, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas international statistics show that more than 1 billion people of the total world population of 2,400,000,000, go to bed at night with their hunger only partially satisfied; and

Whereas communism and other ideologies foreign to the concept of freedom of the individual man thrive best in the land where the spector of hunger stalks; and

Whereas the people of many lands, ill-fed, ill-clothed, and yearning for the freedom and blessings of a democratic way of life for themselves and their children, need bread, butter, and other life-sustaining foods just as sorely as they need guns, tanks, and airplanes to resist the insidious assaults and false promises of individual-degrading political and economic ideologies; and

Whereas during most years the world production of food and raw materials for clothing are ample, if distributed properly, to fill the basic needs of all the peoples of the world; and

Whereas nature has been particularly bountiful to the people of the United States of America where we have stored in warehouses scattered throughout the land huge stocks of surplus food items and raw materials for clothing; and

Whereas the United States is in a position to lead and should lead in helping to relieve the pangs of hunger that gnaw at the vitals of millions who need increased physical strength and endurance to resist aggression and subversive influences; and

Whereas in meeting the problem of famine and hunger on the international level, a giveaway program between governments would be degrading to both the giver and the receiver; and

Whereas the creation and operation on a businesslike basis of a world food bank, with the nations having surplus food stocks depositing such stocks in the vaults and warehouses of such a world food bank to be withdrawn as needed by other bank member nations in their times of national emergency, would be a boon to suffering humanity numbered in the hundreds of millions, would strike a blow in one of the most vital spots of international communism, and would reduce or wipe out surplus stocks which are costly to maintain and at the same time tend to bring in balance world production and consumption of agricultural products: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States should negotiate, through the framework of the United Nations and other international channels, with appropriate foreign nations and endeavor to establish an agreement for the creation and operation of a World Food Bank, patterned after the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, from which member nations could borrow foods or fibers or both and repay such loans when able either in kind, other raw materials, or in cash, and that such agreement should not be binding upon the United States until ratified by the Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of an address which I delivered at Shelby, N. C., on Tuesday, May 4, 1954, on the subject of a World Food Bank be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SPEECH BY HON. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AT SHELBY, N. C., TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1954.

Friends, history has a strange way of repeating itself.

Some 3,500 years ago, in far away Egypt, the government warehouses were bulging at the seams with corn and other supplies of surplus crops.

Seven years earlier Joseph had warned Pharaoh that a time of famine and scarcity was in the making, and urged him to buy up all surplus food crops against that emergency.

Pharaoh, the King of Egypt, heeded the advice of Joseph, and his government—for 7 years—bought up the annual 20 percent surplus production of the land.

That, my friends, is what the Bible tells us about the agricultural and economic problems of that ancient day and age.

Later events proved the wisdom of Joseph's advice and the action taken by the government of Pharaoh.

Today, in America, our Government warehouses, like those of Egypt, in the days of long ago, are bulging with surplus stocks of agricultural products.

What we are going to do about those surpluses is one of the prime questions of the hour.

Let's go back to the Bible again, and find out what was done with the surpluses of 35 centuries ago.

The Bible tells us that these surplus food stocks were used to feed the people of Egypt, during the lean years that followed the gathering of the surplus, and that which was not required for Egypt, was divided up and sold to the peoples of foreign lands in their hour of scarcity and need.

That's the way they did things back in the days of long ago, when, according to the Bible, God was directing—through His prophets and servants—the hand and actions of men.

And, I am convinced that God still stands ready to direct the hand of man in solving the problems that face us today. All that we need to do is to get in tune, as a Nation, with His plans and purpose.

And, now let's do a bit of reviewing of more recent history—of that period following immediately after the Hoover depression—and stake out the reasons why we have surplus stocks of food in Government warehouses.

As a part of the overall plan to set the almost wrecked economy of America back on the track, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt initiated three major reforms or programs, all of which won immediate and almost universal approval.

First, there was the Bank Deposit Insurance Act that gave stability to our financial institutions, which at that time were failing at a rate of about three banks a day.

Second, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was armed with billions of dollars to pump life into a staggering and near prostrate national industrial life.

Third, farm price support program was set in motion, and this program ended an era of widespread loss, under the hammer of the auctioneer, of farm homes and holdings, city and town homes, and small businesses.

It was just as effective in halting such losses as was the Bank Deposit Insurance Act in halting bank failures, and as was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in halting big business and industrial failures.

The word "bankruptcy" started slipping off the front pages of the newspapers, and crawling back between the covers of the dictionary.

Soon millions of unemployed men and women proudly had their names taken from welfare relief rolls as they were added, in increasing numbers, to revived and expanded industrial payrolls.

The first farm price support legislation was later declared unconstitutional, and a new beginning was made. The 90 percent parity program and act, with amendments, which finally emerged, was born of national economic necessity, and was nurtured by the hands of men with experience in the fields of agriculture, economics, and government.

Now, the term price-support program can mean any one of several things to the uninformed and newcomers to the idea, and it usually does, to their confusion. But, those of us who have been in the thick of the fight to establish and maintain a workable 90-percent parity-price support program over a period of years, welcome all true converts to the cause. Their assistance and support, even if it comes late, is needed.

President Roosevelt did not pull the 90-percent parity-price support program out of thin air like a magician lifts a rabbit out of a hat. He built it carefully, in consultation and cooperation with the 48-State Commissioners of Agriculture and other leaders, and, at that time, I was one of those commissioners.

This, however, was not the first time that I had the privilege of working with President Roosevelt. On Thanksgiving Day of 1932, after he was elected but prior to the time he took the oath of office as President, I, as master of the North Carolina State Grange, was one of a group of farm leaders from all over the United States who met with him at Warm Springs. The President-elect had called this conference for a discussion of the farm problem and to obtain suggestions as how best to solve it.

I recall as vividly as if it had happened yesterday, one of the things Mr. Roosevelt said that day. With no trace of a smile—things were too grim back in those days for much smiling—he told us, "I am going to have you farm folks locked up in a room and keep you there until you are able to come out with a program that will solve the farm problem and get the economy of this Nation back on its feet."

And, incidentally, I was the only southerner who was invited to attend that Warm Springs conference when President-elect Roosevelt started building the foundation of the Nation's farm program.

As an administrator of the Federal land bank, covering 11 Southern States, I saw, with my own eyes, the misery and heartbreak, that lay like a funeral pall over every farm community in the wake of the depression—misery and heartbreak we were able

to alleviate, in thousands of cases, through Federal land bank loans.

Private bank loans for agriculture had completely broken down, as they had for almost everything else. Agriculture was sick, sick almost unto death, and as a result, industry's smokestacks stood stark and naked against the sky, and the wheels, shuttles, looms, saws, and joiners were silent.

In that day and hour it was engraved on my heart and brain that the economy of this Nation can be kept healthy and thriving, year in and year out, the wheels of industry kept turning, and employment at a high level, only if proper measures are maintained to assure the farmer-producer receiving his fair share of the national income—that is, a price level of at least 90 percent of parity.

The price-support program we fought for and set in motion through the 1938 amendments to the Agricultural Act, together with allied measures, was designed, and has operated successfully, as a means of stabilizing the overall economy of the Nation.

It is true, as has been charged by the self-styled economy bloc of Congress, that our farm program, in the absence of acreage limitations, has resulted in the accumulation of surpluses in certain commodities. But, let me point out in this connection, that farmers have always, when called upon to do so, voted upon themselves the necessary acreage limitations.

An outstanding example of this is found in the flue-cured tobacco program which has operated so successfully.

The important question of acreage limitations and the further accumulation of surplus stocks, are matters, however, that lie in the future, and are subject, until the law is changed, in a large measure to the whims and fancies of an unsympathetic Secretary of Agriculture.

Just as important, we are faced with the problem of Government warehouses already bulging with surplus food and other agricultural products. And, incidentally, had it not been for such surplus stocks on hand when World War II broke out, the United States and our allies would have been in a pretty bad fix.

In seeking the answer to the question of what should be done with these surpluses, common sense dictates that we examine our relationships with the other nations of the world, particularly in respect to those nations we count as allies in the battle against communistic aggression.

As a Nation we have seen and recognized the benefits that flow, back and forth, from cooperative effort. We are a full-fledged partner, in fact, the largest single contributing partner, in NATO, and are pouring our resources of all kinds into the pooled effort to hold communism in check, and we must and shall continue to do so.

Many of our allies in this united determination to keep the flame of freedom and liberty burning are faced with serious food shortages on their home fronts. Even in Great Britain—the strongest of our allies—the rationing of some food items still goes on.

Why would it not be the part of common sense to make it possible for our allies to spend more of their money, at home, for military arms to implement NATO, and for us to make more of our NATO contribution in the form of our surplus food stocks, food that is needed by our allies?

Only American makers of the instruments of war—those who manufacture and sell guns and tanks, ammunition, and warplanes, and the like—could be expected to object, and I seriously doubt that they would.

Now the British are not the only ally we have that is faced with food shortages, and to whom we are furnishing a part of their requirements in munitions of war to present a strong front against the threats of communism. Some of our other allies are faced with even more acute shortages. In some instances almost faminelike conditions prevail.

Adoption of such a plan would bring about immediate reductions in our piled up surpluses of food stocks, and, at the same time, would relieve some of the financial burden the American taxpayer is having to carry.

This, however, would be only a partial solution to the bulging food warehouse problem, but successful experience in another field points the way toward total solution.

I am talking now about establishment of a World Food Bank, to be administered by the United Nations or by a special agency made up of the United States and our allies in the fight against communism.

For several years the United States has been a participating partner in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, a world bank organization to which we have pledged, in stock subscription, more than $3 billion to help bolster the economy of financially weak nations.

Each member nation's contribution or subscription to the bank's capital stock or operating capital is based upon its estimated individual capacity to cooperate in assisting less fortunate nations in times of emergency and stress.

Altogether, 54 nations are stock subscribers to this International Bank, and a total of 78 separate loans, ranging in size from a few million to $250 million, have been made in 29 member nations.

The World Bank, of which the United States is by far the largest single stockholder, came into existence on December 27, 1945, and as of June 30, 1953, its operation had resulted in a net profit in excess of $76 million.

This International Bank operates just like any other bank. That is, it makes no contributions or grants, but rather lends its money, at interest, with eventual repayment required.

A World Food Bank might well be established along similar lines, with those member nations which draw upon its resources being required to repay their withdrawals, to the bank, either in kind, when they have good crop years, or in equivalent cash.

We—that is, the United States—would not be alone in contributing food stocks to such a World Food Bank, for there are other nations that also have surplus problems, involving various crops, from time to time, and each could contribute or pledge to the common pool of food stocks in accordance with its excess production in one or more crops.

Food-short member nations should be permitted to withdraw from the World Food Bank under a formula which gives weight to both reserve stocks on hand or in sight, and probable total world need in the immediate foreseeable future.

Here, in this land of plenty in which we live, it is hard to realize that approximately 1 billion people of the total world population of 2,400,000,000, go to bed every night with their hunger only partially satisfied.

Through operation of such a World Food Bank plan as I am suggesting, severe food scarcities in many, many instances would be largely eliminated, and the hunger stricken and threatened people of lukewarm, allied nations would be made stronger—both physically and in will—to defend themselves against communistic assaults and cold war threats.

Many of these nations that yearn for themselves the freedoms and blessings of a democratic way of life, need bread and butter just as sorely as they need guns and tanks to preserve their independence. Let's make it easy for them to buy our surplus bread and butter stocks so that they will be better able to make their own guns and tanks to preserve or win the freedom for which they yearn.

And, in this connection, it would be well to remember that a man can, and usually will, fight a lot better on a full stomach than on an empty one.

To our enemies, let's present armed might and resolute unity as a deterrent to war; to our friends and allies, in lands of food scarcity, let's present the ability to enjoy three square meals a day as proof that democracy does pay off, not only in freedom, but also in a better standard of living.

Communism breeds and thrives on hunger, and no greater contribution could be made to world peace and tranquility by this or any other nation, than the filling up of empty places in hungry human stomachs.

Just as actions speak louder than words, food sometimes speaks louder than guns.

Such a World Food Bank would serve a manifold purpose, including: First, the promotion of true friendship among untold millions of people the world over; second, progress on the highway leading toward peace among all nations; and third, the wiping out of piled up surpluses which are costing the American taxpayer more than half a million dollars a day in warehouse fees alone.

It is a goal worth striving for, and one toward which I pledge my efforts.

## INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YOUNG), submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86) which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States hereby finds that—

(a) the prices and incomes received by American farmers have been declining and threaten to decline still further in the future;

(b) there has been a serious decline in the export of American farm products;

(c) shrinkage in foreign markets for American farm products might bring about a decline in farm and national income which could not be offset, even with a more adequate system of farm credit, price supports, and stockpiling programs;

(d) the world market for farm commodities and raw materials has historically been characterized by fluctuations which adversely affect prices, undermine the security of producers, and impede steady expansion consistent with the need for larger supplies of food, clothing, and other commodities as basic elements in expanding economies and improved living standards;

(e) fluctuations in the level of the prices of primary materials have had disruptive effects on world production and trade, and declines in the general level of these prices have historically been important factors in world economic depressions;

(f) food, clothing, and other essential supplies per person in many areas of the world are less than before the war and far below the minimum required for healthful and productive living;

(g) the people in some countries live under the ever-present threat of famine and starvation;

(h) the development of more adequate reserves of farm products and other raw materials would provide essential safeguards against shortages resulting from natural causes such as drought, flood, and pestilence;

from breakdowns in distribution; from inflation, insurrection, and war;

(i) the ever-present threat of a major decline in the level of raw-material prices makes it impossible for underdeveloped countries to proceed with the confidence that is needed for their orderly development; and

(j) the existence of a reserve from which could be drawn, in time of need, some of the basic materials from which food, clothing, and other essentials are produced, would be an important step toward strengthening democracy throughout the world and creating the economic foundations and the atmosphere of hope and confidence necessary for world peace.

SEC. 2. It is the policy of the Congress that the United States participate with other nations, under the auspices of the United Nations, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and other specialized international agencies, establishing an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve which would—

(a) provide for the acquisition and appropriate storage, in the United States and in other countries, or raw or processed farm products and other raw materials, such acquisition to take place at times when overall surpluses of such materials would otherwise cause undesirable price movements;

(b) be developed in a manner that will help to prevent extreme price fluctuations in the international market for farm products and other raw materials and keep production expanding to meet the world's pressing need for more food, clothing, and other essential supplies;

(c) be used to prevent famine and starvation;

(d) help absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials;

(e) provide for the use of currencies paid to the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve by purchasers of materials, or for the use of instruments of credit issued in connection with the operations of the Reserve, to finance purchases of raw or processed products or to assist in the financing of approved economic and social development programs, formulated in cooperation with the appropriate international lending, economic development, and technical assistance agencies, such programs to include (without being limited to) those which further universal public general and vocational education, literacy, public health and medical care.

SEC. 3. The President and his representatives before the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization and other appropriate international bodies are hereby authorized and requested to enter into international negotiations for the purpose of preparing a specific plan and a proposed international agreement or agreements on the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve along the general lines set forth in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 4. The plan and agreement or agreements developed in accordance with section 3 hereof, together with full supporting material and information on operating methods, shall be presented to the Senate of the United States for approval.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of myself and a large bipartisan group of Senators, I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 86) aimed at the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, together with the names of its sponsors, may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.



Mr. President, this resolution does not require the adoption of a specific plan for such a reserve, but authorizes and requests the President and our international representatives under him to negotiate a plan with other free nations of the world, to be submitted to this body for final approval.

The resolution is, in the belief of its sponsors, an expression of the will of the Members of the Senate on policy which constitutes an appropriate prelude to international negotiations, giving our representatives and foreign nations a guide to what the legislative branch of this Government desires.

This resolution is of great interest to the farm people of the United States because it will permit abundant agricultural production and simultaneously provide a constructive method of distributing the available part of that production to tens of millions of people abroad who need food and fiber.

It will be of interest to domestic consumers because it will protect them against periodical shortages, consumer-price increases, and the inflation which accompanies shortages.

It will be of tremendous interest to all the nations of the world—many of them today urging just such an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve—because it will assure them needed food, fiber, and raw materials; and it will provide both a market for, and orderly marketing of, national surpluses which are too often dumped to the disadvantage of producers everywhere.

An International Food and Raw Materials Reserve can contribute to international economic stability; it can be a powerful instrument in the war against want in the free nations of the world; it can provide the export market for our national agricultural surpluses which are hanging over our domestic market and depressing farm prices; it can free our farmers to produce more and relieve the very real agricultural depression which we have today, and it can demonstrate the ability of the free world nations to work together for the betterment of the life of all.

BIPARTISAN MEASURE

The resolution I have introduced is not a partisan measure. It is supported by Senators from both sides of the aisle; Republicans as well as Democrats.

It is a very simple Senate resolution. It contains 4 sections and is less than 4 pages in length.

The first section of the resolution makes certain findings about the decline in our domestic farm income, the shrinkage of our foreign markets for food and fiber, the disruptive fluctuations of world raw materials markets, and the value of having international reserves.

The second section of the resolution declares it to be the desire of the Senate to establish an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve under the auspices of the United Nations, the World Food and Agriculture Organization, and other international agencies involved, designed to accomplish five specific purposes:

First, to provide for the acquisition and storage, in the United States and elsewhere, of raw and processed agricultural products and other raw materials;

Second, to buy and sell commodities in a manner which would help prevent extreme price fluctuations in international markets and keep production expanding to meet the world's pressing need for greater production to raise living standards and banish want;

Third, to prevent famine and starvation;

Fourth, to absorb temporary market surpluses; and

Fifth, to provide that national currencies paid to the International Reserve for commodities by underdeveloped nations may be used for the purchase of other materials in those underdeveloped countries, or loaned back to them for needed economic and social development programs.

The third section of the resolution authorizes and requests the President and our representatives in appropriate world organizations to enter into international negotiations for the purpose of preparing a specific plan for such an international food and raw materials reserve.

The fourth section provides that when such an international plan and agreement has been negotiated, it shall be presented to this body for appropriate final approval.

It is the hope of the sponsors of this resolution that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold hearings and permit the many groups in American life who are interested in the proposal to be heard on it.

PREVIOUS FOOD RESERVE PROPOSALS

Mr. President, this proposal is not new. A world food board was proposed immediately after World War II by Lord John Boyd-Orr, the first Director General of the World Food and Agricultural Organization. It was widely supported by nations around the world, but failed at that time because of the hesitance of the United States and Great Britain to give it their support.

An international commodity clearinghouse was later proposed by the so-called Committee of Experts of the Food and Agricultural Organization and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, which includes our own Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, Grange, and Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

In 1954 the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, which is headed by Mr. Allan Kline, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a worldwide organization of free farm organizations, meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, adopted a report declaring:

The matter of a world food reserve should be kept under active consideration and to that end the committee recommends that the Secretariat prepare a study indicating the nature of the machinery needed to implement the plan and the obstacles that have stood in the way of attainment of this objective, and giving all possible suggestions as to how such obstacles might be overcome.

The matter is before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on motion of Costa Rica, which proposed a study of a food reserve agency.

It is to be expected that these agricultural groups would be in the forefront of efforts to establish an international food and raw materials reserve. They are plagued with producing countries with surpluses that are desperately needed in other parts of the world. They know that it is only the failure of our distribution machinery—our failure to match need with supplies—that causes so-called surpluses to pile up in the agricultural producing nations. They know that there are tens of millions of people in the free world ill fed and ill clothed who need every pound of cotton, every bushel of wheat, every pound of dairy products, or other agricultural commodity that we and other agricultural nations of the world can produce.

FARM INCOME DROPPING

Here in the United States we worry about surpluses. We have pulled farm-price supports down to discourage production to a point that we have an agricultural depression—a depression even by the harsh standards of the Treasury official who calls a 20-percent decline in any segment of our economy only an "adjustment." Net farm income is off more than 28 percent since 1947. It reached $16.8 billion in 1947. The Department of Agriculture has just announced that it was only $12 billion in 1954, making a downward adjustment in its own previous estimates of 1954 farm income that should shock us all.

Just before the 1954 elections, the Department of Agriculture issued an official and widely publicized estimate that 1954 net farm income would be $12.5 billion. They have used that figure in all messages reporting the state of agriculture to this Congress. But now suddenly in March they find that the right figure is only $12 billion.

This means a total decline in net farm income from $13.3 billion in 1953 to $12 billion in 1954—more than 10 percent. And the trend of farm income is still down.

A considerable decline in agricultural exports, which has occurred in spite of the fact that two-thirds of the people of the world are undernourished and ill-clothed, has contributed to our unsatisfactory farm situation.

Our exports in calendar year 1951 were $4,040,000,000. In 1952 they fell to $3,431,000,000. Last year they dropped to $2,844,000,000. The Department of Agriculture advises me that the 1954 calendar year exports will run $3,046,000,000. This is a slight recovery from 1953 but 25 percent below the export total in 1951.

The 1954 calendar year exports were, of course, held up by our special export subsidy programs. During the present fiscal year, more than a billion dollars of exports are being aided by special arrangements to sell for foreign currencies, to barter, give away, and to implement the work of the Foreign Operations Administration.

Latest estimates are that we will dispose of $530 million worth of products by sale for foreign currency, $150 million worth by giveaway, $200 million worth by barter, and $350 million worth through the Foreign Operations Administration.

The Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954, which is Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, has excellent aims. But its weaknesses are apparent. It is a temporary program. Our farmers have no assurance that it will not be terminated like other foreign programs 2 years hence. Every commodity transaction under it is a separate, unilateral, international negotiation. There is no assurance of continuing outlets.

PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. President, how much better it would be for our domestic producers—and for the nations seeking long-term food supply—if there were an international institution where our surpluses could be taken year after year, and to which nations needing our farm commodities could look for continuing supplies. How much better it would be if we might plan for the future, knowing that reasonable domestic surpluses can be moved through this regularized channel, than to attempt to adjust agriculture to spot deals, or depend on the arrangement of spot deals to help us move our surpluses.

That this is a matter of major importance to our American farmers is illustrated by the fact that in the year ending July 1, 1952, we sold:

Wheat from 6,400,000 acres.

Cotton from 6,900,000 acres.

Totally, the farm products from 50 million acres.

The United States is the world's largest exporter of farm products, as indicated by a table showing the percentage of various crops we produce which were exported in 2 recent years, and the percentage of total world trade in those commodities which they constituted. I ask permission to insert this table in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

| | United States exports part of total world trade | | Percent of United States production | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1951–52 | 1952–53 | 1951 | 1953 |
| Wheat and flour | 45 | 35 | 48 | 19 |
| Cotton | 47 | 27 | 38 | 24 |
| Tobacco | 41 | 34 | 25 | 26 |
| Barley | 14 | 12 | 12 | 17 |
| Oats | 4 | 3 | (1) | (1) |
| Corn | 45 | 40 | 3 | 4 |
| Rice | 10 | 16 | 59 | 45 |
| Grain sorghum | 87 | (2) | 55 | 8 |
| Soybeans [3] | 68 | 69 | 27 | 21 |
| Raisins | 36 | 33 | 5 | 6 |
| Lard | 88 | 87 | 24 | 18 |
| Apples | 11 | 8 | 4 | 1.5 |
| Peas | | | 7 | 3 |

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent.
[2] Not available.
[3] Includes oil.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the possibility of selling exports is not the only interest of farmers in international trade in farm commodities.

United States consumers buy many farm commodities produced in other countries.

From the viewpoint of American farm families, there are two types of such imported farm commodities:

One. Those that compete in the domestic market with American farm-produced commodities.

Two. Those that do not compete in the domestic market with products of American farms.

Imported farm commodities that do not compete with domestic production include bananas, rubber, coffee, tea, and cocoa. Amount in 1952, $2.8 billion.

The importance of these to American farmers lies in their price to farmers as consumers and in the significance of these commodities to farm people in other lands as a way of earning dollars with which those foreign countries can buy other commodities produced in this country.

About 1½ million of our farm families are interested in the impact of competing imports on the domestic price of commodities which they produce.

Total value of such competing farm imports in 1952 was $2 billion, or about 6 percent of the total value of our farm production.

We import 61 percent of our wool, 47 percent of our sugar from foreign countries and another 26 percent from our own territories. We import 1 percent of our beef cattle, 5 percent of our oats, 9 percent of our rye, 2 percent of our hogs and pork, 6 percent of our barley, 3 percent of our wheat and flour, and 4 percent of the dairy products consumed in this country.

I ask permission to have inserted in my remarks at this point a table of these percentages and the volume of the imports.

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

| Imports | Percent | Volume of imports |
|---|---|---|
| Wool | 61 | [1] 590, 000, 000 |
| Sugar | 47 | [2] 3, 833, 000 |
| Sugar (from United States territories, Hawaii, etc.) | 26 | |
| Cattle, beef | 1 | $87, 000, 000 |
| Oats | 5 | [3] 67, 527, 000 |
| Rye | 9 | [3] 2, 145, 000 |
| Hogs and pork | 2 | $49, 800, 000 |
| Barley | 6 | [3] 16, 600, 000 |
| Wheat and flour | 3 | [3] 18, 500, 000 |
| Dairy products | 4 | $45, 335, 000 |

[1] Pounds.
[2] Tons.
[3] Bushels.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, although many of these percentages and volumes are very small, such imports are very disturbing to farmers who are on strict acreage allotments and quotas, and whose price supports are dependent on supply.

This Nation should adopt policies which will give United States consumers an adequate supply of all commodities at a fair price, with provision for protecting at least 100 percent parity returns to family farmers. We cannot successfully operate farm price support programs unless there is some regulation of imports.

In the current situation, there is both external pressure to get products into our markets, and internal pressure to

keep them out entirely. It results in unnecessary hurt feelings and ill-will, which an international food and raw materials reserve could eliminate by creating a regularized market for the surpluses of all nations and distributing them on a basis of need.

HALF THE WORLD HUNGRY

Mr. President, low purchasing power in other countries, not overproduction in the United States, limits foreign demand for our farm products. There is no shortage of need for our present production, or increased production, of food and fiber. Half the world's people have just about enough food for minimum subsistence—barely enough for health by any decent standard. Only about one-third of the world population has enough food of the right kind to be well nourished.

The average life expectancy in India is only 27 compared to the United States figure of 68.

In India, 123 of each 1,000 babies born die in their first year. In the United States the figure is only 29 per 1,000. In Iraq and Egypt, only 600 of each 1,000 babies that are born live to be 5 years old.

To bring the average world textile consumption per person up to only one-half the United States average of 38 pounds per year, would require an increase in world production of cotton and other fibers of almost 90 percent.

Population increase in the last 15 years has outrun increases in food and fiber production in the world as a whole and in many different countries of the world, particularly in southeast Asia, southeast Europe, northern Africa, Germany, and Austria.

To be safe, nutritionally, over a long period, requires about 1,900 calories a day with some protein from animal sources in warmer tropical climates; and 2,200 calories a day in cooler areas, such as the United States. In all the world, except a handful of countries in western Europe, North and South America, Australia, and New Zealand, the people on the average life at or very near this breakover point. Since some people in every country live very well, indeed, considerably more than half of the population live below safe nutritional levels most of their lives.

The real answer to the problem of unbalance between productive capacity and effective demand must be found on the side of demand. People have almost unlimited wants—which, unfortunately, do not always meet with a corresponding purchasing power—for better food, better housing, better clothing, better educational facilities, and for a vast array of various kinds of manufactured goods. There could be an ever-expanding circle of the distribution of these things as opportunity is increased. The long-term solution to the present agricultural situation must be found in building up the purchasing power which will create expanded markets for both agricultural and nonagricultural goods, and this can be secured in an expanding world economy.

The underdeveloped countries may be divided into two classes, those which have large natural resources but small populations and those which have large populations in comparison with their resources of raw materials. The former are largely in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. The latter are largely in Asia.

In the countries of small populations and large natural resources, the problem is mainly one of securing outside capital for development, although there is also the problem of raising the level of technical skills of the native population. But in these cases outside private capital is already moving in in considerable amount, and technical training usually accompanies the capital.

POPULATION PRESSURES

It is, however, the economic development of heavily populated underdeveloped countries with relatively limited natural resources that is of the most concern to the agricultural producers. In these countries will be found the vast number of underclothed and undernourished people who could, through economic development, earn the means of payment to absorb enormous quantities of food and fiber.

These countries need both technical assistance and capital if their standards of living and purchasing power are to be substantially raised. It is recognized that, in respect to both technical assistance and capital, agricultural development will receive important consideration, for agricultural development must go hand in hand with industrial development if the necessary expansion in consumer purchasing power is to be achieved.

So far as technical assistance is concerned, some progress has already been made through international and national agencies; but much more needs to be done. The problem of capital for development is much more difficult but equally important in this class of country.

All of the so-called surplus United States food and fiber production would be but a drop in the bucket if the democratic nations should agree to use food to help finance economic and social programs in areas where they are needed; to loan the proceeds from the sale of food surpluses—as might be done through an international reserve—for development programs.

CONTRIBUTION TOWARD PEACE

Mr. President, beyond the agricultural problem, the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve can help solve others of this Nation's most difficult foreign relations concerns. It can make a major contribution toward peace by permitting more rapid expansion in underdeveloped areas in the manner I have just indicated, and also because its operation will stabilize world raw material markets and make abundant production abroad possible.

One of the most persistent, most disturbing, and most perplexing of modern economic problems is the human suffering and relative stagnation enforced upon producers of the world's raw materials by the extreme ups and downs in their prices.

The problem is serious in the more highly developed nations. It is even more seriously present and damaging in the lesser developed nations. Wide swings in raw material prices present prospective investors in raw material development, whether persons, firms, or states, with a very large range of variation in possible returns that can be earned by opening up and developing such projects. Faced with such great uncertainty in markets and prices, both states and individuals are hesitant to open up enterprises that are currently profitable but which may at any time dip drastically below the break-even level through no fault of the enterprise itself. The multiplication of this kind of a situation throughout farming and all other raw materials industries of a nation and of the world puts a very severe damper upon the rate of economic development in these industries.

This slowing down of the rate of expansion in raw material industries not only reduces the supply of such materials to meet human needs and to fuel manufacturing and other secondary industries, it also holds down the purchasing power of persons and firms on the raw materials sector and thus cuts down on sales, scale of operation, and consequently of income and purchasing power of the industrial and service segments of the economy. As a result, the entire economy idles along at a lower rate of production and expansion that needs to be the case if the extreme fluctuation in the prices of raw materials could be evened out. In the more highly industrialized nations the symptoms are seen in chronically depressed industries like farming and coal mining in the United States. In the lesser industrialized nations the drop in raw material prices can bring the entire nation dangerously close to bankruptcy and to cause directly a widespread drop in income and standards of living.

In 1938, when there was a drop in our gross national product of only 6 percent, United States imports dropped 31 percent. This meant economic catastrophe for some of the small nations in South America that depend on a single raw material, sold heavily to the United States, to sustain their payrolls and finance their own necessary importations.

The 6 percent drop in our products resulted in a 48 percent decline in exports in the sterling area of Asia and Africa.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS RESTRICTED

Mr. President, it is only natural that the nations involved in these unfortunate circumstances would take evasive and protective action to save as much as they can within their own economy. This sort of action inevitably includes restriction on imports from the United States, worsening our problems.

The International Food and Raw Materials Reserve will help solve this problem by providing a continuously stabilizing factor in international raw material markets. Through the administrative machinery of the reserve, the stabilized prices of each raw material that enters importantly into international trade could be negotiated and agreed upon. The reserve could thereafter stand ready at all times to buy those raw materials at an agreed-upon price and would stand

ready to sell such commodities when they rose above the agreed-upon stabilized price. The reserve would thus reduce the extreme ups and downs of prices in both domestic and international markets, to the benefit of the raw materials producing nations and consumers as well.

This would be one of the major functions and beneficial effects of the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. This is not its sole purpose.

In addition to performing this highly important market stabilization function, the reserve would perform several other equally important and greatly needed functions that would facilitate more rapid economic expansions, relieve starvation and chronic poverty, and expand international exchange.

Nations which are already highly industrialized have another acute and growing problem for which the reserve would provide machinery for a permanent solution. The industry of advanced nations is chewing up basic resources at a tremendous and rising rate. For example, the United States, which has 7 percent of the world's population and 30 percent of the world's natural resources, accounts for 70 percent of the world's manufactured goods. The United States is using up its resource base at a very rapid rate and very much faster than the rest of the world. To be secure in our rising living standards and to retain the resource base for an expanding economy, we must assure ourselves, someway, a stabilized source of supply of the raw materials for our manufacturing industry. The same situation is true in other industrial nations such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan.

Faced with the problem of securing a future supply of raw materials, highly industrialized nations could depend entirely upon private industrial concerns to make long-term contracts with raw material producers in other lands. And, this should be done. But it can only be successfully and securely accomplished if protected and facilitated by governments and international economic accords.

Such accords conceivably could be done exclusively through bilateral arrangements between the United States and each foreign nation—1 nation at a time, 1 commodity at a time. However, no supplier, private enterprise, or State, wants to become dependent exclusively on 1 buyer; nor do importing nations or industrialists want to become dependent upon only 1 seller.

RESERVE WOULD STABILIZE MARKETS

Through the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, exporting nations can assure themselves long-term stabilized markets and importing nations can assure themselves of long-term supply at stabilized prices.

It would be incorrect to think of the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve as just a world commodity credit corporation. The Reserve is not a price-supporting device nor a device for slowing down raw material production and restricting supply. Rather, the purpose is to help usher in the era of abundance that is now on the world's threshold.

The history of all past civilizations tells us that expanding prosperity shared by the known world is the only basis upon which peace can be attained.

An international reserve can be a long, significant step toward the ultimate attainment of permanent world peace with honor, humanity, and prosperity. This could be our contribution.

This international institution, when established, could become the facilitating force to galvanize the free world into a vast, promising new era of great abundance.

If history teaches anything, it is that islands of abundance in a starving world cannot long endure. History has a way of removing barriers and evening off such extremes of economic opportunity. Usually this is brought about when the barbarians storm the walls of ancient Rome and burn and sack the city. This pulls down everybody to the lowest level.

It behooves the United States to see that the evening up comes about by expanding economic opportunities in other nations, not through forced reduction of living standards in the United States.

We can help to raise incomes and living standards in other nations by aiding them in promoting more rapid economic development.

About a third of the world's people live in the United States, Western Europe and other democratic nations that are relatively well developed and have fairly high incomes and living standards; another third live in countries behind the so-called Iron Curtain dominated by Soviet Russia and its police-state system of control.

The remaining third of the world's people—about 900 million of them—live in nations that have not yet made up their minds about democracy. These are the people of South and Central America, southeast Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. Here "stomach communism" holds out a glittering lure with its false promises of enough to eat.

These nations have not attained the economic development and higher living standards easily possible with modern technology and organization. Poverty is the rule in these countries, as indicated by the figures in a table which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

*Per person average annual real income in selected countries*

(Figures from United Nations publications; for comparison, United States figure is $1,900)

| | |
|---|---|
| **ASIA** | |
| Thailand | $36 |
| Afghanistan | 50 |
| Burma | 36 |
| Ceylon | 36 |
| India | 57 |
| Indonesia | 25 |
| Japan | 100 |
| South Korea | 35 |
| Philippines | 44 |
| **MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA** | |
| Egypt | 100 |
| Ethiopia | 38 |
| Iran | 85 |
| Iraq | 85 |
| Lebanon | 125 |
| Pakistan | 51 |
| **SOUTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA** | |
| Argentina | 346 |
| Venezuela | 322 |
| Uruguay | 331 |
| Bolivia | 55 |
| Brazil | 112 |
| Chile | 188 |
| Colombia | 132 |
| Cuba | 296 |
| Equador | 40 |
| Guatemala | 77 |
| Haiti | 40 |
| Mexico | 121 |
| Paraguay | 84 |
| Peru | 100 |

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, we, in the United States, must intensify our efforts to assist in the development of a coordinated program of aid to relieve hunger and suffering, and to promote expansion and strengthening of the national economies of the democratic nations in ways that will not destroy the principle of self-determination of peoples.

The International Food and Raw Materials Reserve proposal is offered by its large, bipartisan group of sponsors as a measure that offers great aid to peoples abroad in developing, while solving a part of our so-called surpluses problem here at home.

The resolution we have offered does not set up a new international agency. It does not prescribe the exact form of the proposed reserve, or food bank. It simply expresses to our foreign relations officials the desire of this body that they negotiate with other nations to establish such a mechanism.

Other lands around the world have expressed their desire that such an international reserve be created.

The United Nations is studying the matter. There is no doubt that actual negotiations could and would start shortly after this country joined in the effort.

A BOND AMONG FREE PEOPLES

Mr. President, this multilateral international project can move swiftly, creating a new, cooperative bond among the free peoples of the world, if the United States will participate in negotiations.

I can think of no single project in the field of international relations that would do more for the economy of this Nation than the creation of international distributive machinery that would assure us markets for surpluses which are desperately needed abroad.

Nor do I know of any action we might take that would strengthen the alliance of free peoples against communism more than the creation of an international agency that will permit and speed economic development in all of them and make us all true partners in progress toward worldwide abundance.

## EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY PREPAYMENT HEALTH SERVICE PLANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MALONE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 886) to improve the health of the people by encouraging the extension of voluntary prepayment health service plans, facilitating the financing of construction of needed health facilities, assisting in increasing the number

of adequately trained nurses and other health personnel, improving and expanding programs of mental health and public health, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

## EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by us jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

At a later date, I shall send to the committee a statement in support of my amendment. The amendment was offered previously by myself and on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] as a separate bill, under the title "Trade Adjustment Act, 1955."

The purpose of the amendment is to make some accommodation and to provide special consideration for industries which may momentarily or temporarily suffer some adversity because of the national trade policy, which I happen to believe is very important for the Nation.

I strongly support the reciprocal trade program and the general purpose of H. R. 1, but feel that the amendment, which in no way affects tariff schedules, but provides only for Government cooperation and assistance for industries which may be adversely affected, is necessary.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD, as well as being referred to the Committee on Finance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Finance; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

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

After the enacting clause, insert "Title I."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "That this" and insert "Section 1. This."

At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Trade Adjustment Act of 1955.'

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) It is recognized that the maintenance of a sound domestic economy and healthy international relations requires that the United States engage in trade among the free nations of the world. Further, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 reflects the congressional desire that the President be authorized to negotiate with the other countries of the world with a view to lowering trade barriers. The Congress has also recognized, in enacting the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, that there are situations in which the reduction of trade barriers, although redounding to the benefit of the Nation as a whole, may have serious adverse effects on particular domestic industries. These provisions provide mechanisms for determining at what point reductions in trade barriers, either in prospect or already accomplished, will have such adverse effects. They provide no method by which greater prosperity and security for the Nation as a whole can be secured by the reduction of trade barriers, while avoiding or ameliorating the economic losses which particular communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals may suffer in the adjustment of their productive activities which may be made necessary by such reduction. It is the purpose of this title to resolve this problem by providing assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in the adjustment of their productive activity to the economic conditions created by the national trade policy. It is not the purpose of this title to provide a permanent subsidy, but rather to provide the means by which those affected by lowered trade barriers may be assisted in the period of their adjustment.

"(b) It is the intention of Congress that, in determining eligibility for the assistance provided for under this title, the title shall be construed liberally and that any doubt regarding eligibility shall be resolved in favor of the applicant.

"ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT BOARD

"SEC. 203. The President shall appoint a 5-member board to be known as the Trade Adjustment Board (hereinafter called the Board), 1 member of which he shall designate as Chairman. The members of the Board shall be appointed from among the officers and employees of the executive branch of the Government and shall serve without compensation in addition to that otherwise received as officers or employees in the executive branch of the Government, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Board.

"SEC. 204. For the purposes of performing its duties, the Board is authorized to—

"(a) hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, and to take such testimony, as the Board may deem advisable;

"(b) secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this section; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Board upon request made by the Chairman;

"(c) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths, to take testimony, to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Any member of the Board may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Board. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The Board is authorized to exercise any of the powers conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 21 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, and subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to witnesses before the Board; and

"(d) establish such rules, regulations and procedures as may be appropriate to permit the Board to perform the functions prescribed in this title.

"SEC. 205 (a) Whenever the President, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by section 212 of this title, shall determine to invoke the provisions of this title with reference to any article as to which a modification in the rate of duty or other import restriction, or any other concession, has been found either to threaten or to have caused serious injury to a domestic industry, he shall notify the Board of his decision.

"(b) After the notification by the President provided for above, the Board shall, upon application by any community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, employee, or organization representing employees, determine whether the applicant is eligible, or represents persons eligible, to receive the benefits provided for in this title. If the Board shall determine that any community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, employee, or organization representing employees is eligible for the benefits provided for in this title, or represents persons so eligible, it shall issue a certificate describing the community, industrial development corporation, business enterprise, or employees found eligible which shall conclusively establish for a period of 18 months or such shorter period as the Board may determine that the described persons are eligible for the benefits provided for in this title. Such certificates shall state the period for which they are valid and shall automatically expire at the end of such period. Upon application, the Board shall have authority to renew any certificates of eligibility for successive periods of 18 months, or less, upon a showing that such renewal is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title. The Board shall also have authority on its own motion, or upon the motion of any interested person, to cancel any such certificate of eligibility if it finds the continued existence of such certificate is not necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title.

"(c) The following may be determined by the Board to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this title:

"(1) Any business enterprise engaged in the production of an article identical to or directly competitive with an article with reference to which this title shall have been invoked.

"(2) Any unemployed individual whose last regular employment shall have been in a business enterprise which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this title.

"(3) Any community a substantial number of the residents of which are individuals who are eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for by this title.

"(4) Any industrial development corporation organized for the purpose of aiding the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or diversification of production in a community which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this title.

"In determining whether a particular business enterprise is eligible for the benefits provided for in this title, the Board shall consider what portion of the total production of such enterprise consists of the production of an article identical to or directly competitive with the article with reference to which this title shall have been invoked. In determining whether any such enterprise or any community or industrial development corporation is eligible for such benefits the Board shall also consider whether such enterprise, community, or industrial development corporation has developed satisfactory proposals for programs of economic adjustment consonant with the purposes of this title.

"(d) As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'industrial development corporation' includes any body organized and operated by private citizens for the purpose of aiding the development of a more balanced and diversified economy or diversification of production in a community

through industrial development, the training or retraining of employees, or through any other means.

"(2) The term 'employee' includes an unemployed individual whose last regular employment shall have been in a business enterprise which is eligible or may be determined to be eligible for the benefits provided for in this title.

"ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS

"SEC. 206. Information and advice: Any business enterprise found to be eligible by the Board for assistance under this title may apply to appropriate departments and agencies of the Government for technical information, market research, or any other form of information and advice which might be of assistance in the development of more efficient methods of production and in the development of new lines of production. Similarly, any community or industrial development corporation found eligible for assistance under this title may apply to appropriate departments and agencies of the Government for such information and advice as will enable it to develop a more balanced and diversified economy.

"SEC. 207. Loans: Section 207 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended—

"(a) by striking out the word 'and' at the end of subsection (d);

"(b) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the word 'and'; and

"(c) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(f) to make such loans as the Administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to business enterprises and communities, either in their corporate capacity or as represented through industrial development corporations or similar agencies, for the adjustment by such business enterprises and communities to economic conditions resulting from the trade policy of the United States: *Provided, however,* That no such loans shall be made by the Administration to any business enterprise or community unless the Trade Adjustment Board, as established under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955, shall have certified to the Administration that such business enterprise or community is eligible for benefits under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954: *And provided further,* That the requirements of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable to the loans authorized to be made under this subsection.'

"SEC. 208. Unemployment compensation: (a) (1) The Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall on behalf of the United States enter into an agreement with any State in which an enterprise or community, with respect to which a certificate of eligibility has been issued under this title, is located, under which the State, as agent of the United States, will make supplementary payments of compensation to unemployed individuals in the State as provided for in this section, and will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of compensation under this section.

"(2) Supplementary payments of unemployment compensation under this section shall be made only to individuals within the class of individuals determined by the Board under section 205 of this title to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this title.

"(3) If the amount of unemployment compensation payable to an individual under the law of the State in which he is eligible to receive unemployment compensation is less than 66⅔ percent of his average weekly wage, as determined under such law, then the amount of the supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual under this section for a week of total unemployment shall be an amount equal to the amount by which 66⅔ percent of such average weekly wage exceeds the amount paid to the individual under the unemployment compensation law of the State (including payments made by reason of dependents).

"(4) In any case where an unemployed individual receiving supplementary compensation under this section is no longer entitled to payment of compensation under the unemployment compensation laws of the State solely by reason of the expiration of the period for which such compensation is payable under such laws, there shall be paid to such individual, out of amounts paid to such State by the United States for such purpose and without cost to such State, compensation in an amount equal to the rate of State unemployment compensation and any supplementary compensation under this section which he was receiving immediately prior to the time he was no longer entitled to receive such rate. In order to remain eligible for compensation under this paragraph, an individual must comply with the provisions of State law with respect to ability and availability for work, and with respect to the acceptance of offers of suitable work, and failure to so comply shall result in immediate cessation of payment under this paragraph. The total period during which an unemployed individual may receive benefits under this section shall not exceed 52 weeks.

"(5) The amount of the Federal supplementary payment of unemployment compensation to an individual for a week of partial unemployment shall be the amount necessary to provide such individual with a weekly benefit equal to the aggregate he would have received under paragraph (3) of this subsection for a week of total unemployment, less his earnings for such week in excess of the partial earnings allowance, if any, permitted by the unemployment compensation law of the State.

"(6) Any agreement under this section shall provide that compensation otherwise payable to any individual under the State's unemployment compensation law will not be denied or reduced for any week by reason of any payment made pursuant to such agreement. No agreement under this section for payment of compensation by a State agency shall be valid if compensation payable to any individual under the law of such State is less than it would have been under such law as it existed on January 1, 1955.

"(b) Whenever the Board, either upon application of an interested party or upon its own motion, determines that unemployment among individuals found by the Board to be eligible to receive the benefits provided for in this tile is no longer attributable to the trade policy of the United States, no further payments shall be made under this section to such individuals with respect to weeks of unemployment occurring after the date of such determination by the Board, or occurring during any period for which there is not in effect a certification under section 205 describing such individuals.

"(c) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of compensation made under and in accordance with an agreement under this section which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

"(d) In making payments pursuant to this section, there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this section for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical sampling, or other method, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(e) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payments to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this section, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this section may be made.

"(g) An agreement under this section may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section.

"(h) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this section, as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this section.

"(i) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this section if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided by this section.

"(j) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(k) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act.

"(l) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this section or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(m) The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreement under this section.

"SEC. 209. Training and transportation: (a) The Secretary shall—

"(1) prescribe and provide suitable training for unemployed individuals eligible for the benefits of this title who are in need of retraining, reemployment, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation;

"(2) utilize and extend all existing Federal governmental facilities, and utilize the

facilities of any other governmental agency maintained by joint Federal and State contributions, to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(3) by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with existing Federal, State, and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the purpose of coordinating his activities with those of such Federal, State, and local agencies.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that (1) no job opportunity for an unemployed individual found eligible for the benefits of this title exists within his own current labor market area, (2) a job opportunity for such individual equivalent to his former employment is available at a place in the United States outside of his current labor market area, (3) such individual agrees to take the job opportunity outside of his labor market area, and (4) the acceptance of such employment would be in the best interest of the United States, then the Secretary is authorized to make available to such individual at Government expense, facilities for the movement of such individual, his dependents, and his household effects to a location designated by such individual and approved by the Secretary, by using Government or commercial means of transportation.

"SEC. 210. Retirement: (a) Whenever the Secretary shall determine that any individual, 60 years or older, included within a certificate of eligibility issued by the Board is unemployed as a result of the national trade policy of the United States and is unable to find employment because of his advanced age, the Secretary shall issue a certificate containing such a finding.

"(b) Section 216 (a) of the Social Security Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'RETIREMENT AGE

"'(a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term "retirement age" means age 65.

"'(2) In the case of an individual who is certified by the Secretary of Labor as unemployed by reason of the trade policy of the United States and unable to find employment because of advanced age, the term "retirement age" means age 60.'

"(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect with respect to payments made for months beginning more than 1 month after the date this title is enacted.

"SEC. 211. Accelerated amortization: (a) Section 168 (e) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding after the words 'necessary in the interest of national defense during the emergency period', the words 'or necessary for the development of new or different lines of production by an eligible business enterprise or of a more balanced economy in an eligible community'; and by adding after the words 'attributable to defense purposes' the words 'or the national trade policy of the United States, as the case may be.'

"(b) Section 168 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding the following:

"'(3) Eligible business enterprise, community: As used in this section the terms "eligible business enterprise" and "eligible community" refer to business enterprises or communities holding certificates of eligibility under the Trade Adjustment Act of 1954.'

"SEC. 212. Section 7 (c) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission's report of its investigation and hearings, the President may (1) make such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the respective domestic industry, or (2) notify the Trade Adjustment Board, created under the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955, that he has invoked the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955 with respect to such industry. If the President does not take either of such actions within 60 days, he shall immediately submit a report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and to the Committee on Finance of the Senate stating why he has not made such adjustments or modifications, imposed such quotas, or invoked the provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act of 1955.'"

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

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the American-Jewish Tercentennary Civic Assembly, at Norfolk, Va., on March 20, 1955.

Remarks made by him in the Senate on March 24, on a proposed code of peace between Egypt and Israel, and condensation of address by the Honorable Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, proposing a code of peace between Egypt and Israel.

By Mr. BYRD:

Statement by Mr. Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, before Public Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, on Senate bill 1160.

## COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND THE LOSS OF THE PEACH CROP

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the cold weather we have recently experienced throughout the country, and particularly in the South, has had disastrous effects on the cash crops in South Carolina. A recent hailstorm, with hail about the size of small hen eggs, did considerable damage; and then came the freeze of a few days ago, which has virtually destroyed the entire peach crop, costing the small farmers and peach growers untold millions of dollars. Our loss in peaches alone will exceed $10 million.

In the section of the State in which I live, there has developed in the past 20 years the finest peach-growing industry in any part of the United States. From the Piedmont section, alone, we ship approximately 5,000 freight cars of peaches annually. Our smaller crops also of pears, apples, and other fruits have been damaged almost beyond recovery. Our ready market vegetable crops have been irreparably injured.

With the reduction in acreage of the cotton crops, our cash crops for the market are virtually destroyed. Not only the large farmers, but also those on small farms, will be adversely affected by the elements over which none of us has any control.

It is my purpose to secure whatever relief we can to increase our cotton acreage, so as to meet the deficits which will be sustained in the destruction of our ready money markets from peaches, vegetables, and fruits.

As a part of my remarks, I wish to incorporate an editorial appearing yesterday in one of the State's largest papers, the State of Columbia, S. C., which goes into detail regarding the destruction of our orchards and the calamity which nature has visited upon the people whom I have the honor to represent.

I also desire to incorporate in the RECORD a telegram from a friend of mine, Mr. Henry Gramling, in reference to the proposed increase in the cotton allotments.

I assure the Senate and my friends that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate will devote itself to the pressing problems now confronting the stricken farmers, vegetable growers, and especially the peach growers throughout the South, and those affected in South Carolina.

The question is one of immediate and vital concern to thousands of small farmers and large peach growers alike. The members of the Committee on Agriculture will concern themselves now with the various methods of relief which we hope to put into effect for them. Their salvation depends in large measure upon effective relief now—at this very moment. We must act quickly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial and telegram to which I have referred.

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

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of March 29, 1955]

FRUIT CROP RUINED

It was distressing on Sunday morning to awake and find that many beautiful flowers and much new growth had been spoiled during the night by the extreme cold, but this loss, while greatly to be regretted, must come second to the great damage done to South Carolina's fruit crop, which was pretty well wiped out.

Reports from reliable sources say the loss in peaches was between $7 million and $10 million, which is an especially hard blow to take in view of earlier destruction in the Ridge section caused by a hail storm.

There was a potential this year of 6,500 freight cars. For the last 4 years the average has been 5,000.

In Saturday night's freeze minor fruits such as pears and apples also were damaged beyond recuperation.

Peach growing is indeed a hazardous way to make a living, but hardy souls, we are glad to say, continue to fight the battle. The heaviest planting is in Spartanburg County, which produces 60 percent of our crop. There are many trees in York and other Piedmont Counties. The Ridge is the pioneer, and still produces many bushels of the delicious fruit. Lexington has some fine orchards.

While the immediate sections and especially the individual growers will feel the loss the greatest, such a disaster as that which has come to our fruit crop, has a wider effect and a deeper significance than just upon those involved. Such a loss cannot be sustained without reverberations.

There was nothing that could have been done to avoid the loss, since it came from

an act of God, whose wisdom we have no right to question, though we may not always immediately, as in this case, reason why.

GRAMLING, S. C., *March 29, 1955.*

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,

*Washington, D. C.:*

Since the disastrous freeze, we the farmers of the Upper Piedmont section of South Carolina, wish to express our appreciation for the interest you have put forth in our behalf. Last evening a large representative group from this section met at Gramling; after long discussion they have asked me to notify you at once that we feel that the greatest relief, and in many cases the only relief, which can be received would be the privilege of putting more acreage than the present allotment to cotton. We all would greatly appreciate you informing us of any step which we may take which would assist you in your endeavor to acquire same, and as we work out our problems we would also appreciate your help and guidance and any suggestions you may offer as the time element is of utmost importance in making definite plans.

Most of the people who are hurt the worst from this disaster are the large families who have lived on the farm and look to the labor in the orchards for their livelihood. Most of these men have large families and it is impossible for them to acquire other employment. We feel that if in your endeavor you can work out the possibility of them turning to some other crop which they can grow profitably, is the only solution.

HENRY GRAMLING.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—STATEMENT BY THE LATE LT. GEN. RAYMOND McLAIN

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Congress has before it the problem of a proper reserve for the defense of the United States. Many of us, who have given lifetime study to our defensive problems, believe that one of the important steps in universal military training. Under proper regulation such training will give us a reservoir of trained men, men who know how to protect themselves, and who are imbued with the high ideals of the American Government.

We cannot defend ourselves with push-button implements. In hundreds of years of experience, there has never been found anything to take the place of the trained ground soldier.

Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, a great civilian soldier, answered the last rollcall on December 14, 1954. Right up to the last days of his life he retained his interest in the defense of our country.

Life magazine recently published deathbed comments of General McLain. These have been summed up in the Army and Navy Journal under the heading "Lt. Gen. McLain's Legacy," and I ask unanimous consent to have the item published in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

LIEUTENANT GENERAL MCLAIN'S LEGACY

The current issue of Life magazine publishes the deathbed comments of Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, called "the greatest civilian soldier of our times," concerning the need for adequate Reserve Forces.

General McLain, a banker-soldier who gave much of the last years of his life to this critical problem, died of leukemia at Walter Reed AH, Washington, D. C., on December 14. He was 64.

The Life article, prepared from General McLain's scribbled notes as he faced certain death, concludes an appeal for enactment of Universal Military Training with the assertion that "trained manpower is our best assurance that the H-bomb will never have to be used."

General McLain declared:

"The crux of national security is to protect the Nation and its institutions from destruction. The employment of a strategy based solely on nuclear weapons cannot properly be called a defense measure at all, for it almost guarantees the destruction of the very things we would be fighting to preserve. Thus what appears to be an easy way out—the reliance upon machines and atoms rather than upon trained manpower—becomes a trap for us all.

"Is it not better that all of us bear equally the burdens and inconveniences of training for defense rather than face possible death, defeat and slavery amid the ruins of our civilization?

"God grant that we never descend so low in the enjoyment of our blessings that we lose the will to rise and defend the institutions that bring them to us."

## CLOSED - CIRCUIT TELECAST OF CARE AND THE AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Monday night, March 28, occurred an important theatrical event in the city of Washington and in many other cities throughout our Nation.

A pioneering closed-circuit telecast, jointly sponsored by Cooperative for American Remittances to Everywhere and the American National Theater and Academy presented to a vast viewing audience the best in show business over the years.

I am delighted to note this splendid occasion which proved so significant for the twofold objective of (a) focusing ever-increasing public attention and support on the great and remarkable job done by CARE, and (b), demonstrating the renewed vitality of the American theater.

I send to the desk the statements made regarding the "CARE–ANTA 1955 Album" as carried in the printed program of the event, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, preceded by further brief introductory remarks of my own.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

It is most appropriate that the living theater, which has always contributed generously to humanitarian causes, join together with a great welfare organization devoted to human well-being.

When Congress chartered ANTA, the very distinguished list of its incorporators signified the vast and broad potentialities of this organization.

Since enactment of that charter in 1935, ANTA has reached out to fulfill its potentialities in serving the living theater—professional, community, and educational.

Everyone recognizes, however, that a great deal more needs still be done to bring the American living theater to the American people, particularly at the grassroots.

We who prize American culture, we who are proud of the contributions made by our own American talent: Our authors, producers, composers, actors and actresses, stage technicians, and all of the affiliated members of the theater arts, foresee still unreached horizons which ANTA can attain, particularly through modern miracles such as television. But whether it is on the boards of the stage before the footlights, or in front of closed circuit TV cameras, we wish every success to ANTA in its efforts.

PROBLEMS OF LEGITIMATE STAGE

Of course, we know full well that the legitimate stage has recently faced numerous problems such as ever mounting costs of production. The Federal admissions tax has served as a damper. Closing of playhouses because of absorption for other purposes has deprived the theater of many outlets. Competition by other media has posed problems which are, however, far from insuperable.

All of this should, however, spur on the living theater to greater achievements on the American scene.

On the foreign front, I may state, as senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that we Americans have been gratified to see how traveling troupes of the American theater have wrought a profoundly constructive impression upon the consciousness of the people of West European and other countries. These troupes have brought some of the finest American productions to foreign lands. And this is but a symbol of what can and should be done further in the crucial battle of ideas throughout the world—a battle in which we must proudly uphold the banner of American culture against those who would defame it.

ANOTHER WEAPON IN THE BATTLE—CARE

Now, men's stomachs must be fed as must men's minds. I turn, therefore, to that remarkable organization CARE. One need only read the headlines of this afternoon and of tomorrow—regarding the needs of free peoples in the underdeveloped areas of the world, to see full well why it is so important that this organization be given every support.

It should be given the further enthusiastic support in particular of the United States Government by releasing more food surpluses for distribution abroad, rather than simply have those surpluses accumulate more and more storage charges in Government warehouses.

And it should receive the increasing contributions by the American people, themselves, eager to fulfill the humanitarian role which we of the United States have traditionally fulfilled, with sincere pride in our obligation to our brothers overseas. And, I may note, we, the people, have likewise always prized the self-help concept which CARE is demonstrating so practically in many countries. Self-help, food aid, democratic encouragement—these are key concepts of CARE and its 25 component welfare organizations.

PAGES FROM ANTA ALBUM PROGRAM

There follow now the introductory statements by leaders of CARE, ANTA and the Dumont network in connection with the closed circuit theater telecast program. At the outset is the text of ANTA's Congressional Charter of 1935.

[Seventy-fourth Congress of the United States of America; at the 1st session, begun and held at the city of Washington on Thursday, the 3d day of January 1935]

An act to incorporate the American National Theater and Academy

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Leopold Stokowski, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Evelyn Price (Mrs.

Eli Kirk Price), of Philadelphia, Pa.; George W. Norris, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Samuel S. Fleischer, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Amory Hare Hutchinson, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Ellen D. Cleveland (Mrs. Richard F. Cleveland), of Baltimore, Md.; Otto T. Mallory, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Roland S. Morris, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. George H. Lorimer, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Hugh Hampton Young, of Baltimore, Md.; Richard F. Cleveland, of Baltimore, Md.; J. Howard Reber, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Mary Stewart French, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Clara R. Mason, of Philadelphia, Pa.; Katharine Dexter McCormick (Mrs. Stanley McCormick), of Chicago, Ill.; Evangeline Stokowski (Mrs. Leopold Stokowski), of New York, N. Y.; Elsie Jenkins Symington (Mrs. Donald Symington), of Baltimore Md.; B. Howell Griswold, of Baltimore, Md.; Ann Morgan, of New York, N. Y.; John Hay Whitney, of New York, N. Y.; Otto H. Kahn, of New York, N. Y. Harriet Barnes Pratt (Mrs. Harold I. Pratt), of New York, N. Y.; Mrs. W. Murray Crane, of New York, N. Y.; A. Conger Goodyear, of New York, N. Y.; Alice Garrett (Mrs. John W. Garrett), of Baltimore, Md.; John W. Garrett, of Baltimore, Md.; Joy Montgomery Higgins, of New York, N. Y.; Arthur Woods, of New York, N. Y.; Helen Woods (Mrs. Arthur Woods), of New York, N. Y.; C. Lawton Campbell, of New York, N. Y.; John H. Finley, of New York, N. Y.; Cass Canfield, of New York, N. Y.; Katharine E. Canfield (Mrs. Cass Canfield), of New York, N. Y.; William Rhinelander Stewart, of New York, N. Y.; Dorothea Blagden (Mrs. Linzee Blagden), of New York, N. Y.; John W. Davis, of New York, N. Y.; Francis Anita Crane, of New York, N. Y.; Frank L. Polk, of New York, N. Y.; Edward M. M. Warburg, of New York, N. Y.; William Green, of Washington, D. C.; Mary Chichester du Pont (Mrs. Felix du Pont), of Wilmington, Del.; Betty Hawley, of New York, N. Y.; Isabelle Anderson (Mrs. Larz Anderson), of Washington, D. C.; Mabel Boardman, of Washington, D. C.; Huibertje Lansing Pryn Hamlin (Mrs. Charles Hamlin), of Washington, D. C.; their associates and successors, duly chosen, are hereby incorporated, constituted, and declared to be a body corporate. The name of this corporation shall be the American National Theater and Academy.

SEC. 2. The corporation shall be nonprofit and without capital stock. Its purposes shall embrace:

(a) The presentation of theatrical productions of the highest type;

(b) The stimulation of public interest in the drama as an art belonging both to the theater and to literature and thereby to be enjoyed both on the stage and in the study;

(c) The advancement of interest in the drama throughout the United States of America by furthering in the production of the best plays, interpreted by the best actors at a minimum cost;

(d) The further development of the study of drama of the present and past in our universities, colleges, schools, and elsewhere;

(e) The sponsoring, encouraging, and developing of the art and technique of the theater through a school within the National Academy.

SEC. 3. That the corporation created by this act shall have the following powers:

To have perpetual succession with power to sue and to be sued in the courts of law and equity; to receive, hold, own, use, mortgage, and dispose of such real estate and personal property as shall be necessary for its corporate purposes; to adopt a corporate seal and alter the same at pleasure; to adopt a constitution, bylaws, and regulations to carry out its purposes not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any States; to establish and maintain offices and buildings for the conduct of its business; to establish State and Territorial organizations and local branches; and generally to do all such acts and things as may be necessary and proper in carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 4. That the organization shall be nonpolitical, nonsectarian, as an organization shall not promote the candidacy of any persons seeking public office. There shall be no honorary members.

SEC. 5. That said corporation and its State and local branches and subdivisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use in carrying out its purposes the name "The American National Theater and Academy."

SEC. 6. That said corporation be, and is hereby, authorized to have its headquarters and hold its meetings at such places within or without the District of Columbia as it from time to time may deem best.

SEC. 7. The corporation is hereby authorized and empowered to receive by devise, request, donation, or otherwise, either real or personal property, and to hold the same absolutely or in trust and to invest, reinvest, and manage the same in accordance with the provisions of its constitution and to apply said property and the income arising therefrom to the objects of its creation and according to the instructions of its donors.

SEC. 8. That said corporation shall on or before the 1st day of January in each year make and transmit to Congress a report of its proceedings for the preceding calendar year, including a full and complete report of its receipts and expenditures: *Provided, however,* That said report shall not be printed as a public document.

SEC. 9. That as a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, "The American National Theater and Academy" shall file in the office of the Secretary or the properly designated officer of each State or Territory or the District of Columbia in which is located either its headquarters or branches or subdivisions thereof the name and post-office address of an authorized agent upon whom legal process or demand against "The American National Theater and Academy" may be served.

SEC. 10. That the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act is hereby expressly reserved.

JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
JOHN N. GARNER,
*Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.*

Approved July 5, 1935.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

---

## CARE AND ANTA

CARE is happy to be associated with ANTA in this enterprise. It serves not only the great cultural purpose for which ANTA was organized, but also the far-reaching humanitarian aims that to the American people are associated with the name of CARE. The fact that ANTA invited CARE to co-sponsor its annual album show for 1955 is proof of the understanding of the responsibilities which we, the American people as a whole, have towards the outside world and its manifold needs. Foreign aid is not a problem for the Government alone. It is something that concerns all of us and if such aid is indeed to bring the lasting result we all hope for: To awaken and strengthen democracy in all the areas of need throughout the free world, to contribute to the enlightenment of peoples everywhere, and to foster mutual understanding and friendship between free nations.

It is in that concept that CARE has carried on its worldwide aid program since its founding almost a decade ago. During those years CARE's operations have expanded from direct aid to relatives and friends in Europe to the more general relief of needy people in war-torn Vietnam, Korea, and other countries of the East and Latin America. It has also added the concept of self-help, which puts into the hands of free men the tools "to help them help themselves."

It is with a great deal of pride that I, as executive director of CARE, in which 25 major welfare organizations of the United States have forged a joint instrument for foreign aid, hail the fact that through the cooperation of ANTA the humanitarian work of CARE will receive new substantial support.

PAUL COMLY FRENCH,
*Executive Director, CARE.*

---

### A MESSAGE FROM ANTA'S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

In presenting the ANTA Album on closed circuit television this year, ANTA is attempting to fulfill a multifold purpose: To make the legitimate theater available to the country at large over a new medium for the first time—to spread the name of ANTA, its aims and purposes and the importance of its congressional charter—and to raise money with which CARE and ANTA can continue to carry out their work.

The importance of CARE's humanitarian activities abroad needs no delineation on this page and ANTA's own contributions in combating Iron Curtain propaganda overseas is explained elsewhere in this brochure. It is, however, ANTA's domestic program that we want to bring to the attention of the theater-loving public. ANTA's primary purpose, as expressed in its charter, is to extend the living theater throughout the United States—in fact, to establish a national theater. This is a vast undertaking, requiring sound, long-range planning; it is not to be accomplished overnight. ANTA has developed such a plan, which it considers to be a first step in the establishment of a national theater. It is the 40 theater circuit.

This project is broad in scope, imaginative in design and unique in economic concept. Space limitations prevent a detailed explanation here. Briefly, however, it calls for the creation of four production centers, in each of which 10 different plays will be prepared for production. These centers will be strategically located geographically—one on the east coast, one on the west, one in the central States and the other in the south central or southwestern section. Thus we will develop 4 professional talent pool areas in diverse locations across the country instead of concentrating this talent in New York as happens now. It will also mean the creation of 3 new centers of production activity outside New York. In addition, the plan will establish operating theaters in 40 cities of the United States—cities which presently receive little or no professional theater. These theaters will be operated on a nonprofit corporate basis through ANTA chapters founded in the respective communities.

After the plays have been rehearsed and mounted in the production centers, the companies will fan out to the 40 theaters and on 1 given night, all 40 plays will open simultaneously in 40 cities across the country Each production will run 1 week in each city and then begin a circuit tour of 1 week engagements in the remaining 39. This means that audiences in 40 cities from coast to coast will have the opportunity to see 40 professional theater productions in as many weeks. It means, too, that 40 companies of actors, staff and crew will be assured of 40 weeks' employment. This adoption of mass production techniques and assembly-line methods will cut production costs drastically by engagement of personnel on a seasonal basis, the buying of supplies in bulk quantity and reduction of transportation costs through the equipping of all the theaters with basic lighting and scenic requirements. The streamlined budget makes it possible to bring this saving directly to the audience by scaling the box-office ticket prices to a high of $2.50 down to $1.50.

The season of plays will include an exciting balance of varied theatrical fare—revivals of Broadway hits, the classics of

Shakespeare and Shaw, 2 to 4 musicals and 3 to 4 new scripts, running the full gamut of comedy, tragedy, melodrama, and farce. The best of the theater will be made available to the greatest number of people at the most reasonable prices.

All this requires financing, which ANTA proposes to acquire from three basic sources. First, the foundations have expressed a deep interest in assisting and promoting such a project. Second, the theater profession itself is ready to make a variety of contributions ranging from cash to concessions. And third, the communities which will enjoy the fruit of this labor will, we know, want to participate in the establishment of theaters in which the whole country can share and which will prove to the world in dramatic terms that the United States has created a native culture of which it is proud and which it supports.

WILLARD SWIRE,
*Executive Director, American National Theatre and Academy.*

---

DUMONT TELEVISION NETWORK,
*New York, N. Y.*

History has been made by everyone connected with the 1955 ANTA Album, on both sides of the footlights. For the first time, the brightest stars in the theatrical firmament, who annually contribute their talents to make the ANTA Album the top box office attraction of New York's brilliant theater season, can be seen and heard simultaneously in cities throughout the land. From coast to coast and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, theater lovers of the United States can see and enjoy the leading luminaries of the legitimate stage. They are seen portraying roles which established or enhanced their fame and they are seen simultaneously with their action. No "canned" shadow of a bygone scene is this performance, but an electronic transmigration of their living art to be relished by nearly 100,000 devotees gathered in upwards of 40 farflung theaters across the country.

This Telectronic miracle has been achieved with the cooperation of the DuMont television network. DuMont's Adelphi Teletheatre is playing host to a New York audience of 1,100 and, at the same time that the action is being witnessed by the live audience, it is being televised by a battery of 6 DuMont cameras which instantaneously flash the televised images over some 7,500 miles of coaxial cables and microwave relays to theater screens in other cities.

The Adelphi Theatre has been well known for many years to New York audiences who formerly saw leading Broadway productions on its stage. A few years ago DuMont converted it to television production and since that time television audiences throughout the country have become familiar with it as the source of such successful TV programs as Opera Cameos, Chance of a Lifetime and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen's Life Is Worth Living.

The telecast of the 1955 ANTA Album is like the iceberg which shows only 10 percent of its mass above the surface. While the New York audience can see a maze of electronic equipment and a small army of technicians (which is invisible to the remote audiences) the major part of the DuMont equipment and personnel who participated in the project remain anoymously behind the scenes. More than 100 members of the DuMont organization have been involved in the planning and execution of this telecast. Executives of ANTA, CARE, and DuMont spent more than 6 months studying the myriad of details connected with this unique undertaking. Television stations affiliated with the DuMont network in all parts of the country have helped to publicize this trailblazing event with the result that ANTA is better known throughout the land than ever before. By this cooperation between television and the theater, ANTA has taken an aggressive step toward the goal for which it was chartered by Congress—to establish a truly national theater and academy in America.

M. A. MAYERS,
*General Manager, Closed Circuit Operation.*

---

ANTA'S OFFICERS SPEAK

The American National Theater and Academy is the only theatrical organization in this country designed to serve all facets of the American theater—professional, community, and educational. ANTA has an impressive record of past achievement, a practical assortment of current services, and stimulating plans for the future.

In an effort to make ANTA a truly national organization, we have worked toward wide regional representation on our board of directors. This year we are proud to announce that we have board members from 23 States, representing all phases of theater activity.

ANTA has sponsored two national theater assemblies, the first in 1950 in New York and the second in Cincinnati in 1953. Delegates attended from every region of the Nation. Organizations and leaders from community, university, high school, and children's theater, together with representatives of professional theater and the major theatrical unions, reaffirmed their faith in ANTA as the instrumental organization through which national-theater cooperation can be achieved.

Under ANTA sponsorship, two Monterey drama festivals in 1952 and 1953 have showcased many farflung California theater groups. ANTA has also helped to organize and service almost all the various regional conferences. ANTA representatives or guest speakers have appeared at the annual Southwest, Southeastern, New England, Children's, and Arena Theater Conferences.

ANTA's usefulness and effectiveness are dependent on the needs of the theaters across the country. Requests for assistance and advice, suggested improvements, ideas for new projects and constructive criticism are essential for ANTA's existence and expansion. Its growth lies in direct proportion to national interest and support.

With the help of our membership and the goodwill of press and public, it will be our constant endeavor to carry out both the spirit and intent of our charter.

CLARENCE DERWENT,
*President, American National Theater and Academy.*

Tonight about 100,000 friends of CARE, ANTA, and the living theater will enjoy a performance which is epoch making. Never before have so many people gathered in theaters to see a presentation of the best of the stage—"live," as our television friends call it.

This evening may easily set a precedent, whereby each and every one of us, though we live in different parts of the world, shares the thrill of a first night at the same time with those actually within the building where it is held. It might be Sir Lawrence Olivier speaking, "Now is the winter of our discontent" from Richard III in the Shakespeare Theater at Stratford, or Willy Loman in Death of a Salesman searching for an answer to what has gone wrong in suburban New York or the birth of a new ballet in a faraway capital. It is conceivable that one performance on closed-circuit television might be seen by more persons than have ever attended all the plays of Shakespeare from the time of the writing until now.

Whatever the future holds for ANTA, it may well feel that on this evening it has opened a new door through which may flow the stimulus of man's thought in its most exciting form—the magic of the shared theater.

ROBERT W. DOWLING,
*Chairman, Board of Directors, American National Theater and Academy.*

## GIFT TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS OF ARAMAIC NEW TESTAMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is my privilege to call attention to the book which, on Friday last, was deposited in the vault of the Library of Congress. This New Testament is the oldest known in the language of Christ. As ours is a country whose most solemn pronouncements contain the words "under God," no other worldly possession could be more important to us. The New Testament is a book addressed to the people and beloved by the people throughout the Christian centuries. It is therefore appropriate that this earliest documentation should belong to the people. The gift of this Codex to the Library of Congress is a gift to the people of the United States and of the world. The Aramaic Bible Foundation in undertaking to make this gift possible deserves every commendation and encouragement. The announcement of this gift made front page news in virtually every American newspaper. The manuscript itself deserves the attention of everyone. For Members of Congress and the press the book will be available for private inspection on Thursday, tomorrow, at the Whitall Pavilion of the Library of Congress from 11 to 4. It will be put on public view under glass in a case specially built for the purpose and installed in the great Hall of the Library of Congress on Tuesday the 5th of April.

At a time when the great enemy of this country is seeking to invalidate and discourage the teachings of the Bible, it seems to me appropriate that, in this year, this volume is made available in our historic Library.

---

## EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a number of editorials respecting the administration's highway program.

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

[From the Shawnee (Okla.) News-Star of January 18, 1955]

EITHER WAY, WE GET THE ROADS

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, has come out in strong opposition to the highway building program submitted by the President's committee. BYRD contends the bond-financing plan evades the Federal debt limitation, actually puts the Government in the position of keeping two sets of books.

As an alternative, the Virginia solon has outlined a highway-financing program of which these provisions are major items:

1. Repeal the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government, permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Continuing present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems on a long-standing matching basis. This amounts to $535 million yearly.

3. Continue the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government.

4. Add a half-cent per gallon gas tax, which with the oil levy, will be sufficient to underwrite the $535 million Federal aid program.

BYRD makes the point that if a $20 billion bond issue is made as recommended by the committee, each dollar borrowed will eventually cost the road users $1.55. His is a pay-as-you-go program.

In one vital respect, there is no conflict whatever: Both the committee and BYRD recognize there is a desperate need for a highway-building program. The question is which is the better way to finance such a program.

BYRD, as outstanding defender of the national credit, presently seems the only leader greatly concerned with holding to the Federal debt limitation. His challenging statement that not a dollar has been paid on the Federal debt in 25 years, causes one to think maybe the Virginian has a point when he contends retirement of the proposed $20 billion bond issue by 1987 would never come to pass.

---

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of January 28, 1955]

SOME STATES CAN'T BE TRUSTED

Yesterday on this page there was a good pro and con discussion of the Clay Committee's $101 billion highway plan. It pointed out the objections Senator BYRD has to the proposal because it interferes with States rights. Remove the Federal gasoline tax, or most of it, the Virginia solon urges, let the States increase their gasoline taxes by that much and build more of their own highways.

The joker in the Byrd scheme is that there are too many States like Oklahoma which will not spend the proportion of their highway money that they should on the interstate system. We've seen almost a complete breakdown here of the main-traveled highways while we've laid stretches of concrete over country lanes. This finally made it necessary to build a toll road between Tulsa and Oklahoma City. There should have been a free 4-lane road along an improved United States 66 routing between the 2 cities years ago.

We've been promised a correction of this policy by Governor Gary. He said most of the expenditures during his administration will be on the neglected heavy-traffic highways. But we are years behind on such a program and there is no assurance that the next governor will continue the Gary plan or, for that matter, that Gary will be able to overcome all the legislative bias for the sectional road.

We are no more desirous than Senator BYRD or the American Petroleum Institute of having the Federal gasoline tax fixed on motorists for 30 years, as would be required to secure the bonds the Clay committee would have issued to pay for the highway improvement program. But the theory of separating the Federal Government from the interstate highway program to any greater degree than it is today will never get us an integrated system. There are too many political roadbuilders in the State capitols of the United States.

---

[From the Homestead (Pa.) Messenger of January 24, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAYS

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, known for his close attention to national economy, has serious misgivings about the national highway construction program proposed in the Clay Commission highway report. President Eisenhower's road construction program is based on this Commission's recommendations.

The Commission recommends establishment of a Federal corporation for the highway program. This Corporation would borrow $20 billion from the public and collect $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating along the roads to be constructed. This $25 billion would be obtained to build an estimated 40,000 miles of road.

The $20 billion borrowed from the public plus an estimated $11.5 billion in interest on the loan (figured at 3 percent over 30 years) would be paid, the committee implies, from taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils.

Under this plan, the Federal Corporation would be something like the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission. Instead of tolls, however, the Federal agency would have gas and oil taxes to defray the costs. The Turnpike Commission is paying off its debt much faster than it had ever dreamed; so fast, that plans for construction of turnpike spurs are now cluttering the planning boards.

This tendency is a part of Senator BYRD's opposition to the Federal plan. As he says: "It may be expected that even before the 40,000 miles are constructed, the program will be expanded in mileage, scope, and and amount."

Senator BYRD points out that the recommended 40,000 miles of national roads represents less than 1 percent of all road mileage and averages out to about 800 miles per State. In this connection, the Pennsylvania Turnpike, 327 miles in length, represents less than .004 percent of Pensylvania's 88,000 miles of highway.

The 800 miles per State average to which Senator BYRD refers appears a small amount of road, yet 327 miles of Pennsylvania's Turnpike links the port city of Philadelphia with the industrial city of Pittsburgh. The linking of great urban centers, prime purpose of a national highway system, would probably not require more than 800 miles of road even in the largest States. At the same time, there is no indication that the national-road program contemplates equalizing the mileage to be built in each State. The roads will be constructed where needed, we would assume, so that 1 State might have 1,600 miles and others only a hundred.

Senator BYRD also declares, "As we grow, population shifts, and the impact on specific roads changes, and therefore our road needs shift and change."

Populations do shift, but great industrial centers remain permanent and well-constructed highways allowing free and fast traffic flow will always be favored by motorists bound to them. Growth of new industrial centers is a relatively slow process and normally occurs along transportation rights-of-way offering easy access.

Senator BYRD points up, too, the States rights issue when he says: "When the Federal Government makes a grant, it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the State." This is true in one way or another of every lender-borrower relationship and appears to be good business.

As a substitute for the Clay Commission recommendations, Senator BYRD proposes that the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax now imposed be repealed, permitting the States to reimpose it, and that it be replaced by a one-half cent Federal tax; that the Federal Government continue its matching-fund program, amounting to $535 million, and continue its lubricating-oil tax.

This, the Senator says, would permit the States to retain control over their roads, would save $11.5 billion interest, and would evenly distribute road revenue over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

But, the Senator's proposals would not provide the needed new highway system, entire end and aim of the Commission recommendations. Many States, burdened with heavy costs, have permitted highway systems to deteriorate. Permitting them to impose the 2-cent gasoline tax abandoned by the Federal Government does not mean such revenue would go to highway construction. Part or all of it may go to meet what the State considers more pressing obligations.

---

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of January 17, 1955]

MR. BYRD WARMS UP

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has come out with a preliminary appraisal of the $101-billion highway program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission.

The respected Virginian has made it clear that he is choosing his words with restraint, pending Ike's formal announcement on where he stands.

While merely warming up, so to speak, Mr. BYRD has this to say: "Legerdemain * * * thoroughly unsound * * * a procedure that would violate financial principles, defy budgetary control and evade the Federal debt."

That is pretty good for a starter. In full voice, Mr. BYRD may peel the paint right off the White House.

We admire both his splendid early season form and his views on this matter.

The President's commission says among other things that if a Federal corporation is set up, and if that corporation sells $20 billion worth of 30-year bonds, then for some reason or other we can just forget about adding the total to our national debt.

Nonsense, says Mr. BYRD. The so-called corporation plans to pay 3 percent interest to the bond buyers. Over 30 years, that'll mean the buyers must be paid back their $20 billion plus $11.5 billion in interest. And who'll be in hock for all those billions? The taxpayers, of course. If that isn't adding to the national debt, what is?

Good luck, Senator BYRD. From any angle the whole setup looks about as sound as a chain letter.

---

[From the Reading (Pa.) Eagle of January 25, 1955]

THOROUGHLY UNSOUND

A business executive who discovered that his expenditures were too large for safety could not get his firm out of difficulty by keeping a special cash account that would not be entered in the annual balance sheet. Before long, such accounting would only get a firm into greater financial difficulties. It also would be sure to get whoever tried that method of ignoring realities in heavy trouble with the Government.

Because it is impossible to get rid of an obligation by refusing to look at it and hoping that it will go away if it is ignored, we share Senator HARRY F. BYRD's view about the money-raising formula whereby President Eisenhower's highway committee proposes to finance the $101 billion 10-year road-building program, which Ike says should be initiated.

The committee's idea is to have a special Federal corporation issue Government-guaranteed bonds. These bonds would not be counted as part of the national debt. However, Congress would be required to appropriate the money to pay interest and principal on them.

Such procedures, declares BYRD, would violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade the Federal debt law.

The Senator is so obviously correct that further discussion on that point is unnecessary. Whether the account is kept in the regular book or in a new one at which auditors are not supposed to look, the result is the same. The money spent for roads would be the people's money. Likewise the debt would be their obligation.

Individuals have gone to prison for keeping a separate set of books for the purpose of hiding facts from the Government. What should be done about Government officials who hide the facts from themselves is a

question which probably could best be answered by psychiatrists.

Whatever one may think about the substitute plan which BYRD has submitted, the Senator still deserves credit for making a suggestion that is in accord with honest accounting, elementary arithmetic, and the legal debt limit.

BYRD would continue the present program of allotting $535 million a year to the States on a matching basis. He also would permit the States to take the 2-cents-per-gallon gas tax that the Federal Government now gets and levy a special half-cent tax for the Nation's share of the burden. That, he opines, added to what is realized by the present tax on lubricating oil, would suffice to pay for the highway program.

Maybe BYRD is figuring correctly, and maybe he isn't. But at least he's figuring, and doing it out in the open. His methods would be sound and subject to controls. Those suggested by the committee wouldn't be.

---

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer of January 27, 1955]

NEW ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious opposition in Congress even before its formal submission. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Commitee and economy "watchdog" on Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program submitted on January 11, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at a rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the right-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of "the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates."

The $20-billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean "operating the Government on two sets of books: one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2-cents-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility. Thus, says BYRD:

States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Whether the Federal or State Governments are to bear the increased costs of an adequate highway system, our highways will have to carry some 80 million vehicles by 1974, according to the President's commission. Its chairman, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, told the National Conference on Highway Financing of the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 13: "We are indeed caught in a traffic jam, nationwise."

---

[From the Williamsport (Pa.) Gazette-Bulletin of January 20, 1955]

UNCLE SAM TURNS TO AUTHORITY FINANCING

If Senator SPARKMAN can get away with saying that he believes Dwight Eisenhower should be a Democrat instead of a Republican, we have license to comment that we think Senator HARRY F. BYRD ought to be a Republican instead of a Democrat.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia has just released a statement on what he thinks of the Clay Commission highway report. That's the report that advocates Federal spending of $25 billion to build 40,000 miles of road as an interstate highway system.

Senator BYRD doesn't like the plan one iota. He says the way it is to be financed violates financing principles, defies budgetary control, and evades Federal debt law. Moreover, he points out that sinking so much money in such a permanent road program is dangerous because no one can predict years in advance what specific roads will carry the most traffic.

The Virginia Senator outlines in detail how the Clay Commission suggests the Federal road program be financed. The plan sounds very much like the king-sized version of a local authority. And you know that an authority is one of those financial animals that evolved from the easy-payment plan and is stalking the land urging every township, borough, city, State, and region to ignore its corporate debt limits.

Everyone knows, or should, that long-term financing of any kind, and particularly under an authority, makes things cost twice as much as they do. Now listen to Senator BYRD on the highway financing plan.

For the building of the 40,000 miles of road, "the committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3-percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

"If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the committee can be sold at 3-percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1987, the interest would cost more than $11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55.

"Based on all recent Federal experience, I (BYRD) submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years."

Is it any wonder the Virginia Senator says the plan violates financing principles? And, of course, such a plan wouldn't be considered part of the national debt. But debt or not it would have to be paid off.

That can be understood by Williamsport folks who are now paying sewage-disposal rentals, by school districts who under authorities are renting school buildings, by motorists who are paying off debts incurred by parking authorities and such.

Let it be understood that an authority is not an evil device in itself. It's what men do with it. In no case should any taxpayer delude himself into believing that what authorities borrow need not be paid off and is no debt. It's the same as with a washing machine, radio, or sweeper you buy. You rent it until the purchase price is equaled by the rentals, plus interest and carrying charges and then it's yours.

It will be the same with the Federal road program. Uncle Sam doesn't call it an authority. Perhaps advisedly. But the cost of building the roads will be a debt against the people. That's what Senator BYRD is hollering about. And we join in the chorus.

Authorities are all right in their place but it's high time there is some State and Federal legislation to call authority borrowing debt for that's what it is. There must be some checkrein on this type of financing before the wealthiest Nation in the world goes broke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Is there any further morning business to be transacted? If not, morning business is closed.

---

## INCENTIVE PAY INCREASES FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4720.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing pay and allowances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate is, as stated in its title, an incentive pay bill for the armed services. It comes to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services. On the desk of every Senator there is a copy of the hearings on the bill. At the hearings the committee heard from all the branches of the armed services and, in addition, from 14 to 15 organizations, such as the American Legion, which have long manifested an interest in the whole program of national defense.

The overall pay increase provided in the bill is approximately 6.7 percent.

A comparison between increases in the pay of military personnel and increases in pay of the civilian employees of the Government shows that the pending bill gives a very modest increase in the compensation of military personnel.

An examination of pay increases since World War II discloses that, with respect to civilian employees, in 1948 they received an 11-percent increase in compensation. In 1949 they received 4.1-percent increase in compensation. In 1951 they receive a 10-percent increase. In 1955, this year, the Senate passed and sent to the House a bill providing for a 10-percent increase.

In the case of the armed services personnel, in 1949, Congress passed a career compensation act providing for an average increase of 12 percent. In 1952 the armed services personnel received an

increase of 5.7 percent. As I stated a moment ago, the bill before the Senate proposes an increase of 6.7 percent. All the percentages I have stated represent increases in the budget estimates for compensation.

Mr. President, the basic purpose of this bill is to reduce the tremendous turnover in the personnel of the armed services. The turnover has reached alarming proportions. It has brought about a reduction in our military experience level and has caused the expenditure of enormous sums of money in training the highly skilled personnel essential in today's military organization. It is even more important, Mr. President, that we maintain experienced and trained personnel when the administration is reducing the overall number of men in the military services.

I shall not at this time discuss the wisdom or the unwisdom of that program, but it is very evident that we are going to have a considerably smaller number of men in the armed services, and I think all will agree—indeed, the President, in his message, stressed the fact—that a reduction in the overall number makes it necessary to retain as many as possible of those who have skills so that the Military Establishment of the Nation may be enabled to assume and maintain a position of readiness.

This bill does not approach an increase by any overall flat percentages. It proposes to allow selective increases at points in the careers of men in the armed services where experience demonstrates that they are more likely to leave the service for private work.

We have the largest peacetime military organization we have ever known, and all the signs indicate that it is likely to continue to be large not only for years, but for decades.

I referred to the turnover problem in the armed services. It is significant to note that the total turnover for 2 fiscal years, 1954 and 1955, will be 3,713,000 men. That includes losses of 1,963,200 and gains of 1,749,800. The accretions are less than the losses because of the reduction in the total number of personnel in the armed services.

On June 30, 1954, the total strength was 3,302,000. On June 30, 1955, it is expected to be 2,947,000.

In the year 1954, Mr. President, the armed services experienced one of the lowest reenlistment rates in the history of the Nation; and that was true despite the fact that Congress enacted last year a reenlistment bonus by which it was sought to encourage men to reenlist and make a career of the military service.

In the Army, during 1954, the reenlistment record was only 11.6 percent, whereas in 1949 it was 41.2 percent.

That will give the Senate some idea of the very drastic reduction in the reenlistment rate which makes such legislation as is embraced in this bill absolutely necessary.

In the other services, the Navy and the Air Force, there have also been seriously declining reenlistment rates. In the past several months it is encouraging to note that there has been a slight upturn in reenlistments in all services. Those who have familiarity with the facts attribute this increasing reenlistment rate to the anticipated passage of this proposed legislation. It has had some effect even before its enactment, and we sincerely hope and trust that the enactment of this bill will restore the reenlistment rate in all lines, both commissioned officers and enlisted men, by somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 percent.

The turnover rate in officer personnel is also tremendous. For the 2 fiscal years 1954 and 1955, the turnover is expected to be 264,000, representing losses of 144,000, and accretions of 120,000.

There are many indications, especially among the young commissioned officers, that military service is becoming less and less attractive. Some legislation must be enacted by the Congress to give these men the incentive to make a career of the Army if the efficiency of the armed services is not to suffer greatly.

In the fiscal year 1955, at the present rate, the Air Force will lose by voluntary separation approximately 4,500 pilots, principally in the lower grades. Today in the Air Force the problem is so great that in order to achieve a net increase of 1 pilot it is necessary to train 2½ pilots. The training of pilots in the Air Force involves the expenditure of very large sums of money. I shall give some of the figures very shortly. In this connection, Mr. President, we might well remember that, as the President stated to the Congress in his message on the state of the Union, the operation of jet aircraft was considered by insurance companies to be the most dangerous of all vocations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. In a moment. I should like, first, to state the figures.

In 1954, 1 fatality resulted from each 5 major aircraft accidents.

In 1930, in the days of propeller planes, the figure was 1 out of 13.

In 1947, it was 1 out of 8.

I do not have the figures before me, but in the report it will be found that experienced jet pilots whom we are seeking to retain through this proposed legislation have a very low rate of accidents. Most of them occur with those who are in training. The enactment of this bill, we hope, will reduce the rate and obviate the difficulty with respect to insurance to which the President referred in his message.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think the Senator from Georgia has covered what I had in mind, namely, that while jet flying is extremely dangerous, the number of overall accidents in the Air Force training program per 100,000 flying hours has decreased over the years rather than increased.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that. Pilots with experience prefer jet aircraft to the conventional type of ship. They say it has greater stability and has other features which make it preferable for those who are experienced pilots.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. At this point in the discussion I think it is interesting to note the chart at the bottom of page 70 of the very excellent hearings conducted by the committee. It shows the tremendous decrease in airplane accidents after pilots have had 500 hours of training. The accident rate drops from almost 70 per 100,000 flying hours, in the beginning, to about 10 or 15 after the pilots had between 500 and 1,000 hours of training.

The chart demonstrates very vividly, I think, the saving, not only in the money which is needed to finance the training of young fliers, but also in the cost of repairing or rebuilding airplanes damaged in accidents. Therefore, I believe the incentive pay to induce these men to continue in service is fully justified.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for calling attention to the chart. I had the chart in mind, but had forgotten that it was included in the record of the hearings. I knew it had been discussed.

Not only will there be a saving of human lives and a reduction of injuries to human beings, but also, from a purely monetary standpoint, there will be a great reduction in the losses of aircraft.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Unless the military service can be made sufficiently attractive, the best of our American youth will not seek to qualify themselves as pilots or for any other positions in the Air Force. Men cannot be drafted for that service and then be expected to do the highly skilled work of a pilot. Those who are drafted can be assigned to the lower echelons of the service, but those drafted cannot be expected to do outstanding work as pilots of jet planes. If they are drafted, they will remain in the service for only a relatively short period of time.

Therefore, the incentive pay bill, which contains provisions to care for families, should make the Air Service attractive to young men. It is desirable to have an incentive for a family man, not only to enlist in the service, but also to continue in it.

I think the bill which is now before Senate, which has been so ably developed under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is a measure which will assure the Nation of having the best of its youth seeking careers in the military service in the future. Once they are trained, the country will have an investment which will remain a credit to the United States. These young men will depart from the service and go into other work. The Government will thereby have made an investment which it will not lose within a matter of a few years.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for having brought before the Senate a bill which embodies so much looking to the future security of the United States, by providing for the continuance in the military service of men who are ably qualified for that service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his kind remarks about me. With the exception of what he said about the junior Senator from Georgia, the statement of the Senator from Minnesota showed an unusually fine grasp of the purposes of the bill, and the hopes of those who are promoting it on the floor as to what it will accomplish.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will further yield, there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have higher regard or respect than I do for the Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL. I am guilty of no equivocation when I make that kind of remark, whether it be with respect to a military bill, an agricultural bill, or any other type of measure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator. I sincerely reciprocate his kindly expressions.

We have been discussing aircraft. Let us now turn to the field of submarine operations. In the submarine service, it is important to have men of long experience and highly developed skills. The records show that it is becoming increasingly difficult to retain men in this very vital branch of the service. The Navy has developed its first atomic submarine. It is planned to build 3 or 4 additional of these very remarkable craft, which can stay submerged for many hours.

But it must be remembered that living conditions on a submarine are very difficult, at best, and that it is essential to make careers in the submarine service more attractive if this very vital arm of our Defense Establishment is to be maintained.

I shall merely comment briefly on some of the facts reflected by the evidence developed at the hearings as to the cost of retaining personnel in certain fields of the military service, and the enormous financial losses which are incurred when trained personnel leave the service. I point out that it costs $3,200 for basic training or boot training, for the first 6 months. In other words, whereas the cost of the entire bill will be $745 million, it costs $960 million to give 300,000 men their basic training.

At present it costs $9,000 to train a radio repairman, and then he will very likely be lost to private industry, unless he be given an incentive, such as the bill provides, to remain in the military service.

It costs $120,000 to train a fighter pilot to handle a jet plane. A man must have had long training before he can be entrusted with the handling of one of the very valuable B–47's, which are so essential to our Strategic Air Command. To train such a pilot costs $275,000.

So if the bill only partially accomplishes the purpose of retaining men of these skills in the armed services, it will be an economy to the Treasury of the United States, merely based on the cost of training new personnel to supplant those who are now leaving the service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am very much struck by the point which the Senator is bringing out about the turnover and the training of new personnel. I know what he states is certainly true in the military field, probably even more so than in the civilian field. The same situation has been experienced with respect to employees in the civil service. There has been a turnover of 1 million persons in the past 2 years, out of approximately 2,500,000 employed. This has meant a loss to the Federal Government of millions of dollars, because when a man or woman is newly employed, it must be realized that he or she cannot immediately do the work as efficiently as can a person who has been trained over a period of several years. The same is true in the military service, only more emphasized.

Mr. RUSSELL. The turnover is becoming very alarming in some branches of the service. For example, of 4,000 young naval officers who had received training in the Naval ROTC units, and who had completed their obligated service over a period of 3 years, only 200 applied for commissions in the Regular Navy. So it is very evident that there has been an alarming degree of erosion of trained men from the armed services.

The basic concept of the bill is to reduce the personnel turnover by granting pay increases on a selective basis.

The selective features of the bill are as follows:

In the first place, there are no increases in basic pay of enlisted men and officers during their period of obligated service. In other words, for the first 3 years of commissioned service or for the first 2 years of enlisted service, there is no increase in basic pay. That is under the so-called obligated theory.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. By the term "obligated service," the Senator means a period which a man in the enlisted service might have had to serve under the Selective Service Act; and in the case of officers, they would merely be carrying out the obligation of a contract under which they had taken training to become officers. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. An officer obligates himself for 3 years to recompense the Government for the expense to which it has been put in providing training for the officer in the college where he was a student, and who then become a second lieutenant in the Reserves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The theory of the bill is that there should be no incentive pay for a man who is merely doing his duty. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. For an obligation which arises under the law; that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Along the line which has been discussed, is there any incentive in the bill for a person who is not presently in the service, but who has served for a term of years and who would like to get back in the service?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. If he has certain skills, he would get the benefit of the increases provided by the bill. There might be some cases of men who have Reserve status who would feel the provision would be an incentive for them to go back to active duty.

Continuing with my statement, for those electing to remain in military service beyond their obligated period, there are substantial increases.

There are also substantial increases at later points in service so as to provide a greater incentive to remain on a career basis and compete for future promotions, as well as to make a career in the armed services. Examples of the basic-pay increases can be found on page 9 of the committee report. A complete table for each grade and rank can be found on table A of the report, beginning on page 21.

Mr. President, the basic pay scales contained in this bill have as a basis the scales first recommended in 1948 by the Advisory Commission on Service Pay, headed by Mr. Charles Hook, now chairman of the board of the American Rolling Mill Corp. Mr. Hook and his commission made perhaps the most exhaustive study that has ever been made of the pay of personnel in the armed services as compared with that of similar workers in civilian employment. I might say Mr. Hook appeared before the committee and testified that in his judgment the pending legislation represented a sound approach to the pay problem.

Mr. President, the bill provides for an increase in pay for aviation cadets. Under this proposed legislation, cadets will receive monthly pay at the rate of 50 percent of the monthly pay of a second lieutenant, with less than 2 years of service, which would be $111.15. In another part of the bill, it is provided that the aviation cadets will be entitled to $50 a month flight pay, making a total of $161.15 a month. That compares with their present total pay of $109.20 a month.

The bill would also increase the pay of midshipmen and military cadets from $81.12 a month to $111.15 a month. The evidence before the committee showed that these young men were very hard put to get along on a pay scale which had not been changed for many years.

Mr. President, the incentive pay for air crews and submarine members has been increased for all grades in proportion to the increases provided in the basic pay scales. For lack of a better term, it is called hazard-duty pay. In the lower commissioned grades and in all enlisted grades, where the greatest turnover is presently occurring, the ratio of incentive pay to basic pay has been slightly increased in order to provide a greater incentive to remain in a flying status.

Table C, contained on page 25 of the committee report, sets forth a compari-

son of the present incentive pay with that provided for in the bill for each grade.

Mr. President, hazard-duty pay for other hazardous services, such as paratroopers, frogs, and demolition teams, who remove mines from the shores so that military personnel may be landed, or remove mines which are laid to destroy a military organization, is increased by 10 percent. That means officers will get $110 instead of $100. Enlisted men will receive $55 instead of the $50 which they presently receive. I might say that increase did not seem to me to be on an equitable basis with that which was allowed personnel on flying status; but the evidence before the committee indicated that the armed services felt that was sufficient to maintain the paratroopers and similar services at their present level.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Referring to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia concerning hazard pay, I should like to say that during the testimony given before the Committee on Armed Services it was brought out that as the military service make extended use of jet aircraft, smaller crews will be used, and the crews will consist almost entirely of officers. In fact, that is true of the B–47 today. Because of that factor, there will be fewer enlisted men in the crews. Likewise many enlisted men will in the future not receive hazard pay.

Did the committee compile any figures to show what the decrease in the total sum would be as a result of hazard pay now going to enlisted men being withdrawn from them in the future, as compared to the gain which would accrue from the increased pay proposed for officers?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; we did not have any specific figures on that aspect, and, as the Senator, who is an airman of experience knows, it is very difficult to tell the rate of loss of such enlisted men. We did not have any specific figures on that question. There was testimony that there would be a reduction in the number of enlisted personnel who would receive flight pay. As the Senator has stated, there is perhaps no higher skill required in any branch of the service or in any profession in civilian life than that required of the officers who operate the new high-speed jet bombers of the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the Senator will recall that it was classified as the most conservative appropriation today. The reason I asked that question is that there are bound to be those who in the past have objected to hazard pay who will again object to it. I thought if there were some figures showing the offset, they might be of value.

Mr. RUSSELL. We do not have those figures in dollars and cents, but over the years it will be a very substantial sum. Let me say that for my part I have never quarreled with paying a man extra for taking hazards over and above those which other persons in the service have to take.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know that is correct, and the men in the service who will receive the extra pay will appreciate the efforts of the Senator. However, there are those who snipe at hazard pay only because of the money involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, there may be found a case where an officer who is receiving flying pay may not deserve it or may do very little to earn it. A person discovering such a case may develop a hypothesis from that one case. But, considering the whole testimony, whereas there might be one such case, it would be the exception which proved the rule.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will yield for a further moment, he might be interested in a problem with which the Air Force is faced, and one which is closely related to the question of hazard pay. The problem has to do with the training of fighter pilots. Originally we pictured a fighter pilot as a young man out of flying school, who was a tiger, so to speak, and who had a desire to fly fighter aircraft. They were not particularly difficult to fly. After flying them for a few years, the pilots could fly them without great danger to themselves or the equipment. But now, as we make use of the F–100 series and above, the Air Force is faced with a very serious problem, namely, to keep fighter pilots in training, not only for 5, 6, or 10 years but for much longer periods, for I can foresee the day when a fighter pilot of the F–100 series or above will well be a man of 35 years of age or older. Such a pilot is flying equipment which today costs $3 million. Does the Senator from Georgia realize that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I do.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the cost of one fighter plane of that type. The flying of such a plane is complicated, not only by the problems of flying at supersonic speeds and the problems involved in instrument navigation—by means of which all navigation at extremely high altitudes will be done—but also by the problems involved in the electronic handling of missiles and rockets.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I understand. Even the radar equipment on such planes is appalling for a layman to consider.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Today argument is proceeding as to whether a single-seater plane can any longer suffice for interception purposes.

We are going to have to take care of the fighter pilot who continues as a fighter pilot during the years when his brothers are occupying desk jobs and are receiving promotions. We may have to go to the concept used by the Strategic Air Command, namely, that of crew designation with lead pilots who receive temporary appointments and temporary rank necessary in order that his position may be recognized and in order to enable him to function properly in it.

I mention these facts because they never have been brought out fully when we have discussed hazard pay. Today the word "hazard" in that connection means more than ever before.

I do not consider such men only as pilots. Actually, they are trained engineers who, in a period of 5 or 10 years after graduating from flying school, will obtain experience which aeronautical engineers in the past never could obtain.

That problem will have to be met by the Senate and the House of Representatives when we come to deal with the question of taking care of the thousands of pilots in the fighter class who will have to continue as pilots much past the age now accepted, because the stress and strain and training and proficiency required are increasing day by day.

It is difficult for a person not familiar with modern aviation to realize how intricate is the flying of a series F–100 plane.

I am happy that the committee has taken so well informed a view of this matter; and, Mr. President, as a member of the Air Force, I desire to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for the broad view he has taken of the subject of hazard pay.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his statement, which so clearly demonstrates the increasing complexity of military aviation. New problems are presented each and every day. I reiterate that perhaps no more highly skilled technician is known to any industry or avocation than the highly skilled airman who operates a jet aircraft.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as chairman of the committee, and the other members of the committee for the splendid work they have done and the excellent bill they have reported to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida, both on behalf of the committee and on behalf of myself, personally.

Mr. HOLLAND. Second, Mr. President, I should like to discuss quite briefly the subject matter mentioned a minute ago by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], with reference to the hazardous duty pay provided by the bill.

I think many citizens of the country will be interested in realizing the nature of these hazardous duties. For that reason, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia would object to having incorporated at this point in the RECORD, as a part of his remarks, the paragraphs of the able committee report which bear on that subject. If he does not object, I suggest that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the paragraph, on page 12, immediately following the heading "Background—Definition of Hazardous Duties," which recites the nine hazardous classifications under earlier legislation, and also, on pages 12 and 13, the paragraphs dealing with the three new categories which are covered by the bill, namely, "(D) (10) Duty as low-pressure-chamber inside observer," "(D) (11) Duty as a human acceleration or deceleration experimental subject," and "(D) (12) Duty involving the use of helium-oxygen."

I believe it would be well to have those excerpts printed at this point in the RECORD, because I think they will be very highly informative to those who will read this RECORD and will indicate the tremendous hazards which our men in the Armed Services will be encouraged to undergo as a result of the incentive treatment they will be given by this bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall be happy, indeed, to join the Senator from Florida in that request. Of course, Mr. President, the new definitions of "hazard pay" go to show the complexity of the machines of modern war and the new crafts which are required if there is to be an efficient fighting force. So I believe it would be informative to have the matter referred to by the able Senator from Florida incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 125) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLAUSE (4) THREE DUTIES DESIGNATED AS HAZARDOUS

BACKGROUND—DEFINITION OF HAZARDOUS DUTIES

The Career Compensation Act of 1949 sets forth nine duties which qualify members to receive incentive pay under 1 or 2 separate scales. These are duty (1) as flight crew member; (2) on board a submarine; (3) involving regular aerial flights not as a crew member; (4) involving glider flights; (5) involving parachute jumping; (6) having contact with persons afflicted with leprosy; (7) involving demolition of explosives; (8) involving submarine-escape training; (9) at the Navy Deep Sea Diving School when such duty involves participation in training.

This bill adds the three new duties in clause 4 (D), making a total of 12.

* * * * *

*(D) (10) Duty as low-pressure chamber inside observer defined as hazardous, cost, $310,860*

This clause defines the duty as low pressure chamber inside observer as hazardous, thereby authorizing incentive pay of $110 per month for officers and $55 for enlisted men for those engaged in this type of service.

This duty refers to the officer or enlisted man who is assigned as inside instructor in a low pressure chamber. This chamber is a room used to simulate high altitude flight conditions to which air crews are exposed in actual flights. Pilots and air crewmen in complete airborne equipment are indoctrinated in the chamber on the physical and physiological effects of high altitude. When a simulated ascent is made a trained officer or aviation technician is assigned as inside instructor.

An inside instructor is subject to considerable physical hazard. He must carry out demonstrations from time to time, emphasizing the hazards of inadequate protection at high altitude. In addition, he is called upon to act as a subject for specialized physiological experiments conducted at research and training institutions. A considerable number have been forced to discontinue such work because of physical disability caused by recurrent aeroembolism and visual changes.

This duty which did not exist at the time of the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 involves comparatively few people, approximately 53 officers and 365 enlisted men for the Department of Defense.

The estimated additional annual cost of hazardous pay for this type of duty would be $310,860.

*(D) (11) Duty as a human acceleration or deceleration experimental subject, cost, $36,960*

This clause defines duty as a human acceleration or deceleration experiment subject as hazardous, and thereby authorizes officers and enlisted men engaging in this type of service to be entitled to incentive pay at the rate of $110 or $55 per month, respectively.

The hazardous duty defined in this clause consists of two types of operations. The first refers to the men who serve as subjects on the human centrifuge. The human centrifuge consists of a cab or gondola suspended at the end of an arm which duplicates a circular path on a horizontal plane. As the cab rotates around a vertical axis centrifugal force is applied to an individual sitting in the cab or gondola.

The other types of operation consist of service on the crash deceleration sleds and ejection seat towers.

All of these experiments are necessary in order (1) to determine the effect of high speeds and stoppages on the human body and (2) to develop protective harnesses and downward ejection seats for escape from high-speed aircraft.

These duties subject volunteers to considerable physical discomfort and danger to health and, in some cases, to life.

Under this clause, the duties of which did not exist at the time of the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, involve approximately 12 officers and 32 enlisted men for the Department of Defense and an additional annual estimated cost of $36,960.

*(D) (12) Duty involving the use of helium-oxygen defined as hazardous cost, $217,000*

This clause defines as hazardous that duty involving the use of helium-oxygen for a breathing mixture in the execution of deep-sea diving. Divers qualified in the use of helium-oxygen as a breathing medium are assigned duty with the 10 submarine rescue vessels of the Navy. They are employed in salvage and repair operations for the fleet. The use of helium-oxygen permits diving to much greater depths than with compressed air, consequently the hazards are markedly increased.

The use of helium-oxygen in deep-sea dives involves an increased incidence of decompression sickness (bends). Many cases have occurred while the diver is still in the water decompressing, which rarely occurs when compressed air is used. This duty involves approximately 25 officers and 280 enlisted men and would cause an estimated additional annual cost of $217,800.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who is a valued member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Georgia, and assure him it is a great privilege to serve with and for him on the committee.

In regard to a question asked by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], hazard pay for officers as against enlisted men, it is true, is it not, that the purpose of the committee was and is to have hazard pay given to those who undergo the hazards?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The committee has undertaken to exercise the greatest care to confine the hazard-incentive pay to those who actually incur the dangers of hazardous duty.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There would be no intention on the part of the committee to discriminate against any enlisted man, would there? I am sure there would not, because the question of the rank of those who fly in a jet bomber, for example, is entirely an administrative matter, one entirely within the realm of Air Force decision.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true; and the committee does not discriminate against the enlisted men who fly, as they do, and as they will continue to do, particularly in the matter of air transportation. I hope that enlisted men will do so in ever-increasing numbers, because we should increase materially the number in that service. The evidence before the committee shows that it is not nearly so comprehensive a service as it should be. Any enlisted man who flies will receive harardous-duty pay, as do commissioned personnel.

I did not understand the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to complain about any discrimination against enlisted men. He pointed out that in view of the fact that the trend in aeronautics, through the development of jet craft, was to reduce the number of the crew, and thereby add to the responsibilities of those who were in the crew, it might be essential that trained engineers of commissioned rank—and in some cases very substantial rank—would be required to handle such craft.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator made that statement. I am sure the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] understands the position of the Senator from Arizona. I merely wish to point out the fact that as we confine the crews more to officers, of necessity we eliminate some of the enlisted men in the crews. So those who object to the amount of money involved in hazard pay will find an offsetting factor. I certainly believe that enlisted men who fly should receive hazard pay to the same extent as do officers.

I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for bringing before the Senate this very excellent bill, which will provide the kind of pay schedule to which service men are entitled.

I was deeply concerned over the failure of the Congress, in the recent tax act, to provide exemptions and allowances under retirement, for retirement pay for members of the armed services. I have been in touch with the Treasury Department, and the situation appears to be the result of inadvertence on the part of Congress It is not premeditated or planned. We find that while we gave tax reductions on retirement pay for most retired persons—for practically everyone else—we did not do so for retired members of the armed services over the age of 65. Therefore I had prepared an amendment which I had hoped to offer to this bill, which would give to retired service personnel the same sort of allowance and deduction in con-

nection with their pension and retirement pay that any other employee of the Government, any employee in private industry, or any other citizen gets.

I wonder whether or not the Senator would feel desirous of accepting such an amendment, which would merely insert the language, "except that such term does not include a fund or system established by the United States for members of the Armed Forces of the United States," strike out certain language now in the Internal Revenue Act, and include this sort of treatment for our service men who are retired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I share the view of the Senator from Minnesota that an injustice has been done to the retired military personnel by not allowing them the same exemptions as have been allowed in other fields. However, I hope the Senator will not press the amendment in connection with the pending bill. I say that because, as the Senator knows, the Finance Committee is very jealous of any legislation which might in anywise affect the tax structure of the Nation. We would probably start a controversy by undertaking to adjust the situation in connection with the pending bill, even if I were to accept the proposed amendment. Furthermore, it would tie up the bill in the House. It would require conference with the House. I had hoped that the bill might become law by the first of April, which would mean that members of the Armed Forces who would benefit, including retired personnel who would receive an increase under the terms of the bill, would begin drawing the increased allowances 1 month earlier. If the proposed amendment were attached to the bill, it would be manifestly impossible for the bill to become a law by the first of April. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment. It has merit. The cause he seeks to promote cries for justice. However, I do not think it can be obtained in connection with the pending bill. If the amendment were pressed at this stage, it would undoubtedly delay the bill, and perhaps might not be adopted eventually. It could cost the retired personnel a loss of 1 month in the modest increase they would receive under this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, I respect the judgment of the chairman of the committee. Primarily I wished to bring this subject to the attention of the Senate. I have prepared an amendment, but I shall not offer it, in view of the advice and counsel given by the chairman. I feel that that is sound advice. However, I shall present my proposal in the form of a separate bill, and have it referred to the Senate Finance Committee. I feel that, as we adjust pay schedules for military personnel, we ought to remove the rank discrimination in connection with retirement pay which exists in the present law. I shall present my proposal later in the form of a separate bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to join the Senator at the first appropriate occasion, in undertaking to see that this injustice is eliminated.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the new proposed hazardous pay schedule the percentage of increase, as against basic pay, in the case of all officers, is larger for the lowest rank, and the percentage for each rank is larger than that for the next higher rank. That is, the percentage as against the base pay. That has not been true in the past.

The same thing is true with respect to the percentage of increased hazard pay, as against base pay, in the case of enlisted men. The percentage of increase, as against the base pay, is largest in the lowest rank of enlisted men; and the percentage in each rank is larger than the percentage in the next higher rank, this in every case involving enlisted men. That was not true in the previous law.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has never been true before. I think the Senator for bringing that fact to the attention of the Senate. I think that indicates that this is truly a career incentive bill. Its purpose is to offer an incentive to the younger personnel to make a career of the Armed Services, and to prevent the enormous wastage of funds involved in continually training men in these fields, only to lose them to private life.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. To follow up that point, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that in the grades to which we must look to find the crews of the B–47, the B–52, and the F–100 series, the greatest increases have been provided. The committee is to be commended for that fact. I refer to the grades of captain, major, and lieutenant colonel. I am glad to see that, because it provides added incentive. In that connection, General Le May stated, in relation to the important point which the Senator from Missouri was discussing earlier, that if we provide increased incentive, perhaps the families of the pilots will cease trying to get them out of the Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Montana, who has done a great deal of work in this field, and who was very helpful to the committee in giving his views on the importance of strengthening the Armed Services to prevent wastage of trained men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and commend him for the fine exposition he has given of the bill.

I should like to invite his attention to the fact that I have at the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, to grant a 25 percent increase across the board. The Chairman of the Armed Services Committee will recall that I appeared before his committee and was very graciously received.

I should like to ask his advice at this time. I understood that it was his hope that the bill might be enacted into law so that the proposed pay increases could go into effect on the first of April. I should like to ask his advice as to the wisdom of offering my amendment at this particular time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Montana will not press his amendment at this time. If the amendment were agreed to, of course it would be manifestly impossible for the bill to become effective next month.

Moreover, I hope the Senator will give us an opportunity to see how this bill will work. The bill has been carefully drawn to apply the maximum increases at the very places where the attrition with respect to skilled men has been greatest, where we have been losing the greatest number of trained men.

The Senator's amendment would provide for a 25-percent increase across the board. That is about the maximum we allow in certain grades in which the losses have been greatest. The bill will cost a considerable sum of money. It will cost $745 million a year. I believe the Senator's amendment would cost about $1,300,000,000. I hope the Senator will let us have an opportunity to see if the pending bill will not accomplish the purpose of increasing the number of career men in the armed services without incurring the greater cost his amendment would entail. If the increase is to be made as great as the Senator's amendment would make it, I believe we should give the matter a little more study before enacting such a measure, before we spend that much money and give more than a 25-percent increase to some engaged in hazardous duty and less than 25 percent to others.

The Senator from Montana has been very helpful to the committee, particularly in bringing to our attention, and to the attention of the Senate, the vital importance of doing something in this field. However, I am sure that to adopt such an amendment would result in lengthy conferences with the other body. Inasmuch as the House has not held hearings on the Senator's proposal, it would probably result in long delay in giving increases in pay to a great number of persons in the armed services.

I hope the Senator will give us an opportunity to observe how the bill before the Senate will work as law. Then if some weaknesses should develop, we can strengthen such weaknesses. It would be preferable to do that than to grant a 20 percent overall increase.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be more than happy to comply with the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I appreciate the courtesy he and his committee have shown me. I know the committee is well aware of the difficulties existing in the present situation so far as reenlistments are concerned.

On the basis of the assurances given by the Senator from Georgia, I shall not offer my amendment.

I should like to ask the Senator what is being done to restore the fringe benefits which have been taken away from those in the armed services since the end of World War II.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that most of the fringe benefits that were taken away from the armed services were taken away administratively.

No legislation in that field was enacted by Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure all the fringe benefits have been restored. Furthermore, the bill before the Senate creates a new fringe benefit in the form of a dislocation allowance. Whenever a serviceman is moved from one permanent station to another permanent station, he is allowed, under the terms of the bill, an amount equal to 1 month's quarters allowance. That is in addition to his transportation allowance. In other words, if he stays at a hotel overnight, he is compensated for it. That additional fringe benefit is provided under the bill now before the Senate.

I might add that taking away of the fringe benefits, while the total amount of money involved was not large, had a great deal to do with demoralizing the armed services. Many of the members of the Armed Forces considered the elimination of fringe benefits as an indication of other things to come. It was an indication to many of them that their services were not appreciated. I know that the motivation in taking away the fringe benefits was not a lack of appreciation for their services.

However, the fringe benefits have been restored, and we are creating other valuable fringe benefits in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I am glad he has put emphasis on the fact that the fringe benefits were not taken away by legislative act of Congress, but were taken away administratively. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the various armed services, I hope, will not bow to local pressure, but will ever keep uppermost in their mind the welfare of the uniformed personnel.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to mention one more fringe benefit which is included in the pending bill. That is the fringe benefit which deals with the use of trailers. An amendment to the bill makes it possible for a man who has all his furniture in a trailer to receive compensation for moving his furniture in the trailer instead of moving it in a separate van.

I should like to make one further comment with respect to fringe benefits, by saying that when I was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for 2 years, that subject was brought to the attention of the committee more than any other subject. I do not believe it would be indiscreet to say that the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, as a former military man, interested himself in this subject, and has always felt that it was a very important subject. I am glad that the fringe benefits have been restored administratively, because those benefits mean so much, particularly to the young wives and children of our servicemen. That is particularly true with respect to hospitalization, and all that goes with that benefit. I thank the chairman of the committee for permitting me to make this additional statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very happy that the distinguished former chairman of the committee made the statement.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I merely wish to mention one point which perhaps has not been brought out in the debate. In my opinion the pending bill points up very clearly, and more than any other act, recognition of the fact that we must have for a long time a large professional Army, a large professional Air Force, and a large professional Navy.

I believe there are ways of adding to the compensation of the men in our armed services other than by merely increasing their money pay. It can be done by giving proper recognition to the important part they play in our defense. These men are men of the highest skills, the highest crafts, and the highest professional standards. Certainly they are entitled to the recognition that goes with the very fine contribution they are making.

I do not know of a finer group of men than those who are represented by a great percentage of the men and women in our armed services. After they receive their special training they are earnestly devoted to their duties. That devotion is not confined to the airmen who have been mentioned here in debate. The same high level of devotion is found in the corporals, sergeants, and technical sergeants of the Army, in the Air Force, in the Navy, and in the Marine Corps. It is found among the commissioned officers.

I believe the bill before the Senate represents a sincere recognition on the part of the Nation, not only of Congress, of the fact that the personnel concerned are exponents of permanent crafts and professions and skills, and these men are entitled to monetary rewards, and also to public recognition and moral support. Anything which tends to create high respect for the services, and promote self-respect among those in the services is most desirable. In this respect I believe the bill is a very fine contribution, and goes further than anything we have ever had before along this line.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his contribution and for the fine help he extended in committee.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was very happy to see the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] withdraw his amendment for an across-the-board 25 percent pay increase. I was happy also to hear the chairman of the committee urge the Senator from Montana to permit us to make this approach and to give it a chance to work.

During the last summer, when I served my annual tour of active duty, with the Fourth Air Force, I questioned airmen and officers on what they felt was needed in the Air Force to provide greater incentive. Mr. President, believe it or not, pay was not always mentioned as the top item. The men were very much concerned with better housing. I can tell the Senate, as most Senators well know, that there is not adequate housing on our air bases. The men are also concerned about medical care. That is particularly true of the Strategic Air Command. Those men are ordered away from their home bases for as long as 90 days on temporary foreign duty, and during that period their wives and children are left on the air base without adequate medical care. In fact, up to this time it has been denied to them.

The men would also like to have more stable assignments. Men are transferred from one base to another in the middle of a school year. When a man is transferred, he should not be transferred for a period of 6 months or a year, but should receive assignments of stability—say 2 or 3 years at each base.

Commissary privileges are another matter with which the men are greatly concerned.

I agree with the chairman that some of these are administrative matters. The present law takes care of commissaries, if they are properly operated.

I again thank the chairman for urging the Senator from Montana to withdraw his amendment, so that the bill before the Senate will be given an opportunity to operate as law.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that the men in our armed services have a great interest in the services, and they do not leave the military service except with great reluctance, and only because they are offered greater opportunities on the outside. Therefore their interest is not based entirely on pay, but it is based a great deal on the fringe benefits which have been mentioned and also on respect for the uniform. I believe our citizens have been extremely derelict in that respect.

We are inclined to be great patriots in time of war and pay high respect to our men in uniform. We do all we can. We establish USO and other centers in towns for the entertainment of soldiers. But come times of peace, I suggest that the uniform is not held in proper respect in this country. Proper respect for the uniform is a fringe benefit which can be given the men without costing the Government a nickel.

Mr. RUSSELL. This country has been guilty of manifesting in a mass way the feeling expressed by Kipling regarding Tommy Atkins—"It's 'Savior of 'is country' when the guns begin to shoot."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What the distinguished Senator from Arizona said with respect to pay is correct. It might be misconstrued, however, as being in opposition to what I said. But I was talking in percentages, and the distinguished Senator from Arizona was talking in dollars. So we are both right. A captain actually receives more hazard pay in dollars than does a major general. Nevertheless, it is true that in the case of enlisted men the top enlisted men receive more hazard pay in dollars, although the lowest ranking enlisted men receive

more in percentage as against their base pay.

I mention this so that persons reading the RECORD will see no difference between the remarks made by me as against those made by my friend from Arizona.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what a great and wonderful thing it is to have experts on both sides of the aisle see the question from the same perspective.

The Senator from Massachusetts adverted to the trailer allowance. I think it should be said that the prohibition against any payment when a man moves his household goods by trailer grew out of a ruling by the Comptroller General rather than through an administrative ruling. The bill grants permission to pay not exceeding 20 cents a mile when a man moves his household goods by trailer. If this provision is properly handled by the services it will result in not only a benefit to the servicemen involved, but in a saving of money to the United States. It is capable of abuse, and, in order to prevent abuses, I hope the Secretaries of the various services will very carefully regulate it and see that the regulations are strictly adhered to.

Mr. President, among other so-called fringe benefits provided in the bill is an increase in the per diem from $9 to $12. This allowance, of course, is given to men who travel under orders on Government business when quarters and mess are not available.

The bill likewise provides for the same increase for those on the retired list as is provided for those on active duty.

There is also a modest increase for lieutenant generals, generals, and admirals, when they are on active duty. That is fully reflected in the report of the committee.

Mr. President, the bill represents a careful study by the Department of Defense, the House committee, and the Senate committee. I hope it will accomplish its purposes, and retain in the services men possessing those skills which enable the armed services of the United States to remain on a ready basis, prepared at any moment to strike devastating blows against any aggressor against our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Armed Services were, on page 3, line 5, after the word "new", to strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections"; in line 12, to strike out "service." " and insert "service."; after line 12, to insert:

(f) Any officer serving on active duty in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral shall, in addition to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled by the provisions of this act, be entitled to an additional increment of basic pay in an amount of $100 per month. Any officer serving on active duty in the grade of general or admiral shall, in addition to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled by the provisions of this act, be entitled to an additional increment of basic pay in an amount of $200 per month. The additional increments provided by this subsection shall not be considered a part of the active duty pay or of the monthly basic pay of these grades for the purpose of the computation of retired pay.

On page 7, after line 19, to insert:

(13) Section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act is amended by adding at the end of such subsection the following: "In lieu of transportation of baggage and household effects, a member of a uniformed service who transports a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States for use as a residence and who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household effects, under this section, shall under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned be entitled to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, or to the dislocation allowance authorized in this section, whichever he shall elect."

On page 8, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(13)" and insert "(14)"; and at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(14)" and insert "(15)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no amendment, but I have some brief remarks which I should like to make before the passage of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to the very full statement made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The committee report is unanimous. I have some very brief remarks to make as senior minority member of the committee, to supplement what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said.

Mr. President, I fully support the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in his explanation of the concept and details of H. R. 4720. As he indicated, this bill was unanimously reported, and the committee was of the opinion that in providing for selective pay increases the bill represents a constructive approach to stabilizing the personnel turnover of the Armed Forces.

The principal purpose of the bill, Mr. President, is to provide a real and substantial incentive to those already in our armed services to remain there, to make a career of serving their country in those services. The bill is not intended to provide an incentive to those men who are simply doing their duty to their country as required by law, that is, those who have been chosen under the selective service law.

We want those experienced and dedicated men now in our services to feel that they can and should remain in service, and it is with just this in mind that the pending bill has been drawn.

After completion of periods of obligated service, that is, 3 years for officers and 2 years for enlisted men, substantial pay increases are granted under the bill. It is significant to note that the largest percentage increases are in the lower-commissioned grades and middle-enlisted grades. A second lieutenant who has completed 3 years of service will receive a 25 percent increase, or $59.28 a month. A first lieutenant who completes 3 years receives a 22.33 percent increase, or $61.22 a month. A sergeant E–4 with over 4 years' service receives a 16.21 percent increase, or $21.33 a month. It is particularly interesting to note that those noncommissioned grades with over 4 years' service receive extra in-grade increases at selected points of service in the normal 30-year career pattern in order further to provide the incentive of which I spoke.

That such an incentive is necessary is illustrated by a number of important statistics, but most importantly by that which reveals that the overall reenlistment rate for regulars in our services has continued thus far throughout 1955 at the alarmingly low rate of 24 percent. This is less than half the average level of reenlistment for the period 1950–53.

The effect such a turnover as this represents, both from the military and the economic standpoint, should be clear to all of us. In 1955, for example, an estimated 200,000 skilled officers and airmen will leave the Air Force. If this trend continues, there will be more than 100 percent turnover in the Air Force every 5 years. No industry could possibly absorb this rate of turnover and remain an effective organization; neither can the United States Air Force. General Twining has said on a number of occasions that this rate of turnover, if continued, would lead directly to an alarming decline in operational effectiveness.

The President in his message to the Congress on January 13 of this year emphasized the effect of the high turnover rate on operational efficiency. When we think that it costs no less than $45,000 properly to train a single jet pilot, we are certainly made aware of the terrible economic drain which such turnover represents in addition to the military weakness it inevitably causes.

In adopting the concept of selective pay increases, the committee has been well aware that this Nation is now attempting to do what it has never done before in peacetime—that is, to maintain a military establishment at a level of around 3 million men. In the 1930's, the total strength of the Armed Forces ranged between 250,000 and 350,000. After World War II the figure was around 1.5 million. In 1952 we again had 3.6 million men in uniform. Now we are leveling off at around 3 million. In past years, either our forces have been small enough to attract the needed career personnel, or there has been an existing emergency during which men answered their country's call. We now face the prospect of a force of around 3 million men for an indefinite future. Yet the failure of the armed services to attract a sufficient number of enlisted men and young officers on a career basis threatens to affect the battle-readiness of our combat units and represents a manpower turnover which is not only economically unsound but downright dangerous.

I should like to add, Mr. President, that the committee has realized that pay is not the sole problem in attracting and

retaining men in the armed services. There is, of course, the matter of our overseas commitments which require the families of men to be overseas under adverse living conditions, and in many cases for men to be separated from their families on defense missions. The housing problem generally is a critical one, which I am sure will receive appropriate attention by Congress.

In addition, the bill provides compensation for hazardous duties in the service, which are appropriately specified. It also makes provision for the award of a dislocation allowance to enlisted personnel in order that the dependents of enlisted men, who, under regulations, are entitled to a travel allowance for them, may be more properly taken care of.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to emphasize again that the principal purpose of the bill is to provide, by the means to which I have referred, an adequate and attractive incentive to the men already in the service to remain there and in their country's defense to make a career of military service to their Nation on a basis which will meet their economic requirements and career aspirations attractively and as completely as possible. H. R. 4720 has the unanimous support of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and it has also the endorsement of the so-called Hook Commission on Service Pay, the board established in 1948 for the purpose of reviewing this problem and making recommendations regarding it. I urge the passage of H. R. 4720 as amended by the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the ranking minority member of the committee, and to say that I give my full support to the bill.

I have seen few measures which have been better conceived or more thoroughly thought through, and in connection with which the statistics supporting the necessity for the proposed legislation have been better arranged, than the bill before the Senate.

While on many occasions I have felt it necessary to disagree with or to criticize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretaries of the various branches of the armed services, I wish at this time very heartily to compliment them upon the excellent statements they made before the Senate Committee on Armed Services in support of the Career Incentive Pay Act of 1955.

Also, I wish to congratulate and to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services upon the hearings which were held and the record which has been made in support of the bill. Anyone who wishes to be informed of the problems of the Department of Defense and about the needs of the men and women in the armed services can profitably spend his time in reading and examining this most illuminating and well-prepared record.

The bill will actually save money in the long run. Not only will it save money and provide a more effective Defense Establishment, but it will also improve the efficiency of the armed services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in connection with the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and to add my full support to this bill.

I have been impressed during the testimony before the committee with the problems faced by the military services as a result of the high turnover of personnel. I should, therefore, like to address myself for a few moments to this problem of personnel turnover, and some of the savings which may be realized if we do not have to continue training such large numbers of replacements in all of the military services.

With respect to the magnitude of this turnover problem, I shall mention a few figures. In the coming fiscal year (fiscal 1956) approximately 1 million men—about one-third of the planned size of the active military forces—will become eligible for release from the service. At the present rate of reenlistment experience it will be necessary that about 750,000—three-fourths—of these men be replaced with new, inexperienced men.

Now, it costs about $3,200 to train a new recruit in the bare rudiments of military skill, that is, the first 6 months of his service. This means an annual outlay of nearly $2½ billion. This is only the cost of initial training and does not include the cost of lengthy technical training in such skills as electronics, armament, or aircraft maintenance.

If an additional 10 percent of the million men we stand to lose in this 1 year can be induced to remain in the service on a career basis, a minimum investment of $320 million would be preserved, an amount equal to the cost of almost 1,000 jet interceptors. This, of course, is only the dollar investment. I do not need remind the Senate that the gain in experience and skill level would add immeasurably to the operational efficiency of our Armed Forces and to the security of our country.

Now for another example: During fiscal year 1956, a total of 4,500 trained pilots are expected to leave the flying services. It costs at least $120,000 to train 1 F–94c jet pilot, and a great deal more to train jet-bomber pilots. On the basis of the $120,000 cost, the 4,500 pilots returning to civil life represents a minimum investment of $540 million. If one-fourth (25 percent) of these young, highly trained officers can be induced to remain in the service, $135 million of this investment can be preserved. And, again, the operational efficiency of our flying services would be greatly improved.

We have heard testimony that it costs $275,000 to train a jet-bomber pilot. This figure includes only the formal training courses he attends. If you include the experience he must gain before he can go into this training, this cost may mount to over half a million dollars. By way of comparison this is greater than what it cost us to build two B–17's in World War II.

Nearly all of our B–47 commanders are veterans of World War II. We must be able to retain enough highly qualified young men to allow us to replace these men as they grow older.

We heard from the Secretary of the Air Force that it cost $14,800 to maintain an enlisted man in the Air Force for 4 years, including his training. This figure was so staggering that the Secretary had it verified by a firm of civilian accountants. Everyone of these men we can get to reenlist means a saving of $14,800. That is an amount at least equal to the cost of the training of a doctor through 4 years of medical school.

The main purpose of this bill is to reduce this exodus of trained, skilled personnel. The title of the bill, "The Career Incentive Act," states its objective. It is designed to make the military career more nearly competitive with opportunities offered by industry so that more young men will remain in the service on a career basis.

I am convinced that the incentives for career service which this bill will create will result in substantial savings to the Government and to the taxpayer, not only in the immediate future, but for years to come.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the very key to the security of our country and to the survival of our national freedom and independence is in trained manpower. It is true that scientific progress has greatly mechanized our way of life and has greatly revolutionized our military defense, so that fewer men can do more with machines.

But we need skilled and trained manpower to run our machines of defense. We need not only to attract skilled manpower for our armed services, but we need to retain the manpower we spend so much money to train.

Last Friday I placed in the RECORD an address by the Secretary of the Air Force, and I should like to quote from that in part because the Secretary made the point as effectively as could be when he said:

I would like to tell you of our biggest problems in the Air Force. It is a problem of people. It is a problem that must be solved if we are to maintain and increase the capability of the Air Force. Your Air Force has expanded since 1950 from a strength of 48 wings and 411,000 people to a present strength of 121 wings and some 950,000 people. The enlisted ranks of the Air Force are made up of volunteers. Since the Air Force cannot go out and hire trained and skilled personnel to maintain its valuable and highly intricate equipment, we must train each new man to do a job. In the tremendous buildup that followed the outbreak of the Korean war we trained hundreds of thousands of young men to do the many jobs that are required to keep our airplanes flying and our equipment working. Our problem is that we have not been able to make the Air Force career sufficiently attractive to keep enough of these young men who have done such a fine job for us in the service. This year, for instance, we will lose $2¼ billion worth of trained personnel. We know that if we make the Air Force career sufficiently attractive, more of these fine young men will stay with us. Consequently, we have undertaken a campaign to correct many of the problems and to make the Air Force career competitive with careers in civilian life.

The biggest problem we found was pay. As a result of a long program to emphasize the need and advantages of proper pay to our service personnel, it appears that Congress will this year pass a new pay bill. This bill will give selected pay raises to individuals in the armed services and should go a long way to making our service career more attractive.

Mr. President, I am sure that what he said goes equally for all of the other armed services. And so I have urged

the passage of this bill in the very interest of our national security.

But before concluding my remarks, I wish to say that it is not pay alone that is necessary in order to be able to recruit and retain the necessary military manpower. There are other things such as housing. I regret to say that the housing conditions of our military personnel, both in this country and at our establishments overseas, border on being a national disgrace. Too many of our personnel are forced to live in mere hovels—in literally firetraps—because of lack of housing.

On this score, we can give great credit to the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, who authored the legislation that provided the excellent Wherry housing—the brightest spot today in military housing, and a tribute to what private enterprise can do, if given the chance, on Government programs. The only trouble is that we do not have enough Wherry housing.

There is great hope for correction of this bad situation in a bill recently introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who may well become the hero-successor to the late Senator Wherry. I trust that there will be quick and prompt action on the Capehart bill, S. 1501, and that in the near future the Senate will act promptly on correcting the inadequate military-housing situation, just as I am confident it will act today on correction of the inadequate military-pay situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 4720) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill just passed may be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered.

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

## NOMINATIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a list of appointees under an act which will expire on March 31. Since the Senate may not be in session tomorrow, this is the last day upon which the proposed action could be taken.

The request is for the confirmation, as in executive session, of a list of nominations referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The entire list was approved by the committee, without objection, and is comprised of persons, presently engaged in the service, who are designated for promotion in the Foreign Service as consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that the Senator from Georgia is requesting confirmation of nominations in the Foreign Service?

Mr. GEORGE. I am asking for the consideration of a list of promotions in the Foreign Service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of persons whose positions which would expire on the 31st of this month?

Mr. GEORGE. The authority for the appointments will expire on the 31st of this month, unless the action proposed shall be taken today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the report of the committee is unanimous.

Mr. GEORGE. The report of the committee is unanimous. The persons concerned come from almost every State in the Union. This is the last list of appointments under the act of March 31, 1954.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc. The President will be so notified immediately.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Chair.

## REDETERMINATION OF MARKETING QUOTAS FOR BURLEY TOBACCO FOR THE 1955–56 MARKETING YEAR

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4951), which is order No. 124 on the calendar, the so-called burley tobacco bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4951) directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

## RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of Italy.

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

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

## VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE HONORABLE MARIO SCELBA, PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY

During the recess,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Prime Minister of Italy is visiting the Senate today. The Chair appoints the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to escort to the rostrum our distinguished visitor.

The Honorable Mario Scelba, Prime Minister of Italy, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by the Foreign Minister of Italy, the Honorable Gaetano Martino; the American Ambassador to Italy, the Honorable Clare Booth Luce; the Italian Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable Manlio Brosio; and Mr. A. José De Seabra, of the State Department.

The Prime Minister of Italy took the place on the rostrum assigned him in front of the Vice President's desk, and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted to places assigned to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate and guests of the Senate, it is my great honor to present a man who for some time has led his great country brilliantly and effectively, and who is visiting the United States as the official representative of a people and a government whose friendship with the United States makes us, with them, one of the great bulwarks of freedom in the world today.

I present the Prime Minister of Italy. [Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

## ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MARIO SCELBA, PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY

Thereupon, from his place on the rostrum, the Prime Minister of Italy delivered the following address:

Signor Presidente, Signori, considero un alto onore l'essere accolto al Senato della vostra democratica Repubblica.

Tengo a ringraziare il Presidente per le sue parole e per il suo saluto; e il mio ringraziamento va, a nome del mio paese, a tutti gli illustri membri di quest'Assemblea. Le vostre deliberazioni hanno recato in questi anni un immenso contributo al consolidamento della nostra democrazia e della nostra ricostruzione morale e materiale. Sono commosso di ritrovarmi tra quelle mura dove tanto si è parlato dell'Italia, e tanto si è fatto per l'Italia.

I contribuenti americani hanno voluto accollarsi oneri notevoli, perchè nella vostra saggezza politica, nella vostra generosità e per la vostra esperisnza della storia, avete identificato la causa della libertà e della salvezza dei popoli europei con gli interessi del vostro paese.

Ultimata la ricostruzione, ci accingiamo ad affrontare a fondo i nostri problemi strutturali, proposti ed imposti dalla natura stessa della nostra Patria. La loro soluzione è di per sè stessa un obbiettivo, ma è un mezzo insostituibile per il consolidamento della democrazia. Avvezzo al sacrificio, non sempre palese per chi non lo conosce, ed al lavoro spesso ingrato, il nostro popolo prosegue l'azione intrapresa, che la storia e il nostro senso di responsabilità ci additano. Sappiamo fin troppo bene a

quali conseguenze andrebbero incontro tutte le nazioni civili ma, primo tra esse, il nostro paese e le nostre istituzioni se l'Italia perdesse la sua libertà: lo sappiamo fin troppo bene, meglio di chiunque altro. Da questa nostra consapevolezza scaturisce la nostra determinazione di conservare la democrazia e la libertà.

Ma noi sappiamo che, difendendo la nostra libertà, difendiamo quella di cutti. E il fatto che talvolta i nostri amici si preoccupino, e persino ingiustificatamente si allarmino, per la nostra sorte è la prova di quanto noi tutti siamo interdipendenti e quanto la debolezza dell'uno sia ragione di debolezza per tutta la comunità, sia essa debolezza economica o nella difesa militare.

I nostri interessi quindi coincidono. Uniamoci e collaboriamo sempre pù strettamente: è questa la premessa di tutta la nostra politica estera, che si estrinseca nell'alleanza Atlantica e nell'integrazione dell'Europa; nella comunità che non sia solo militare, ma politica ed economica.

Dall'Europa sono giunte in questi giorni buone notizie: dopo la nostra ratifica dell'Unione europea occidentale, la prima sul continente, il lungo processo di maturazione dell'ideale europeo si evolve, si fa; operiamo, senza impaziente ma senza ritardi, affinchè nazionalismi che sono millenari si fondano e superino nel concetto dell'integrazione.

L'unificazione europea sul piano politico e sul piano economico, con la creazione di un vasto mercato con libero movimento di uomini e di beni, rafforzerà il settore orientale del nostro sistema atlantico e diminuirà all'America il peso delle sue responsabilità e dei suoi impegni nella comunità democratica. Essa servirà in tal modo a consolidare la sicurezza dei popoli liberi e garantire la prosperità e la pace.

Ho detto, e vorrei qui ripeterlo, che l'amicizia tra Stati Uniti e Italia è un elemento positivo, anzi fondamentale, per conseguire gli scopi della nostra comunità, comunità che è a sua volta un nuovo vincolo, tra i tanti che già esistono, della nostra amicizia.

The address of the Prime Minister of Italy was interpreted by Mr. A. José De Seabra, of the State Department, as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate: It is indeed an honor for me to come before the Senate of your great Republic. Let me thank the President of the Senate for his greeting and his words. But my thanks go on behalf of my country to all the distinguished Members of the Senate. The decisions taken here in recent years have brought a notable contribution to our democracy and to our morale and our material recovery.

I must confess I am moved as I stand in this place where so much has been said of Italy and so much has been done for Italy. The American taxpayer has shouldered considerable burdens, for your political wisdom, your generosity, and your experience have urged you to identify the cause of the freedom and the welfare of European peoples with the interests of your country.

Our recovery in Italy is today an accomplished fact. We are now tackling the structural problems which are nature's legacy to our country. We are determined to solve them, for that is essential if we are to consolidate democracy. Sacrifice and hard work will be required of us. They have always been the lot of our people, although this has not always been acknowledged.

But history and our sense of responsibility point out our course, for we know full well what would befall the civilized nations, and foremost among them our country, if Italy were to lose her liberty. We know it full well, and we can visualize it better than can anyone else.

From this knowledge, spring our determination and our resolve to safeguard democracy and our freedom. We know that in safeguarding our freedom, we safeguard the freedom of others. [Applause.]

The fact that our friends show concern, and at times unjustified alarm, about our future proves how interdependent we are, and how the weakness of one of us is a source of weakness, economic or military, for all the community.

Our interests, therefore, coincide. Let us unite and cooperate ever more closely. That is the very foundation of all our foreign policy, which stands for the Atlantic Alliance and the integration of Europe. Our unity must be not only military, but political and economic.

Good news has come to us from Europe. After our ratification of the Western European Union, the first on the continent, the European ideal is slowly materializing. Europe is in the making. Let us work without undue haste, but without delay, in order that century-old nationalisms may be merged and integrated. [Applause.]

European political unity and the creation of a single market, with free movement of men and goods, will strengthen the Atlantic system in its eastern reaches, and will relieve America of its responsibilities and obligations in a democratic community. This will consolidate the security of free peoples and will make for prosperity and peace.

The other day I said—and I wish to repeat it—that friendship between the United States and Italy is a constructive element in the achievement of our community aims; and the community is, in turn, one more link in the solid chain of our friendly relations. [Applause, Members rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] will respond for the majority to the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, and my colleagues in the Senate, it is a very high honor and a very great pleasure to receive in this historic Chamber the leader of one of the oldest and proudest nations of western civilization. The contributions of Italy to our country have been rich and rewarding. We have drawn upon the ideals of ancient Rome for many of the things which have made our society both free and stable.

Premier Scelba, who does us the honor of coming here to visit with us today, is much more than the representative of an old and proud nation. He is a fighting leader of his people in the struggle to maintain freedom in the modern world. He has dedicated his life to fighting dictatorships, whether they be dictatorships of the right or of the left. To such a man, Premier Scelba, it is an honor and a very great privilege, on behalf of my colleagues, to extend greetings. We wish you and your nation well. May we always be free. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will respond for the minority to the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, and my colleagues, I think the warmth of the welcome from both sides of the aisle indicates that we are most happy to have you, as the distinguished representative of the great nation of Italy, visiting us here today. Your country has contributed as much as any other on the face of the globe to our culture, to our form of government, and to our economic development.

Before you, you see representatives of 48 States of the American Union. There is not a single State in this great country which has not added to its population people who have come from your country, or whose parents or grandparents have come from Italy. They have enriched our life by so doing.

We are devoted, as you are in your country, Mr. Prime Minister, to the cause of human freedom. During the very brief time you will be here among us you may gain the impression that there are some fundamental differences between our two great political parties. But, Mr. Prime Minister, I think I can assure you that if the free world is ever challenged, if the American way of life and the way of life represented by the free people of Italy is ever challenged by totalitarian aggressors, it will be found in the future, as we have found in the past, that Americans will be standing shoulder to shoulder with Italians in helping to maintain a free world of free men. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is also honored today by having two other parliamentarians as guests.

The first is the distinguished Foreign Minister of Italy, Signor Gaetano Martino. I should like to introduce him to Members of the Senate. [Applause, Members rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is also present one who needs no introduction in this body—a former Member of the House of Representatives, and the present Ambassador to Italy from the United States, Hon. Clare Boothe Luce. [Applause, Members rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. I know that Members of the Senate would like to have the opportunity to greet our distinguished visitors. Therefore the recess will continue so that Senators may have an opportunity to speak personally with our visitors.

The Prime Minister was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk, and was there greeted by Members of the

Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND.

Following the informal reception, the Prime Minister and the distinguished visitors acocmpanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair).

## VISIT TO THE SENATE BY STUDENTS OF ST. MARTIN'S EPISCOPAL SCHOOL OF NEW ORLEANS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last December it was my privilege to address the fathers and mothers of the children attending St. Martin's Episcopal School, which is located at 5309 Airline Highway, near New Orleans, La. At that time I was informed by a member of the senior class that the schoolchildren intended to visit Washington. I told them if they came to Washington I would be glad to show them around.

Today, I am happy to state that in the galleries are 25 students of St. Martin's Episcopal School. These boys and girls have earned their way to Washington by selling old newspapers and scrap iron and by babysitting and waiting.

I am glad to present them to the Senate. I ask them to rise, so that they may be greeted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair asks our young guests in the galleries to rise.

(The group rose in their places in the gallery and were greeted by applause.)

Mr. ELLENDER. The group of students is chaperoned by the Reverend and Mrs. John Jenkins and Miss Dorothy Dorsa.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the students be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

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

Mary Allen, Bill Andrews, Margy Barry, Alice Bland, Bob Cairns, Daryl Canfill, Gene Doswell, John Girault, Kathy Hamilton, Anne Heyerdale, David Lagarde, John Lambert, Elliott Laudeman, Betsy Little, David Malone, Bonnie Markle, Larry Maxwell, Martha McCoy, Eric Phillpott, Betty Pratt, Suzanne Ray, Sue Ruppel, Sharon Smith, Carol Wetterhall, and Tad Wisdom.

## REDETERMINATION OF MARKETING QUOTAS FOR BURLEY TOBACCO FOR THE 1955–56 MARKETING YEAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4951) directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the pending measure H. R. 4951, combines the provisions of S. 1457, to redetermine the national marketing quotas for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing years, and for other purposes; S. 1327, to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; S. 1325, to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and S. 1326, to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and all committee amendments to those bills.

The first two sections would include material covered by S. 1457, and would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to redetermine the national marketing quota for the 1955 crop of burley tobacco on the basis of the latest available statistics.

It would permit reduction of the 1955 crop to allotments of seven-tenths of an acre or less by not more than one-tenth of an acre; no allotment to be so reduced below five-tenths of an acre.

It would provide for the removal of quotas and price supports if the redetermined quota is not approved by two-thirds of the producers.

It would reduce the acreage and percentage of cropland factors used in determining minimum burley allotments from seven-tenths to five-tenths and from 25 percent of the cropland, to 10 percent of the cropland; no allotment to be reduced more than one-tenth of an acre in any 1 year.

Section 3, which includes material, contained in Senate bill 1327, provides that excess acres harvested in 1955 and subsequent years will not count in establishing future allotments. This will prevent producers from building up history through allotment violations.

Section 4, which includes material contained in Senate bill 1325 has to do with one who files a false report with respect to the tobacco acreage of his farm. A farmer who contributed to breaking down the marketing program by growing tobacco on unreported fields would have his next quota reduced by the percentage which his greatest production was of his quota.

Section 5, which includes material contained in Senate bill 1326, would increase the marketing penalty for overplanting tobacco from 50 percent of the average market price in the preceding market year to 75 percent of such average market price.

Mr. President, there is good cause for the proposed legislation. A normal quantity of tobacco in storage is approximately two and a half years' supply. At present more than three and a half years' supplies are in storage. If there were not a pound of burley tobacco raised during the next year, it would bring burley tobacco stock into approximately normal balance. We recognize such eventuality would be a disastrous situation for the burley tobacco growers, but we also recognize that sooner or later this program will fall unless supplies are brought into normal balance.

The proposed legislation, as I have said, would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make a redetermination between now and the planting season and to advise the growers what additional reduction to the 10 percent cut, which was made last fall, should be made before the 1955 crop of burley tobacco is planted.

Mr. President, some may say, "Why was not this cut made last November?" At the time the acreage was determined by the Department of Agriculture it was thought that there would be 582 million pounds of burley tobacco marketed, but that did not happen. There was a considerably larger amount of burley tobacco marketed last year than was anticipated by the Department when it made the determination in November as required by law. Latest estimates indicate a 670 million pound crop. It is the belief of the Department now that a proper determination would have been a 30 percent cut for the 1955 crop. This bill would permit a redetermination of the marketing quota, but not to exceed a reduction of 25 percent.

Mr. President, some may say that the burley tobacco industry could withstand a continuation of the present law; but if the proposed legislation is not enacted, we shall add this year an additional surplus over and above that already referred to, and we will be in worse condition 12 months hence than we are now.

In my judgment, which is supported by the views of officials of the Tobacco Branch of the Department of Agriculture, we may well require a 50 percent cut in the acreage of burley tobacco next year if this bill is not passed this year to curtail the production of burley tobacco at this time.

There will be some who will suggest that the section of the bill which would reduce from seven-tenths to five-tenths the minimum allotment is unnecessary at this time. I wish to say that this bill in its present form is supported by the Department of Agriculture, by major farm organizations within a goodly number of States, and by a great majority of the group who were represented at a meeting in Lexington of the eight-State burley committee. It was their judgment then, and it is now their judgment, that the enactment of this proposed legislation is essential for the preservation of the burley-tobacco program which has meant so much to more than 300,000 growers of burley tobacco in those 8 States.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What proportion of the crop of burley tobacco is now produced by those who have seven-tenths of an acre or less in the burley area?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Approximately one-third of the burley tobacco is produced by those who grow seven-tenths of an acre or less.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator advise the Senate to what extent the production per acre has increased because of greater fertilization and more scientific methods of production over the past 5 or 10 years as compared with the situation at the time this program was first inaugurated?

Mr. CLEMENTS. In 1940, the average production per acre was 1,045 pounds. In 1954, the average production was 1,650 pounds of burley to the acre.

Mr. BARKLEY. So today seven-tenths of an acre, or any similar amount, represents greater productivity than the same amount of acreage, or in some cases, twice the amount of acreage, reported in 1940. Is that not correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct. I should say that on the basis of what it will produce now seven-tenths of an acre will produce more than would have been produced in 1940 on the average allotment for burley tobacco, which was about 1.2 acres.

Mr. BARKLEY. So seven-tenths of an acre now, because of the processes by which increases in production have been brought about is almost equal to an acre and one-half of tobacco in 1940. Is that correct?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In undertaking to adjust the situation, so as to alleviate the conditions brought about by overproduction, I understand it is the Senator's view and the view of the committee that it is necessary to bring about a reduction in the production of the small acreage owner, as well as in the production of the large acreage owner. Otherwise, the new program would not be effective, and the entire program for burley tobacco would be injured and might collapse. Is that the view of the committee?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is the view of the committee; and, I may say to my distinguished colleague, it is certainly my view. I know the attitude of my colleague, who has been a champion of this program since its inception, namely, that under no conditions would he wish to inflict any hardship upon the small growers. But my belief—and I feel certain it is the belief of my colleague—is that it is necessary at this time, when an acreage production cut must be made, to maintain equality in the sharing of the cut.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all sympathize with the small grower. In my early days, I was a small grower myself. My father, also, was a small grower of tobacco. I understand the entire problem of the production of tobacco, whether it be burley or other types of tobacco.

I have always been, and I am now, in sympathy with the small grower of anything, whether it be tobacco, wheat, corn, or cotton. Yet I realize that if this program should collapse because of overproduction, the lack of markets, or by whatever method it might be brought about, whether by infringement on limitations fixed or overfertility of soil—for whatever reason the program might fail, the small producer would suffer in the same proportion as would the large producer, and he might not be able to change his acreage to some other type of crop growing as readily as a large producer could. Is that a fair assumption?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is certainly a fair assumption; I agree with it wholeheartedly.

I wish to add that, in my judgment, if the program should fall—and it will fall unless there shall be a fair distribution of the cut among the growers—the larger grower could more easily adapt himself to another type of farming than could the small grower, who is more dependent upon tobacco as a cash crop than upon any other item.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may illustrate, I have a friend in Kentucky who during the past year grew 81 acres of burley tobacco. He has a large farm. It is a very rich farm in the very center of the bluegrass region of Kentucky.

If by reason of overproduction and the consequent collapse of the price-support program, which has enabled burley tobacco growers to receive adequate compensation for their work, the program should fail, he could change his acreage into grasses or other crops, or he could raise cattle, any of which would adequately, or at least to some extent, compensate him.

As compared with a man having seven-tenths or five-tenths of an acre, which one, in, that situation, would have the advantage, even in the event of the collapse of the entire program?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should say the larger grower would have the advantage.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the senior Senator from Kentucky.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As the Senator from Kentucky knows, a large part of the burley tobacco grown in Tennessee is produced by the small farmers, those having 1 acre or less, and it is grown as a cash crop. The small tobacco farmer has already had his cash crop cut down to the point where it is almost impossible for him to survive. An increase in the cut will cause him serious difficulty.

Does not the Senator feel that a man having 10 acres is better able to absorb the cut which has to be made in order to keep the program than is the small farmer who has only seven-tenths of an acre now?

Mr. CLEMENTS. He not only is better able to absorb it, but he will share the cut in the same proportion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Since a cut below seven-tenths of an acre, in the case of a small farmer, will cause him grave economic hardship, does not the Senator feel that, as a matter of fairness and equity, in order to give the small producer at least a minimum amount on which to live, the large producer ought to share a somewhat greater proportion of the cut than the smaller farmer?

Mr. CLEMENTS. My heart is with the small grower as much as that of the Senator from Tennessee. I think my heart and the heart of my colleague should be inclined more sympathetically to the small grower, because there are more small growers in Kentucky than in any other State of the Union.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It might be well to add that there are also more large growers in Kentucky than in any other State of the Union.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There are more large growers in Kentucky than in any other State, but the percentage which the grower in Kentucky has allotted to him is not the highest. In some States the average acreage allotment is greater than it is in Kentucky.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asked the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky a question as to whether the small farmer is able to produce more than he formerly could produce by reason of better fertilization and improved agricultural methods. If that be true of the small farmer, is it not equally true, if not more so, of the farmer having a larger allotment?

Mr. CLEMENTS. In my opinion, there would be no difference. They both have access to the same techniques. I do not know of a single county in the burley-tobacco-producing areas which is not blessed with a county agricultural agent. The agents have done excellent work in our State, as I know they have done in Tennessee and the other burley-tobacco-growing States, in acquainting the small grower with the new techniques which have been developed to increase their production.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It seems to me that the farmer who has a larger allotment still will have a substantially larger income to get by with. In view of the dire economic plight of some of the very small growers, and the fact that hundreds of thousands of small farmers have been going out of business every year, until they have become quite a problem in our Nation, I think that instead of a general overall cut to keep all the farmers going, it would be in the public interest and would be much fairer to apply a larger amount of the deduction to the larger grower, while still allowing the small farmer to have his seven-tenths of an acre, which barely enables him to keep going anyway.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I agree with the theory expressed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee; but, from a practical standpoint, I think he will agree that it was not too long ago when the minimum was nine-tenths of an acre. At the time it was nine-tenths of an acre, that amount of land did not produce as much tobacco, on the average, as seven-tenths of an acre, and even less than seven-tenths of an acre produces today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is also true, is it not, that while a farmer can produce more with whatever land he has, the small farmer, who usually has quite a large family to support, as the Senator from Kentucky and I know also has to pay a little more for what he buys in the way of equipment and groceries? In other words, his cost of living has gone up very greatly, too, so that as of now, if his acreage is cut any more, it is going to be economically impossible for many of the small farmers to survive, and I think that would be an all-around catastrophe in our agricultural community.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to my friend from Tennessee that I dislike seeing any farmer receive a cut, regardless of whether his acreage is small or large; but that is not the real problem with which we are now confronted, when we have more than a year's oversupply of tobacco in storage. The question is, Are we going to save this program? If so, we shall have to take the action which the bill contemplates.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to join with the two able Senators from Kentucky in supporting the pending bill, or all tobacco bills, because farmers in Indiana raise considerable tobacco just across

the river from Kentucky. There are in Indiana many small tobacco farmers. I find that they are in favor of the proposed legislation. I merely desired to join with the two able Senators from Kentucky, and particularly with the author of the bill, the senior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. CLEMENTS), in supporting the proposed legislation. I think it is sound and that the Senate ought to support it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his observation, as well as for expressing support of the proposed legislation, and for his mention of the fact that farmers in his State favor the bill. During the past week I was in my home State. I did not find any farmer who grew tobacco in the State of Kentucky who wanted a cut in his acreage; but every grower of tobacco with whom I talked said that the program is more important than the exact acreage involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we may assume that, because of overproduction of the particular crop affected by the bill, we would be unable to maintain the program, and the price of tobacco reverted to what it was before there was a program in operation, would there be any incentive for a farmer, even with seven-tenths or five-tenths of an acre, to grow tobacco?

Mr. CLEMENTS. There would not be. In view of the surplus in storage at the present time, no farmer would desire to grow burley tobacco in a small amount without price supports.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would not only affect the tobacco crop itself, but it would affect drastically and tragically the value of the land on which the crop is grown, which is so vital to the tobacco industry of the United States and, I might say, to the Treasury of the United States, because the tobacco industry makes a greater contribution to the Treasury than any other crop, or almost all other crops in the United States combined.

Mr. CLEMENTS. My colleague, as usual, is eminently correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The great State of Missouri has a unique position in this matter. Last year an outstanding Missourian was elected to the House of Representatives from the Sixth District whose family for generations have been identified with the tobacco industry in Missouri. I had the privilege, shortly after lunch, to discuss this matter with this Representative, the Honorable WILLIAM HULL, JR., of Weston, Mo., who has been in the tobacco business all his life. Congressman HULL stated that while there are some minor modifications which the tobacco farmers of Missouri might wish in the bill, nevertheless they are wholeheartedly in favor of the bill as a whole; and he added he voted for it when it passed the House. Therefore, Mr. President, I support the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky in his presentation of this bill before the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank my friend from Missouri for his observation. It is certainly fine to have in the RECORD a statement that a Member of the House from Missouri, who has probably had a longer connection with the growth of burley tobacco than has any other Member of the House, has taken that position.

Mr. President, there may be some who would suggest, as one of my colleagues did, that a compromise ought to be offered and considered. As a matter of fact, the bill before the Senate now represents a compromise. The only type of tobacco which has a minimum acreage is burley. None of the other types have a minimum acreage.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to make a statement and then ask a question. I have never seen, and I have never known any person who ever saw, and I have never yet heard of, any farmer growing Bright Leaf tobacco who had an allotment of less than 2 acres. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if he has ever heard of a Bright Leaf tobacco grower having an allotment below 2 acres.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have not. As a matter of fact, I do not live in the flue-cured tobacco area. There is not an allotment for flue-cured tobacco in Kentucky. There are more types of tobacco than flue-cured and burley; but none of the other types of tobacco, including flue-cured, have a minimum allotment.

## VISIT TO SENATE OF MEMBERS OF PRECISION DRILL TEAM OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY, INDIANA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I merely wished to announce that the Purdue University drill team won the precision drill award in the cherry blossom contest, winning against all other competitors. As it is a great agricultural school as well as an engineering school, its students are very much interested in tobacco.

Two members of that drill team, Mr. Thomas McHenry and Mr. Dale Vermillion, are present in the gallery at this time. I know it will be interesting to the people of Indiana to know that the great University of Purdue won the precision drill team contest in Washington.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

## REDETERMINATION OF MARKETING QUOTAS FOR BURLEY TOBACCO FOR THE 1955–56 MARKETING YEAR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4951) directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as I was saying, a compromise has already been reached. I have stated that burley is the only type of tobacco which has a minimum acreage allotment. The growers of burley tobacco are of the opinion that burley tobacco should be in the same class, minimum acreagewise, as are all the other types of tobacco. However, because time is of the essence in the present situation, and since it is very essential that a determination be reached so that the Department can take such action as is needed in calling for a referendum, and have the question settled while there is still time to accomplish desirable results, the group concerned with the matter in the House of Representatives agreed to a compromise of five-tenths of an acre.

Mr. President, there are many who talk about the large number of big growers. I should like to read from the latest table I could obtain from the Department of Agriculture, which gives by size the estimated number of growers under the 1955 tobacco acreage allotments: 9,800 growers have one-tenth of an acre, 9,300 growers have two-tenths of an acre, 17,000 growers have three-tenths of an acre, 19,000 growers have four-tenths of an acre, 46,000 growers have five-tenths of an acre, 19,000 growers have six-tenths of an acre, 87,000 growers have seven-tenths of an acre, 14,000 growers have eight-tenths of an acre, 7,700 growers have nine-tenths of an acre, 7,300 growers have 1 acre, 28,000 growers have between 1.1 and 1.5 acres, 28,000 growers have between 1.6 and 2.5 acres, and 21,000 growers have between 2.6 and 5 acres.

When we come to the big growers we find the following: 8,000 have between 5 and 10 acres, 1,800 have between 10.1 and 20 acres, 400 have between 20 and 50 acres, 40 have between 50 and 100 acres; and 10 have 100 acres or more.

So it is easy to see that two-thirds of the growers are what may be called small growers. If the proposed cut goes into effect this year—and it will not be a general cut unless it covers more growers than those who would be covered by the present law—another twenty-odd thousand growers will go into the protected class, along with the 207,000 who are now in that category.

Mr. President, I could not take my seat without urging the Members of the Senate to consider whether they wish to protect a program which up to this time has cost the American taxpayer nothing, but which is now in jeopardy. One of the best proofs that it is in jeopardy is the fact that today more than $220 million worth of burley tobacco is pledged for Commodity Credit Corporation loans. I am advised that more burley tobacco than any other type of tobacco is under CCC loans, although the amount of burley tobacco which is produced is nowhere near so large as the amount of another variety of tobacco which is produced, namely, flue-cured, or Bright Leaf tobacco.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to consider this bill most seriously. As I have said, in Kentucky there are more small growers than there are in any other State. I wish it were possible for them to have one acre apiece. But that could not come to pass without wrecking

the present program, and the continuation of the program is more important to them, I am confident, than one-tenth of an acre more or less.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I take it that the Senator from Kentucky is aware of the fact that the law provides that on November 1 the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate the stocks on hand and shall publicly announce a quota for the ensuing crop year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. How does the Senator from Kentucky justify, if he does, the action of the Secretary of Agriculture in determining the quota for the next year in such a way as to so far underestimate the supply of tobacco and to give a larger percentage cut to the small grower with an allotment of less than 1 acre, than the cut given to those having allotments of more than 1 acre? In other words, as late as November 1, the Secretary of Agriculture issued the marketing quotas; and he so far missed the estimate as to bring us to this predicament, with the result that the growers having allotments in excess of 1 acre had their allotments reduced 10 percent, whereas the growers with allotments of less than 1 acre had their allotment reduced by as much as 12½ percent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I regret very much that the Secretary of Agriculture or, I should say, the Department of Agriculture—because the Secretary's determinations are based on the estimates made in the Tobacco Branch of the Department—miscalculated the production for last year. I think it is fair to say that my friends, the Senator from Tennessee and the people of the area where he lives and the people of the area where I live were, likewise, very much surprised to find that an additional amount of more than 100 million pounds of burley tobacco passed through the market, in excess of the amount which had been estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, the Senator from Kentucky realizes, I am sure, that nothing else in the world is quite so hazardous as the making of crop estimates. I am sure he recognizes that the Department of Agriculture does its very best, and has official reporters almost everywhere, and they turn in what they regard as good figures. But when there is a combination of good weather and the proper amount of moisture on the proper days, changed conditions frequently result. In that case varying estimates have to be indulged in.

Let me ask the Senator when burley tobacco was first brought under these acts. Was it not in 1946 or 1947?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me, let me say that, as I recall, in the Agricultural Act of 1938, tobacco was included among the basic crops.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, I have in mind a subsequent year.

Mr. BARKLEY. In 1948, an amendment of the so-called Triple A Act fixed the support price of tobacco at 90 percent of parity. But since 1938, tobacco has been in the category of basic crops.

Mr. ANDERSON. My point is that at one time we had to deal with cotton acreages, and we had to try to determine the minimum acreages. As I recall, whenever we face such a situation, it is extremely difficult to handle, because the situation cannot be cared for by reducing the allotments of only the producers who have fairly sizable allotments. If we leave alone all the minimum allotments—if we cut them virtually nothing—it will be necessary to cut by a very heavy amount or to a very large extent the allotments of the large producers, will it not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, that is also true with respect to cotton, peanuts, and other crops.

If there is a minimum below which the acreage allotments cannot be cut, and if that category includes a great many growers, then we are faced with a situation such as the present one, and when 100 million pounds extra come on the market, if the cut is applied to the larger producers only, it is a very, very heavy and disastrous cut, is it not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is quite true; and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who served so ably as Secretary of Agriculture, had many dealings with the tobacco problems when he served in that position.

Not very long ago the minimum acreage was 1 acre. We reached the point where the growers with acreages above 1 acre had to take too great a cut, and the minimum acreage was reduced to nine-tenths of an acre.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was there not quite a struggle over that question when the reduction took place?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was a hard batte in the Congress at that time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is true. As the Senator knows, one of the reasons is that the yield per acre increased so greatly that a grower with 1 acre was producing as much tobacco as a grower with 1½ acres had been producing only a few years before, while the consumption of burley tobacco had not increased.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I invite the attention of the junior Senator from New Mexico to the fact that even thought the crop of tobacco had been exactly as expected, the determination of the Secretary would still have been utterly unrealistic. The choice was whether to use the full amount of discretionary authority, thereby giving to the larger growers only a 10 percent reduction, and to the small growers a 12½ percent reduction, or to use a realistic estimate and give a 15-percent reduction to the larger growers and a 12½-percent reduction to the smaller growers.

The choice was made; and this is the second year in which the smaller growers have had a larger percentage reduction than the larger growers. The able Senator from New Mexico has pointed out that if we were to retain the present minimums, it would require the larger growers to have a larger percentage cut; but this is the second year in which the small growers have had the larger percentage cut. Is there any justice in that?

I thank the Senator for yielding. I do not know why the tobacco branch of the Department or the Secretary should be so unrealistic as late as November 1.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure my friend from Tennessee that I, too, regret it very much, but we are faced with a reality and not a theory. We need to save this program, and the way to assure its being saved is to enact legislation which will enable the growers themselves to approve, by two-thirds vote during this month, the continuation of this program.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am familiar with the various conferences which took place among the burley-tobacco growers representing the eight States already referred to, and numerous conferences held within the State of Kentucky, with which I am familiar, dealing with this question.

Resolutions have been adopted by Farm Bureau federations, burley-tobacco growers associations, and various other organizations representing the tobacco growers. They have adopted resolutions unanimously and have sent them to us. We have dealt with them and considered them.

It is true, is it not, that in the various meetings considering this subject both the small tobacco growers and the large tobacco growers were represented in reaching a determination and in voting upon the resolutions which have been sent here advocating a program of this kind?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So they have not been without representation. Their voice has been heard in the deliberations which have resulted in a unanimous attitude, as I recall, on the part of numerous farm organizations throughout the State of Kentucky. I cannot speak for any other State. Those organizations have recommended this type of legislation in recognition of the drastic situation which confronts them and the tragic result which would follow if, for any reason, this program should collapse. It could collapse only because of great overproduction or, of course, because of rejection of the program by a little more than a third of those who vote upon it. The pillars would come down on all of them—not only the large grower but the small grower. In proportion to his interest, the small grower would be hurt

worse than the large grower if the whole program should collapse.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct; and I thank my colleague for his fine contribution.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague [Mr. SCOTT], the distinguished Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. GORE], the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], and myself, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina, for himself, and other Senators, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and insert:

(2) No burley tobacco farm acreage allotment of seven-tenths of an acre or less shall be reduced under this act.

On page 3, it is proposed to strike out the colon in line 17 and the following words:

*Provided, however,* That no allotment of seven-tenths of an acre or less shall be reduced more than one-tenth of an acre in any 1 year.

On page 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "five-tenths" in line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the words "seven-tenths."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the distinguished Senator wish to have these amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. ERVIN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, stated in simple language, these amendments are designed merely to retain in effect the present seven-tenths of an acre minimum allotment to growers of burley tobacco. I respectfully submit that these amendments ought to be adopted, for any 1 of 3 different reasons.

The first is that before the provisions of the bill looking to the redetermination of the proper allotments for burley tobacco growers for the year 1955 can be carried into effect, the tobacco-planting season will be at hand, and the passage of the bill without the amendments would create a great deal of confusion in the burley tobacco-growing areas. For that reason, if for no other, these amendments ought to be adopted.

In the second place, they should be adopted because there is no need at this time for any reduction in the acreage allotted to the growing of burley tobacco.

Burley tobacco cannot be used as soon as it is grown. Like other tobaccos, it must be aged. An aging period of 2.7 years must elapse before burley tobacco can actually be used.

We have on hand a supply of burley tobacco of approximately 3½ years, which is only 0.8 of a year beyond the amount we must have on hand for the proper aging. It would require only one bad tobacco-growing season, and the enforcement of certain provisions incorporated in the bill, other than the provisions to which my amendments are addressed, to bring the production of burley tobacco into balance with the demand for burley tobacco.

It is well known in the burley tobacco field that burley tobacco planters have been overgrowing tobacco, and have been doing so because of a provision in the law which should have been eliminated long ago. That provision deals with a grower of burley tobacco who overplants his present allotment and secures an increase in his future allotment if he pays the penalty.

Furthermore, there is a provision in the bill which would raise the penalty for overplanting from 50 percent to 75 percent. Therefore, it is not necessary to reduce the amount of the acreage allotted to burley tobacco growers at this time. If the bill is passed, with the provision in it which increases the penalty for overproduction from 50 percent to 75 percent, and with the further provision that hereafter it will not be possible to acquire increased future allotments for growing burley tobacco by overplanting one's present allotment, and paying the penalty, such a reduction will not be necessary.

Therefore, we will soon create a situation where the production and use of burley tobacco will be balanced and there will be no surplus on hand.

The surplus we now have on hand is only slightly above the amount that is necessary for the proper aging of burley tobacco.

My able and distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], stated that he favors the small growers of burley tobacco, and that his heart bleeds for the small man, as my heart bleeds for him, too. However, Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Kentucky has one consolation which he can lay to his bleeding heart. It is a consolation that I do not have. He has 78,000 growers of burley tobacco in his State, who have on the average a 2.6-acre allotment. I have 20,000 growers of burley tobacco in my State who have an allotment of not exceeding six-tenths of an acre.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should not want the Senator to leave the Senate under a wrong impression with reference to the average allotment of Kentucky growers of burley tobacco. The acreage in Kentucky, according to the figures I have, is 261,000 acres, and the number of growers is 154,000. The average allotment, therefore, would be somewhat less than the figure my friend from North Carolina has used.

Mr. ERVIN. I do not believe there is any difference between the Senator from Kentucky and myself with respect to the figures. I believe we are substantially in agreement. In his State there are 79,300 small farmers, who have an average allotment of seven-tenths of an acre or less. In that respect they are like my people, except that my people have an average of six-tenths of an acre. However, the State of the Senator from Kentucky also has, in addition to those I have mentioned, 78,000 farmers who have an average of 2.6 acres. As I say, he can lay to his heart the consolation that half of his farmers will have an average of 2 acres, notwithstanding any reduction that may be made. I have no such consolation.

I am familiar with the burley tobacco growing areas of North Carolina. The Lord thought a great deal of North Carolina, particularly western North Carolina. He wanted people there to be just as close to heaven as He could reasonably get them. Therefore, He built some mountains in that area. In order to build the mountains, He had to put a great many rocks into the ground. He had to do that in order to get the people close to the angels. As a result of the presence of those rocks, there is not in western North Carolina very much land that can be used by the growers of burley tobacco.

The same observation applies to the tobacco growing areas of Tennessee and West Virginia. They, too, have small burley tobacco patches of one-fourth or one-half or seven-tenths of an acre scattered through the mountains.

Those people have no cash crop except the burley tobacco crop. Of course they have another crop, Mr. President—a big crop of children. A man who has an allotment of seven-tenths of an acre or less can gross only about $420 a year. That is all the cash crop he has. He may also have some chickens, a cow, and a pig, and he may raise some vegetables. However, he has no other way of getting cash except by growing burley tobacco.

We might as well face the situation, Mr. President. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]—who, I regret, has left the floor—said he was interested in the small farmers, and therefore would support the bill without my amendment. I want to give him the assurance that his small farmers will be a great deal smaller if the bill is passed without my amendment. If the bill is passed without my amendment, we will eventually have a situation where the Arabs will take away the vineyards of the Naboths.

That will happen, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has pointed out, if we keep cutting the minimum allotment. At one time the minimum figure was 1 acre. Then it was cut down to nine-tenths of an acre; then to seven-tenths. Now it is proposed to reduce the figure to five-tenths of an acre.

The successive cutting down of the minimum acreage of the burley tobacco farmers reminds me of the man who wanted his dog to have a short tail. He cut his dog's tail off a little bit at a time, because he felt this process would not hurt the dog so much.

That is exactly the condition which will be brought about if the Senate rejects my amendments and continues the process of cutting off the minimum allotment a little at a time. If we keep cutting the minimum allotment in this way, the small burley tobacco farmer will eventually have no allotment of any practical value.

I respectfully submit that that will be the situation. No farmer ought to be cut down below a cash income of $420, which is the amount he can gross a year

on an allotment of seven-tenths of an acre.

As the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] pointed out in his questions to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], a farmer who has seven-tenths of an acre as an allotment by reason of an increase in production, has the equivalent of twice that much. By the same token, a man who has a 2.6 acreage allotment, as is the case with 78,000 farmers in Kentucky, has the equivalent of 5.2 acres. The farmer who is fortunate enough to have as much as a 10- or 20-acre allotment has the equivalent of 20 or 40 acres.

My friends from Kentucky tell me how much interested they are in the small farmers. I know that to be a fact, because they themselves are big-hearted men. I know they hate to do to the small farmers of my State what they are preparing to do. However, it seems to me that if their hearts bleed as much as mine does for the small farmers, of whom there are 79,000 in Kentucky and 20,000 in North Carolina, approximately 25,000 in Tennessee, and a like number in West Virginia, their hearts will prompt them to vote for my amendments, which will keep the present minimum in effect. Next year, if the increase in the penalty does not cut down the excess production, we can consider the matter again, instead of discussing it now, on the eve of the planting season.

Therefore, Mr. President, I plead with Members of the Senate not to continue to reduce the minimum allotment of burley growers, because the eventual result will be that there will not be sufficient acreage left to the small grower of burley to warrant his remaining in this agricultural field.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the senior Senator from North Carolina, but I shall not attempt to go into any further argument of the subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the question which is involved.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

I think my colleague [Mr. ERVIN] has offered a very important amendment that merits very careful consideration by all of us.

This burley tobacco problem is one that has been growing on us for some time. It is a very serious infection, and unless it is handled right, it might mean the end to our whole burley tobacco program.

Many, many attempts have been made to find a solution that would be satisfactory to everybody concerned. More important, we have made attempts to find a solution that would be just and fair to all burley tobacco growers.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the provisions of the pending bill, with one exception. I should like to say that during the committee hearings and deliberations we all were in accord except for one phase of the burley problem.

To me, and I think to anyone acquainted with the farm problems of the Nation, that one point of difference is of the utmost importance.

I refer to the section of the bill with which the proposed amendment deals. The bill passed by the House contains a provision under which no burley tobacco acreage allotments of five-tenths of an acre or less would be reduced. Until this year, no acreage allotments under seven-tenths of an acre have been reduced. In other words, until now the burley tobacco growers have been assured of at least seven-tenths of an acre allotment.

More important than the percentage reduction, however, is the fact that this means the difference between profit and loss for thousands of burley growers.

I have always agreed that some steps must be taken to reduce the total production of burley tobacco in order to bring supply closer in line with demand, but I do not think we will solve the problem by forcing the small producers out of business.

In this respect, I should like to call a few facts to the attention of the Senate. I have some figures here that are hard to believe, but they are true.

In my home State of North Carolina, we have about 19,000 burley-tobacco growers. Last year, the average acreage of burley tobacco in North Carolina was sixty-four one-hundreths of 1 acre. That is just a fraction above six-tenths of an acre. It is hard to believe, but the cold facts are that the average burley-tobacco grower in North Carolina produces his crop on just a little over half an acre.

All the burley grown in North Carolina is produced in the western counties—in the mountain counties.

I should like to tell the Senate something about the fine mountain people of our State. There are no finer people anywhere.

My senior colleague, Senator ERVIN, comes from the mountains of North Carolina, and I think everyone in this Chamber agrees that a better man cannot be found anywhere.

The mountain people of our State are rugged individuals who believe in living and letting their fellow men live. For the most part, they live on very meager cash incomes.

In many, many cases, the cash income that is received from burley tobacco is the only cash income the mountain farmer has. A tenth of an acre, a quarter of an acre, or even a half acre seems very small when we talk of it here, but when it represents a family's total cash income, then it becomes the most important thing in the world to the head of that family.

Let me give one more set of figures. In 1951, for example, when farm prices were higher than they are now, the average value of burley tobacco in North Carolina was $949 per acre. That means that the average burley farmer in North Carolina, with just a little over a half acre of tobacco, received about $500 for his entire crop.

I cannot find it in myself to believe that a plan which would cut such a man's income by as much as this bill would do is good legislation. I say that if the bill passed by the House becomes law, there will be thousands of burley-tobacco farmers next year who will suffer beyond repair.

There are several provisions in the House bill, namely, the sections that would set up tighter penalties for overplanting and more rigid enforcement regulations; that will go a long way toward reducing the overproduction of burley tobacco.

I hope every member of the Senate will keep these things in mind when the votes are cast. I ask Senators to vote for the amendment that will assure a seven-tenths of an acre allotment.

The small-burley-tobacco growers are already suffering beyond words. If the acreage floor is reduced, it will be the death blow for thousands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to detain the Senate at this time in regard to this matter, but I do wish to make 1 or 2 brief observations with reference to the bill itself and to the amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

I appreciate all he has stated with reference to the tobacco growers of western North Carolina. My grandfather came from that region. He was born, reared, and married in that section of North Carolina, and then moved to Tennessee, thence into Kentucky, where I was born. My father was born in Tennessee.

I understand the problem of large families, because I was the oldest of eight children. We never grew more than six acres of tobacco, which would be less than an acre per child. I think I understand all the problems of the big family and of the small grower of tobacco and other farm crops.

The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina proposes to reduce the production of the small farmer by a small degree, and the Senator uses a dog's tail as an analogy. According to his argument, he would cut it off a little at a time; but he would cut it more often. Therefore, it would hurt worse.

The pending bill authorizes a minimum acreage of five-tenths of an acre. The Senator would make it six-tenths of an acre.

I can remember, Mr. President, when the tobacco growers of North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the other tobacco-growing States produced tobacco at a pitifully small price. I have been identified with tobacco all my life. Tobacco is the hardest crop to grow, I think, among all crops, because it is still hand-produced and hand-marketed. There is no machinery used in its production except to a very limited degree. When I was a boy we used to say it took 13 months out of every 12 to grow and market a crop of tobacco. I can recall when burley tobacco, which has been bringing 30, 40, 50, even 60 cents a pound under the program which has been in effect for a number of years, sold at 5 cents a pound.

In my section of the country, where we produce dark-fired tobacco and flue-cured tobacco, those types of tobacco sold at 3 cents a pound. The price has gone to 30 and 35 cents a pound, and the 5-cent tobacco price has gone to 50 or 60 cents a pound. It has enabled our farmers to enjoy a successful program.

Nothing more discouraging or tragic could happen to a tobacco grower, whether he produces flue-cured, dark-fired, or burley tobacco, than to lose the price supports which have maintained him.

Tobacco is very important to the economy of our country and very important to the Treasury of the United States. It has been singled out from other crops for a 90-percent support, not by Executive order, but by law. We all appreciate that, and we had something to do with it.

We have encouraged the enrichment of our soil. We have encouraged all farmers, under a soil-conservation program and other programs, to enrich their soil so as to produce more abundant crops.

We have encouraged tobacco growers in all the tobacco-growing States to grow more tobacco on their farms, whether their acreage be seven-tenths of an acre or half an acre, or whether it be 40 or 50 acres. The farmers have increased their production. The increase in production per acre has largely been responsible for the surplus which is now on hand.

Tobacco growers feel that there should be a reduction in the allotment, though there has been a leveling off of the supply on hand in storage, and, as the Senator from North Carolina has said, in the case of burley tobacco, it must be stored and aged at least 2 years. There is practically a 3½ years' supply now on hand.

Shall we say to the small grower, for whom I have great sympathy and whose spokesman I have been in this body and in other bodies for many years, that we will reduce the allotment of the large producers but will permit the small grower to produce a larger percentage of the total crop and thereby complicate even more the problem which now faces the burley tobacco grower? I think it faces the small grower of tobacco at this moment more particularly than any other type of grower in the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. My amendment is for the purpose of preventing anyone from cutting off any of the dog's tail. It is to keep the tail the same length.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from North Carolina provides for one-tenth of an acre under certain circumstances, and then he says that if it does not work satisfactorily in some future year, we will cut off more.

Mr. ERVIN. My amendment provides for the retention of the present minimum. We need not cut off the dog's tail at all. I am in favor of letting the dog keep it. It is the unamended bill which would cut off the dog's tail.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if the situation continues to grow worse in the next few years as it has in the past year or two, the Senator's idea would be to cut off the tail at the end of that period.

But I do not wish to dwell on the dog's tail, because there are better parts of a dog than that.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that the adoption of the amendment which would continue the minimum acreage at the figure of seven-tenths would mean that the surplus would be added to this year, and that a small percentage of the growers would be required to take all the cut?

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be true; and we would say to those who now produce more than one-third of the tobacco on the smaller acreage, "Go ahead. Produce all you can. Create a greater surplus." If there is any cut at all, it will be against those who produce more than seven-tenths of an acre. That is a program which I think would not work to the advantage of the small grower.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that the cut which is proposed by the pending bill will not solve the surplus problem we now have, and that it will take an additional cut in the 1956 crop to bring about a balance?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator means that without the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina the bill now pending does not make a sufficient cut to bring about a balance, and there will have to be another cut next year?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the cut next year is as large as the Department says is necessary this year, 25 percent, and in the testimony before the subcommittee which heard the matter, the Department of Agriculture stated it would take a 50 percent cut over 2 years to bring about a balance, and if the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina were adopted, would it not mean that a small percentage of the growers would take the entire 50 percent?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no doubt about it. Not only that, but the cuts heretofore made up and down the line have not been made by percentages. They have been made by tenths of an acre. In the case of those who produced tobacco on 1 acre or less the reduction went from 1 acre to nine-tenths of an acre, then to seven-tenths, and now it is proposed to go to a minimum of five-tenths. The difference can hardly be calculated on a percentage basis because it has not worked that way heretofore; whereas the cut from seven-tenths to five-tenths amounts to a larger percentage for those who grow more. It is rather more difficult to work out a cut for the small grower, if there is to be a cut at all, on a percentage basis, than for the larger grower.

Therefore, without taking further time, I hope the amendment offered by our good friend from North Carolina and his colleagues will not be agreed to, and that the bill as reported by the committee will be passed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the tobacco price-support program has been perhaps the most successful part or segment of the entire agricultural price-support program. Up to now, as was said by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the price-support program with respect to tobacco, not only burley, but also all other types, has not resulted in a loss to the taxpayer; indeed, considerable interest and profit has been returned to the Treasury.

However, particularly in the case of burley tobacco, a very serious situation is faced at this time. There was an overproduction of burley last year, and the production was larger than had been estimated.

More seriously, however, the consumption of tobacco has fallen off within the United States, and the sale of burley tobacco abroad likewise has been reduced. I venture to suggest that unless Congress enacts an enlightened foreign-trade program, our export markets may be further reduced.

The problem before the Senate today is not whether there should be a reduction. The amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] would permit reductions beyond the minimum acreage, which by law is now seven-tenths of an acre. That is, an allotment of seven-tenths of an acre or less, under present law, cannot be reduced. The bill proposes to reduce the legal limit to five-tenths of an acre.

The senior Senator from North Carolina, for himself and other Senators, including the junior Senator from Tennessee, has offered an amendment to retain the seven-tenth-acre allotment. But that does not mean, as the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] seemed to have in mind, that the small growers would take no cut in their allotment for the coming crop year. Indeed, the bulk of those growers last year had an allotment of eight-tenths of an acre. That has already been reduced to seven-tenths of an acre, which is now the floor.

The bill before the Senate would lower the floor from seven-tenths of an acre to five-tenths of an acre, and would make possible a still further cut.

I reply to the junior Senator from Kentucky by pointing out that he is correct in his statement that the allotments have been in tenths of an acre. But that has worked to the advantage of the small grower, because just now the eight-tenths-acre allotment has been reduced to seven-tenths, which is a 12½-percent reduction. Beyond an acre, the reduction has still been made in tenths, or to the nearest tenth, on a percentage basis, which means that the majority of small growers have already taken a cut from last year's crop, when their acreage allotment was reduced from nine-tenths to eight-tenths. But for this crop year, when the acreage allotment has been reduced from eight-tenths to seven-tenths, there is a percentage cut in excess of that taken by growers having larger acreages.

If the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina should be adopted, the bill would then provide that the Secretary of Agriculture could wipe out the cuts already proclaimed for this year, and redetermine them. Therefore, under the bill with the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina, the Secretary of Agriculture could reduce the eight-tenths-acre allotments 12½ percent. He could determine to reduce the larger acreages by 15 percent.

But someone might say it would be unfair to cut the larger growers 15 percent, while cutting the small growers by only 12½ percent. Perhaps that would constitute an element of unfairness. But where is fairness to be found in the cuts already applied, which reduce the small grower by a larger percentage than the larger growers are reduced?

We have minimums in our economy and in our laws. I point out to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] that a minimum-wage law is on the books. I supported it, and I expect to support an increase in the minimum wage. Perhaps it will not

be so great an increase as the distinguished Senator from Michigan would suggest, but perhaps we might compromise on a figure.

In this instance it is proposed not to increase a minimum, but to reduce a minimum. What has contributed to the philosophy behind minimums? The purpose is to provide a minimum below which we believe a family cannot have a decent American living. Why is there a minimum cotton acreage? In order to save the small grower from being driven from his farm. Why is there a minimum in burley tobacco allotments? It is simply in order to permit the small hillside or mountainside farmer to maintain his home and his farm.

It is not easy or pleasant to propose that one group of growers should have a larger percentage representation than others have. But I believe there are minimums below which we should not go—in wages, in the salaries of Government employees, in cotton production, in tobacco production.

Tobacco acreage allotments involve financial problems for thousands of very small farm homesteads. What the senior Senator from North Carolina, I, and other Senators who have associated themselves with the amendment seek is the maintenance of homesteads, farmsteads, and to enable those who occupy them to remain on their farms and make a living.

Seven-tenths of an acre. That is a small plot on which the Government of the United States is asked to permit a farmer and his wife and children to toil with their hands to eke out a living. I know that others who have larger acreages will have reductions. I am one of them. But those with larger acreages can turn to something else if reductions must be made. Those with larger acreages would be less affected by a reduction in their allotments than would a farmer with a few acres on a hillside. To him it is the difference between maintaining his homestead and being forced to leave it.

Therefore, I hope the amendment will be adopted. I wish to make it plain that I expect to support the bill even if the amendment is not adopted. The tobacco farmers and their representatives have said that they are willing to have production controlled and limited so as to keep tobacco within the proximity of demand. In recognition of that, the Congress has treated the tobacco farmers more advantageously than it has any other group. Tobacco alone has a rigid 90-percent price support. That we must maintain. That we can maintain. But some reduction in production is absolutely necessary. I believe, however, that a 12½-percent reduction in the production of tobacco for the farmers with less than an acre is sufficient within a year.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that the 12½-percent figure the Senator has mentioned is based on an administrative decision of the Department of Agriculture, and the manner in which it handles its tolerances?

Mr. GORE. If that be true, it is effective, nevertheless.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I desired the RECORD to show that it was not in the law; that it was a matter of administration.

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator has made reference to the fact that farms of five-tenths of an acre do not provide a living for many persons. Is it not a fact that more than 100,000 of the burley growers' allotments today are five-tenths of an acre or less?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that today a third of all the growers who are under the five-tenths of an acre allotment will not be affected by the proposed legislation either this year or next year, or any other year, so long as the legislation is on the books?

Mr. GORE. The bill does not provide any reduction for those persons.

Mr. CLEMENTS. So a third of the burley growers now are under an allotment of five-tenths of an acre or less, and they at least have a financial interest, and evidently their present acreage is contributing to their livelihood.

Mr. GORE. I have no reason to question the figures which the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky has given. I wish to point out two things. One is the allotments above the minimums now about 70 percent of the tobacco. So in order to make a reduction that is effective, it is not absolutely necessary to reduce the minimum by more than 12½ percent. If the minimums should be reduced by 12½ percent and the others by 15 percent, I believe we might bring the production within reasonable proximity to demand.

I wish to verify what the Senator has said, and also what his colleague, the now junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], has said, that the administrative decision is to reduce to the nearest tenth. But the small farmer cannot be blamed for that. The fact stands that for the second year this administrative decision has resulted to his disadvantage. The large grower has taken a 10 percent cut each year, but the small grower has taken more than a 10 percent cut for each year for the past 2 years.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee or any other Senator can give the proportion of those growing burley tobacco who do not rely upon it as their main source of support, but who grow it as a sort of sideline. It does not take long to produce an acre of tobacco, nor does it take very much labor.

It can be produced in the garden or, if one's back yard is large enough, in the back yard. Such tobacco can be produced and cultivated after working hours, if one is engaged in another profession or calling. Does the Senator know the percentage of those who produce tobacco on less than an acre who have other occupations, and raise the tobacco as a sideline, to supplement their incomes, and not as their main source of income?

Mr. GORE. I do not have the exact figure, so I cannot answer the Senator. I would say to him I am not pleading for any part-time farmer. The bill contains a provision, which I do not resist, to permit reduction of town lots to the extent of 25 percent of the acreage. That, I believe, is going a long way toward reducing the number of part-time farmers. What I am pleading for is the preservation of a minimum for the homestead owner who makes, or ekes out, I should say, his living from a few acres of soil.

Mr. BARKLEY. Even in that case farmers with less than 1 acre of tobacco frequently raise other crops. They may raise corn or wheat, or have orchards. Orchards can be grown in that part of the country. So that if a man had a family and he had only seven-tenths of an acre of tobacco, it would require only a portion of the time of one single human being in that family to produce less than 1 acre of tobacco. There must be other occupations in which such farmers engage at least a part of the time, so that they do not have to rely on the seven-tenths of an acre to support their families, without the assistance of any other crop. I myself do not know what proportion such growers represent, but it must be considerable.

Mr. GORE. It may be more considerable in the State so ably represented in part by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may say so, a large part of that production has been induced by the very program we are seeking to preserve.

Mr. GORE. Undoubtedly there are farmers who have other crops, but not many farmers in Tennessee, with a few acres on a hillside, can go into wheat production. It costs too much to own a binder or a combine. Not many farmers with a few acres on a hillside can grow very much corn. In an area with heavy precipitation, his soil would soon be gone. Tobacco is a cash crop, and just as we need minimum wages, just as we need minimum cotton acreage allotments, I think we need minimum acreage in tobacco allotments, which should be overall, instead of having a reduction in the production of burley tobacco only.

I contend, however, that it is socially better, or at least fairer to reduce the allotments of the larger growers by 15 percent, and reduce the allotments of the small growers by 12½ percent, rather than to reduce the allotments of the larger growers by 10 percent and reduce the allotments of the small growers by 12½ percent. If there is to be a 2½ percent difference, I believe the advantage should be on the side of the homestead owners.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee does not desire to leave with this body the impression that this measure or any other legislation on this subject contains any provision

which would make it mandatory for the Department to do anything other than distribute the acreage equally.

Mr. GORE. I have not sought to leave any impression other than whatever the facts of the case warrant.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If it has happened, it has been by administrative decision in the Department, rather than by legislation now on the statute books, has it not?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Kentucky uses the words "if it has happened." Does not the Senator from Kentucky think it has happened?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Tennessee, that because of administrative rulings, it is possible that the allotments of some of the growers have been affected more than 10 percent, when there was a general 10 percent reduction.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. Does not that apply to all growers whose allotments were reduced from eight-tenths of an acre to seven-tenths?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would say that is correct, under the administrative ruling.

Let me say further to the Senator from Tennessee that, in my opinion, the proper way to handle the matter would be to make the determination on the basis of one-hundredths rather than one-tenths. If that were done, the manner in which the tolerance is handled in the Department would not affect adversely or jeopardize any grower.

I will join the Senator from Tennessee in urging the Department to put it on that basis.

Mr. GORE. Surely we should handle it on a basis by means of which at least the small grower would be treated fairly.

Let us make perfectly plain what has happened: Originally there was a minimum of 1 acre. It was reduced to nine-tenths of an acre. Then the legal minimum was fixed at seven-tenths of an acre, although that did not mean the allotments were reduced to seven-tenths. We fixed the floor at seven-tenths of an acre. Then the bulk of the farmers who had allotments of nine-tenths of an acre had their allotments reduced, in the ensuing year, by one-tenth, or 10 percent. The administrative decision was to make the cuts to the nearest tenth, which meant that the bulk of the tobacco farmers had their allotments reduced from nine-tenths to eight-tenths of an acre.

For this year's crop, the Secretary of Agriculture proclaimed a reduction of another 10 percent in the acreage allotments. To a grower who had 4 acres, that meant a reduction of four-tenths of an acre; but to the large number of farmers with minimum allotments, whose allotments last year were eight-tenths of an acre, that meant their allotments would be reduced to seven-tenths of an acre, or a reduction of 12½ percent. I think the able senior Senator from Kentucky will agree with that statement of fact.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will agree that the Department of Agriculture made that ruling, and handled it in that way, administratively.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. Of course, I know he had no intention of having the small growers treated unfairly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Neither do I now have any desire to have the small growers treated unfairly.

Mr. GORE. I certainly acknowledge that.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it is with the deepest of regret that I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Kentucky and with other Senators who represent tobacco-growing areas. This is my first disagreement on tobacco legislation in the handling of which I have participated, with other Members of Congress representing tobacco-growing areas in my 17 years in the Congress; and I regret it deeply.

But I think we must recognize that there are limits and minimums below which we should not go, and I believe a seven-tenths of an acre allotment is one of them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest that it would be the course of fairness, justice, and, I hope, wisdom to support the amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call for a division.

On a division, the amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk another amendment, in behalf of the same principle as that of the first amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 18, inclusive, and to insert:

(2) No burley tobacco farm acreage allotment of six-tenths of an acre or less shall be reduced under this act.

On page 3, it is proposed to strike out the colon in line 17 and the ensuing words in lines 17 to 19, inclusive, and to insert:

*Provided, however,* That no allotment of six-tenths of an acre or less shall be reduced more than one-tenth of an acre in any 1 year.

On page 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "five-tenths" in line 16, and to insert in lieu thereof the words "six-tenths."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment is to make a minimum of six-tenths of an acre, instead of a minimum of seven-tenths of an acre, as under the first amendment, or instead of a minimum of five-tenths of an acre, as in the bill. I submit the amendment in order to afford an opportunity of repentance for Senators who did not vote for the first amendment; this is done in order that they may vote to do just half as much injury to the small burley tobacco grower as they otherwise would be voting to do.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement: Every argument which was valid against the other amendment is valid against this one. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in response to the statement of the senior Senator from Kentucky has made—and undoubtedly he was entirely sincere in making it—I wish to offer this additional thought:

Under the provisions of the pending bill the largest percentage reduction that can be made in any acreage is 25 percent. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from North Carolina would permit a 25-percent reduction in the acreage allotment of the minimum acreage this year. Last year it was eight-tenths. The senior Senator from North Carolina now proposes that it be made six-tenths. That would permit a 25-percent reduction. That is the largest reduction provided in the bill for any acreage allotment.

I read from page 2, line 9, of the bill: "Shall not be reduced by more than 25 percent."

That applies to all allotments. The amendment of the senior Senator from North Carolina would bring the minimum acreage in line with that figure.

Why do we need to reduce the minimum to a greater extent than the reduction provided in the pending bill for this year? Will the senior Senator from Kentucky explain why it is necessary to reduce the minimum to five-tenths of an acre when the maximum reduction under the bill would be to six-tenths of an acre?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the whole philosophy behind the bill is to assure the sharing of the cuts among a greater number of growers. When the allotment is reduced to five-tenths, the result will be a sharing among a greater number of growers of the reduction in acreage which will be necessary this year and next year.

Mr. GORE. Then, with this five-tenths minimum, the Senator is preparing for next year rather than providing the necessary cuts for this year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It would not only provide for next year, but it would provide for any year. If within a year or 2 years there should be an increase in the acreage allotment, this provision would still be on the books. When necessary, all, or a greater number of the growers, could share any cut which might be considered sound and wise.

Mr. GORE. Will not the Senator agree that the maximum cut which can be made under this bill is 25 percent?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. For the part-time farmer, for the large farmer, or for the minimum acreage allotment?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It would be not to exceed 25 percent for all those above a certain base.

Mr. GORE. Then, if the amendment of the senior Senator from North Carolina should be adopted, the bill would still permit a 25-percent reduction in acreage for all growers.

Mr. CLEMENTS. No; it would not.

Mr. GORE. For all the minimum growers, who have an allotment of eight-tenths of an acre.

Mr. CLEMENTS. For all growers who have an allotment of eight-tenths. My interpretation—and, I understand, the interpretation of the Department of Agriculture—is that it would permit a 25-percent cut.

Mr. GORE. Then the only purpose of reducing the minimum to five-tenths of an acre instead of six-tenths is to provide for a further reduction in acreage of the growers with minimum allotments for next year or a succeeding year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If that should become necessary; yes.

Mr. GORE. I suggest that no case whatsoever has been made for the reduction of the minimum down to five-tenths of an acre. The maximum extent to which the minimum can be reduced this year, under the terms of the bill, would be six-tenths; and there is no need to enact legislation further than that, because the entire question will be before the Congress again next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4951) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

REDUCED COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I did not offer an amendment to the pending bill to take care of another agricultural problem which is very grave. The tobacco bill was prepared and has made its way through legislative channels, and I would not offer an amendment which would in any way jeopardize its passage. However, I wish to detain the Senate for a few minutes to call particular attention to a problem in my area of the country which has been made much more acute than it was a week ago, when the cotton acreage allotment bill was debated on the floor of the Senate.

A serious though unintentional wrong has been done to a great many of the small cotton growers in the Cotton Belt. I say unintentional because I know that no Senator was intentionally doing anything wrong.

Last year Congress enacted a law which permitted the acreage allotments of the very small growers to be greatly reduced; and because of the power which was given in that bill various State committees and county committees operated in such a way as to increase the number of cases which represent great distress. There was no way to administer the program without creating a great number of such cases. However, more of the smaller growers were left out than would have been the case if the law had not been changed. The program was administered by the Department of Agriculture under the law enacted last year.

I do not say that the Department had any knowledge of this procedure at the time the hardships were created. But at least it did not do anything about the situation after learning what had happened. The Department has not recommended any relief bill of any kind with respect to the hardship cotton cases. Some of the officials of the Department have been very cooperative in obtaining the facts, and very sympathetic in trying to help bring about a remedy, but the Department itself has not recommended any bill to the Congress which would meet the situation.

The House committee and the House of Representatives went into the subject and recommended a bill. The Senate committee considered the subject and recommended a bill. It had its day on the floor of the Senate, but did not pass.

I am not complaining about that, or imputing any wrong motives to anyone. I thank the Senators for the attention they gave to the subject. But the hardship cases remained. They have not been remedied. As I say, they have been made more acute.

I wish to recite very briefly how serious the situation is in some areas. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that in my State more than 55,000 tenants will be displaced in the Cotton Belt because of reductions in cotton acreage allotments this year. The displacements in Mississippi alone will be in excess of 11,000, representing one-fifth of the total displacements throughout the entire Cotton Belt, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This number is concentrated in one State.

Under the Senate committee bill it would take only 28,000 acres to bring some measure of relief to 32,000 farmers. I repeat, only 28,000 acres would bring some measure of relief to more than 32,000 farmers, Mr. President. In my own home county in east-central Mississippi, near the Alabama line, more than 300 tenant farmers have been displaced.

This figure does not give the complete picture, because it refers only to tenants. There are many small farmers who will be drastically affected by the reduction. It is estimated that in my home county more than 500 small farmers of 5 acres or less will have their income reduced by more than $100 because of the reduction in the cotton acreage.

In that same county there are about 1,584 cotton farmers, and almost 50 percent of them, or 760, would be benefited in some way from the small increase of providing for 4 acres, or 75 percent of the highest planted acreage.

I recite those figures to show how acute the problem is and how distressing it is.

On top of it all has come the most severe freeze experienced in that section of the South in 75 years. It has wiped out almost the entire peach crop, the bean crop, and the tomato crop; it has totally wiped out the tung-nut crop; it has wiped out the pecan and a number of other crops that go to fill in the agricultural picture. These combined facts will cause the people to leave the land. That is what makes it a national problem. It puts them on the road, so to speak. It puts the tenants off the lands and it takes the homeowner, the landowner, off his farm. That is so because he does not have enough of a minimum crop to justify his staying on the land. It eventually puts him in the relief line.

I submit those are the people who represent some of the very finest American virtues in the way of family life, community life, and also represent what have been sound economic units.

We are certainly getting a great deal of sympathy, Mr. President, but no remedy for our situation. The American Farm Bureau appeared before the Senate committee in opposition to the cotton bill. They admitted the problem existed, they admitted something should be done about it next year, but they opposed anything being done about it this year. This is another illustration of what the little man is up against.

Congress, and the Senate in particular, is failing to rise to the actual facts of the case and failing to try to provide a remedy.

Mr. President, I make a prediction. Because of this distressing situation, within a few weeks, but too late to plant any cotton, Congress will be passing legislation to appropriate money to help take care of these same people who, through our changing of the law, through a lack of proper administration of the law, and because of the failure to give proper heed to their plea, are now faced with the distressing situation I have spoken about. We are contributing to the creation of that situation. Nature is making its own additional contribution.

Within a few weeks there will be pleas made for relief funds, through the Farmers' Home Administration, or through some other agency.

Even at this late date I want to place on the conscience of the Senate the fact that we have not yet thoroughly and fully considered the problem, and we have not yet risen to the occasion of wrestling with the problem and providing a remedy, not through a relief measure, not through some token relief, but through an avenue or channel that will permit these people to help themselves. We are failing to give them some method whereby they can help themselves on their own land through their own methods and through the sound processes of our economy. A small cotton acreage bill will do it.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I congratulate him on the splendid efforts he has made during this session of Congress to give some relief with respect to cotton allotments to the small family-size farm. I believe his figures will show that in the State of Texas there are

more than 18,000 farms on which the cotton allotment has been cut below 5 acres. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. In the eastern section of Texas there are many small family-size farms. We know the difficulties the small farmers in Mississippi face. The Senator from Mississippi has been trying, ever since the Senate defeated legislation on this subject, to revive a bill dealing with it. Even at this late date he has come forward with a proposal which would increase in a small way the allotments for the small family-size farms. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct; along with other Senators, including the Senator from Texas, we have been trying to perfect a bill which could be presented to the Senate, because of the undue distress conditions which have resulted from the severe freeze.

Mr. DANIEL. I commend the Senator for his continued efforts.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his kind remarks and for his helpfulness on the program.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to associate myself fully with the remarks of the able junior Senator from Mississippi. Just as earlier I pleaded for a minimum acreage allotment for tobacco farmers, I believe it is necessary to have a minimum acreage allotment for cotton farmers.

We had such a minimum before the Agricultural Act of 1954 went into effect. I did not vote for that act. The act should have retained minimum acreage allotments. I shall join the Senator from Mississippi in proposing such an amendment, not only for the current crop year, but as a part of permanent agricultural legislation.

I join the junior Senator from Texas in the high compliments he paid the junior Senator from Mississippi for his untiring efforts in connection with this endeavor. I hope that even at this late date something can be done. There is no necessity for increasing the cotton production as a national program, but there is urgent need to provide minimum allotments for the very hard-pressed small farmers.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his remarks and for his fine contribution to the solution of the problem. The Senator from Tennessee referred to a measure he would be willing to cosponsor, and I wish especially to thank him for his offer. We will certainly join in the sponsorship of a bill which will restore to the law a provision which has always been in the cotton law since 1938, until it was changed last year. Under the provisions of the 1938 act, the small cotton farmers were able to hold their heads above water, because we provided a floor below which the reductions in acreage could not go.

Last year, I think without deliberation, we struck that provision from the law whereby it would be mandatory to make such allotments, and in the very first year, in some States, the farmer was wrecked. We are not meeting the situation by supplying a remedy to take care of him this year.

I shall be glad to join the Senator from Tennessee in introducing such a measure. My colleague and I have introduced a bill to create a national reserve of at least 1 percent of the total national acreage to be placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture in order to take care of some of the distress cases. Something must be done; otherwise the farmers will be run off the lands which their families have owned for many years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with the Senator's encouragement I shall draft such an amendment to be proposed tomorrow, and I shall be happy to place his name upon it as a cosponsor.

I wonder if the Senator can see any basic social distinction between a minimum acreage for a cotton farmer and a minimum wage for an industrial worker.

Mr. STENNIS. They are certainly related. I am not speaking of a guaranteed wage. The farmers of Mississippi do not want anyone to guarantee them anything. They have a cotton loan which has enabled them to get a better price. The cotton program has not cost the American taxpayers one penny. With respect to tobacco they are running ahead. They have made something like $250 million profit on cotton so far; and that which is now in storage is one of the best assets we have in our stockpiling program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator, if he is interested in checking the history of cotton legislation, that I attempted to include a 1-percent reserve. I am sure he would be interested in knowing who it was who made the motion to strike and succeeded in striking it from my bill. I should be happy to have the recommendations of the Senator from Mississippi. They should be made a part of the permanent legislation on the subject.

Mr. STENNIS. Only a few years ago a recommendation was made along that line by a representative of the Farm Bureau. The representative of the Farm Bureau recognized the problem which exists this year, and said legislation should be introduced with reference to it, but he was not willing to join in a little remedy to meet the distressing situation. It will be too late next year to take care of many of the people who are being driven from their land this year, because they will never go back.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4951) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 4951, which was just passed, contains the provisions embodied in Senate bills 1325, 1326, 1327, and 1457, which, respectively, are Calendar Nos. 107, 108, 109, and 111. Therefore, without objection, the Senate bills referred to will be indefinitely postponed.

## PRESERVATION OF TOBACCO ACREAGE HISTORY OF FARMS VOLUNTARILY WITHDRAWN FROM PRODUCTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 110, Senate bill 1436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1436) to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1313 (g)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of this section, on any farm—

"(1) which was entitled to an acreage allotment for the crop year 1955, and

"(2) on which no tobacco is produced for one or more crop years subsequent to 1954, there shall be deemed to have been planted in tobacco in such year or years in which no tobacco was produced an acreage equal to the entire allotment for such farm for such year or years."

SEC. 2. Section 313 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(j) In any case in which the amount of acreage available in any crop year for allotment among farms exceeds the amount available for such purpose for the preceding year, such excess shall be distributed to farms the acreage allotments for which—

"(1) were decreased in any prior year, and

"(2) are lower than the highest acreage allotments for such farms for any prior year, before any of such excess may be distributed to any farm the acreage allotment for which is not less than its highest acreage allotment for any prior year."

## AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4941) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what the bill involves.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill, which was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee, affects some Foreign Service personnel. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is familiar with it. I have discussed it with the distinguished minority leader, who is a member of

the committee which reported the bill unanimously. If the Senator from New Hampshire desires an explanation, I am sure the Senator from Montana will be glad to oblige him. The minority leader has stated that there is no opposition to the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The present law expires on March 31, and it is necessary that this bill be passed in order to continue the recommendations made last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 4941) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 465. An act for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; and

H. R. 4259. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

## EASTER RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is a House concurrent resolution at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a House concurrent resolution, which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (H. Con. Res. 103), as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That when the two Houses adjourn on Monday, April 4, 1955, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Wednesday, April 13, 1955.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

## ORDER FOR RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m., on Friday next.

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

## AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO MAKE REPORT DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may have authority to report the Paris Accord, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow.

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

## REPLY TO WHITE HOUSE ON COLUMBIA RIVER POWER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor and had yielded to the majority leader. But I do not press the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had not recognized the Senator from New Mexico.

The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in my opinion, the President of the United States is entitled to receive from his subordinates the correct information on great issues which affect the welfare of our country.

I fear that President Eisenhower is not receiving accurate information with respect to the great power projects built under his predecessors in office—and which are needed in abundance in the future—if the Nation and particularly the Western States are to continue to make progress.

At his press conference on March 17, 1955, the President referred to Government power undertakings. He said: "When the Federal Government does this, they can print money to do the job. Nobody else can and there is a very great difference; because the second that the Federal Government starts to print money to do these things, they are taking one cent, or at least their proportion out of every dollar that any of you might happen to have in your pockets.

"Now," continued the President, "that has the effect of cheapening money and I don't think we ought to go into that."

Thus the President apparently assumes that Federal power projects are a financial loss to the taxpayers—that they require the printing of money, and that they take money out of our pockets.

It would be difficult to state a more fundamental misunderstanding of the financial position of our great Federal hydroelectric projects.

Perhaps all the President meant by the comment I have quoted—it is, after all, not very clear—was that the use of Federal funds for the construction of these great projects would have an inflationary impact and thus "cheapen money." But if that is what was meant, the President obviously fails to distinguish between nonproductive expenditures and expenditures for productive assets which help to expand the economy.

### NORTHWEST POWER PAYS FOR ITSELF

Inflation occurs when available money and credit outstrip available goods and services. Government expenditures beyond Government revenue collections may indeed contribute to inflation—when they go into things which do not add to the gross national product. Thus Federal outlays for our armed services—however necessary—may become inflationary when not matched by taxes, and so may Federal public works of a nonproductive nature.

The opposite is true, however, of hydroelectric projects which add to our economy hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of new electric energy at the lowest possible price. The development of our energy resources is the very root of the continuing expansion of our economy—energy resources is the very root of the continuing expansion of our economy—the constant expansion which has been the key to the prosperity of this continent that is the envy of the whole world. It is no wonder that governments all over the globe, with the encouragement and assistance of our own Government, are laying the foundations for their own economic expansion by imitating the great American multipurpose river projects. These are the projects which, here at home, the President now considers financially unsound.

No, Mr. President, Federal construction of sound hydroelectric projects like Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Hells Canyon, that lead to a tremendous expansion of production, of payrolls, of agriculture—of a new market for the whole Nation—is not inflationary and does not "cheapen" our money. Rather, such Federal investment is the foundation of an economic chain reaction which is the best insurance of continued prosperity.

### MCKAY ATTACKS NORTHWEST POWER AS "SUBSIDIZED"

But I am afraid this is not all the President meant by his comment—I am afraid he may really believe that our great Federal dams are actually built with "printing-press" money which comes out of the taxpayers' pockets, never to return.

On a radio program October 23, 1953, Secretary of Interior McKay referred to the hydroelectricity generated by the Government in his home region, the Pacific Northwest, as "subsidized power." He said:

I don't think it's right to subsidize power out in my country.

Such a statement naturally implies that Government power facilities in the Pacific Northwest receive outright grants from the Federal treasury, and helps explain how the illustrious President of the United States gets some of his misinformation. Certainly if the President relies on such information from a Cabinet officer, he gets the distinct impression that the Federal Government is pouring money into power facilities without any return. Yet, if anyone in the country should be aware that such an impression is entirely false, that person should be Secretary Douglas McKay, who used to be a Governor of Oregon.

Mr. McKay should know it is erroneous because the true facts are readily available to him in the annual report of one of his largest Interior agencies, the Bonneville Power Administration.

COLUMBIA RIVER POWER IS SUCCESSFUL FINANCIALLY

The 1954 annual report of Mr. McKay's Bonneville Administration shows that the Federal Columbia River power system has, between 1939 and June 30, 1954, returned to the United States Treasury $349,746,787. Of this total, $170,409,916 has gone for repayment of capital investment and $85,272,271 to cover all costs of maintenance and operation during that period. The interest paid to the Treasury totals $84,883,402.

Mr. President, how have these payments to the Treasury compared with the rate of repayments established for the Columbia Power System? If Mr. McKay and the President will refer to page 13 of the 1954 report of the Bonneville Administration, they will find this cogent paragraph:

> Repayment of the capital investment for the Bonneville Power Administration is approximately $55,400,000 ahead of schedule and the repayment of the power capital investment of the Bonneville Dam project is approximately $9,600,000 ahead of schedule, a total repayment of nearly $65 million in excess of scheduled requirements as of June 30, 1954.

If this is subsidy, the National Treasury will profit by having more of this kind of subsidy.

The Federal power projects in the Pacific Northwest, far from tapping our pockets and requiring the printing of money, are among the most financially profitable undertakings ever built and operated by the United States Government.

NEW PAYROLLS MADE POSSIBLE BY KILOWATTS

Entirely aside from its favorable effect on the Federal Treasury, the Columbia River power system has had a tremendously beneficial effect on the economy of the entire Nation. Since 1939, the aluminum industry has invested nearly $475 million in Northwest plant facilities. Millions more were invested by other electro-process industries attracted by the supply of power.

But not all of the money was spent in the Northwest. According to a study of the Stanford Research Institute, about 44 percent of the expenditures for new plant and equipment flowed into channels of trade outside the Pacific Northwest—approximately $209 million going to business and industry in other States throughout the Nation.

A measure of the economic impact provided by low-cost power is provided by the Standford study on 1 year's operation of just one of the industries using power from Columbia Federal projects. In 1 year—1952—the Northwest aluminum industry purchased $20,788,036 in goods and services; had payrolls of $34,953,239; paid $6,724,000 in State and local taxes, and divided expenditure of $9,713,000 among the region's various transportation services.

These figures for a single year's operation for a single industry are all the more spectacular when it is realized that, prior to 1939, not a single pound of aluminum was produced in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, failure to correct the falsehoods about operation of Columbia River Federal power projects would be a disservice to both my State and to the Nation. I consider it a duty to point out when I think the American people are being given incorrect information about the hydroelectric projects which have been so valuable in electrifying our farms, providing new payrolls, improving navigation, curbing floods, and opening new farming opportunities. There is no doubt that such misstatements are helping to prejudice the American people against further hydroelectric projects in my region.

ABUNDANT WATER POWER STRENGTHENS NATIONAL DEFENSE

Development of the power resources of the Columbia River is a matter of major national consequences. Our Nation's ability to keep ahead of Russia in the cold war, if in fact we are, depends on our ability to continually expand our productive capacity. In turn, enlarging our industrial base depends largely on fully utilizing our energy resources. Because the Columbia River and its tributaries contain some 42 percent of our Nation's hydroelectric potential, it is imperative that the program for Columbia development—already set back by several years—continue if we are to meet the requirements of national security. Its continuation is being hampered by fastening on to it the indefensible labels of subsidized power and printing-press money, and constitutes a disservice to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an address by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, detailing the economics of federally financed power projects.

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

THE HELLS CANYON PRINCIPLE

(Address at 50th annual convention of International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers at Spokane, Wash., Wednesday, March 16, 1955, by Gus Norwood, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association)

I selected the subject the Hells Canyon Principle because of my conviction that the debate so far has been largely conducted in the wrong forum and on the wrong issues. The proper forum for the Hells Canyon case is the Congress of the United States and not the Federal Power Commission, not the Secretary of Interior, and not the White House. On March 8, when the Hells Canyon Dam bill was introduced in the Congress the problem was finally placed before the proper court. Propagandists will tell you that Hells Canyon has been up before the Congress twice and has been twice rejected. That is not true. In 1950 the package which came before the Senate consisted of 13 irrigation projects including the huge and costly Mountain Home project plus a new and radical accounting policy called the Columbia Basin Account and then as a sort of an incidental tail on this huge package was tacked on the Hells Canyon project. The Senate turned down the package on the issues of the accounting policy and on the costliness of the irrigation works. As a matter of fact the Hells Canyon Dam was so well thought of in the course of that debate of April 1950 that Senator CHAVEZ who was handling the River and Harbor Act of 1950 offered to include the Hells Canyon Dam in that bill provided that the Army would be the constructing agency. The offer was not taken up and thus on a fluke Hells Canyon Dam was not included in the bill at that time. At any rate the matter is now before Congress where it should be.

This shifting of the case into the Halls of Congress gives us hope that now attention will finally be focused on the real, central issues. We hope the debate in Congress will cut through the propaganda smokescreen which hase been raised not only by the Idaho Power Co. but to our sorrowful amazement by the members of the staff of the Federal Power Commission who should have been in there fighting to protect the public interest.

Contrary to the Idaho Power Co. advertising and testimony that the issue is one of taxes, water rights or the survival of private free enterprise, you and I know that the real question is one of full development versus a 60-percent development of one of the finest remaining waterpower sites in America. This is the issue which drew together the many groups which formed the National Hells Canyon Association. And at the Federal Power Commission hearings in Washington, D. C., the attorneys of the National Hells Canyon Association repeatedly raised the question of full versus partial development.

And what happened? How did the Federal Power Commission attorneys and staff witnesses get around the superiority of the high Hells Canyon Dam. They devised a most interesting gimmick. They worked out one of the cutest tricks you ever saw. First, they conceded that the high Hells Canyon Dam would produce more power than would the 3 small dams, but, they said, the 3 small dams would be more "economic," and on the thin excuse of this word "economic" the Federal Power Commission attorney recommended that the license be granted.

To start with, suppose we compare almost any business with the electric utility business. The grocer invests a dollar and in the course of a typical year he will enjoy a gross revenue for that year of $8. His grocery investment turned over eight times. But suppose instead he had invested his dollar in an average private electric utility, then the annual gross revenue from that dollar would have been only 24 cents. Now take the case a little further. Suppose Uncle Sam is investing $1 in the Pacific Northwest in Federal dams and transmission lines. How much gross revenue will that dollar produce? The answer is 8 cents. The difference between the grocery business and the business of Federal dams and transmission lines in the Pacific Northwest is on the order of 100 to 1. The same dollar produces $8 gross revenue in 1 case and only 8 cents in the other.

Let's look at it in another way. Suppose in both instances we want to earn an annual gross revenue of $8. To accomplish that objective the grocer invests $1 while the Federal Government must invest $100. What difference would it make in these two situations if the interest rate went up 1 percent? The grocer would throw in a penny but the Federal Government would have an extra bill for interest of $1. Except, of course, there would be no actual cost of the Federal Government because the power projects are on a self-liquidating basis and all costs are merely passed along to the buyers of electricity. So the electricity user instead of paying the Federal Government $8 must pay $9 or a rate increase of some 13 percent. Thus we see demonstrated that a 1 percent increase in the rate of interest on the Federal power investment in the Pacific Northwest would result in a 13 percent increase in power rates. That's quite a leverage, 13 to 1.

This illustration can be backed up by studying the annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration which covers Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville, and other dams and the transmission lines. Last year it cost $36.7 million to operate the entire system of which $12.3 million was interest on the Federal investment at 2½ percent interest. Question: How much would the actual cost of power be increased if the rate of interest were inceased 1 percent? The answer is 13.36 percent. So we see how much leverage there is in the hydroelectric power business as between interest rates and power rates. Low interest rates lead to low power rates.

There is no great mystery to this. When we build a power plant in the Pacific Northwest we automatically build a fuel pile right into the plant. A hydroelectric dam like Grand Coulee never has any fuel costs. So the main cost is interest and the repayment of debt. But let me go on to our second illustration.

The terrific impact of low interest rates at upstream storage dams is dramatically illustrated by the operating cost statement for Hungry Horse Dam as recently published by the Bonneville Power Administration. Of $2.93 million costs for the past fiscal year $1.78 million was for interest or 60.7 percent of the total cost. The $2.93 million of total costs were divided three ways: interest 60 percent, depreciation or debt repayment 30 percent, and finally only 10 percent for all costs of wages and materials for operation and maintenance.

From a financing standpoint Hells Canyon Dam will be a twin to Hungry Horse Dam. Here too the key to the full development is cheap money. The FPC hearings brought out that of the annual cost of Hells Canyon Dam in the early years 59.5 percent would go for interest.

If the rate of interest on the Hells Canyon Dam is increased 1 percent from 2½ to 3½ percent then the power rate must be increased 24 percent. If the rate of interest is increased from 2½ to 6 percent then power rates must be increased 84 percent. But a private firm would require a rate of return of about 12 percent before Federal profits taxes in order to have left a 6 percent rate of return. On that basis private financing of Hells Canyon Dam would increase the power cost 228 percent from about $20 per kilowatt year to about $65. That explains why the Idaho Power Co. did not apply to build the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Referring again to the record of hearings before the Federal Power Commission we find that the actual at-site cost of electricity for the Idaho Power Co. projects is on the order of $40 per kilowatt year. High as this rate is we must remember that it was achieved only as the result of a careful "cream skimming" process whereby only the easy part of the Snake River is harnessed and the rest of the water is allowed to run to waste, enough to equal the output of Bonneville Dam. Thus we see that on the basis of actual costs, the power rate from the Idaho Power Co. dams will be about twice the power rate from the high Hells Canyon Dam. Even by leaning over to allow for conflicting testimony in the hearing record, it is safe to say that Hells Canyon power will be at least 35 percent cheaper per kilowatt-hour.

So there you have it. Hells Canyon Dam will provide 60 percent more power for at least 35 percent less cost per kilowatt-hour. In a nutshell, that is the conclusion to be drawn from over 20,000 pages of testimony.

The staff and attorneys of the Federal Power Commission tried to hide the superiority of Hells Canyon by means of a gimmick or trick. They tried to rig the rules so as to give that company the powerful advantage of the 2½ percent interest rate as used in Federal financing. But instead, it seems to me, the staff has unwittingly called attention to the crux of this case, and that is the powerful leverage of Federal financing. To let the Idaho Power Co. get into the Snake River is like sending a boy to do a man's job. In this case we can read plainly in the hearing record that full development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River can thus be achieved only by virtue of the important leverage of Federal financing and therefore the Federal Government should build the Hells Canyon Dam and achieve the full potential of the resource.

Now let us see if we are ready to define what is promised in the title, the Hells Canyon Principle. What is the public policy which would cover this type of situation and prevent all of this monkey business? Presumably we do not intend to say that just because we favor a Federal project at Hells Canyon that therefore we are in favor of all future Northwest dams being Federal. Rather I think we find ourselves pressed into very much the same line of thought which led Abraham Lincoln to state and restate one of his guiding principles, and I quote, "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves." With this thought in mind and considering our main objective of achieving the full development of the natural resources we might say:

The Hells Canyon principle states that within the limits of Federal jurisdiction, when the full or maximum economically feasible development of a hydroelectric damsite cannot be achieved by private or local public financing, then the issue should be referred to Congress which should normally provide for Federal financing in order to do the full job.

The application of this principle at various Pacific Northwest damsites would permit private construction of Noxon Rapids Dam and PUD financing of Priest Rapids Dam if full development of the water resource is assured. However, this principle would call for Federal construction of the 1,008,000 kilowatt Paradise Dam on the Clark Fork in preference to the three puny Buffalo Rapids projects proposed by the Montana Power Co. Likewise this principle would call for rejection of the Mountain Sheep Dam and the Pleasant Valley Dam because these would seriously underdevelop the Snake River.

This principle can equally apply for the development of other significant natural resources as well as hydroelectric dam sites.

The borrowing power of the Federal Government does not belong to someone else. It belongs to us, the people of the United States. The dam sites also belong to the people of the United States. We make the credit of the Federal Government and we can say where it should be used.

In the present instance we find that a private company by dint of its full effort can build a 60 percent project but the consumer would have to pay possibly twice as much for the resulting power. By using our combined credit we can have the complete Hells Canyon Dam constructed and obtain the power for at least 35 percent less per kilowatt hour. So the choice is between a scarcity dam with its high cost power versus an abundance dam and low cost power.

The Hells Canyon struggle has taken a long time. It was 7 years ago in February 1948 that I sent in the first letter of protest for the Northwest Public Power Association. But the passing of the years brings reassurance because as the facts are laid on the table and as the people receive the facts and understand them, we can confidently look for the right outcome. Furthermore, the dramatic leverage of Federal financing in this case may give us confidence not only to state what is here called the Hells Canyon principle but also to insist upon the adoption of this principle as our public policy with respect to the conservation and development of our fast disappearing natural resources.

## SALE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES ABROAD

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I noticed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today an article entitled "Benson Tells of Surplus Sold Abroad," written by Aubrey Graves. Below the headline is a subheading which reads as follows: "Wheat and Cotton are Disposed of in Large Lots; More Deals Pending."

The body of the article states that the Secretary of Agriculture bought these commodities for $145 million under the price-support programs, but that the Government will receive only $107 million for them.

I have a statement which shows where the losses actually occurred. I am glad to inform the Senate and the Nation that cotton was obtained for $30 million and sold for $30 million. Wheat was bought for $80 million and sold for $49 million, representing a loss of $31 million. The cost of other commodities to the Commodity Credit Corporation was $35 million, and they were sold for $28 million.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in full in the RECORD the article to which I have referred and the statement I have had prepared.

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

BENSON TELLS OF SURPLUS SOLD ABROAD—WHEAT AND COTTON ARE DISPOSED OF IN LARGE LOTS—MORE DEALS PENDING

(By Aubrey Graves)

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson announced yesterday the sale of 600,000 tons of wheat and 160,000 bales of cotton to Yugoslavia, Turkey, Chile, Peru, and Pakistan.

In return for these surplus commodities, which the Commodity Credit Corporation bought for $145 million under price-support programs, the Government will receive $107 million, payable in the currencies of the purchasing countries.

Sales of another $150 million worth of other CCC stocks to still other countries, the Secretary added, are well along toward completion, and negotiations are in various stages of progress looking to similar disposal of another $200 million worth of goods.

These foreign trade developments were Benson's answer to recent Democratic criticism that he has been "dragging his feet" in disposing of $7 billion worth of excess food and fiber now in Government hands.

"Records," he said, "will show that the Department is moving vigorously to dispose of surpluses in overseas markets. * * * Exports for the first 8 months of fiscal year 1955 are already 15 percent ahead of the same period a year ago."

The Democratic-controlled House Appropriations Committeee charged last week that Benson was not pushing foreign sales because he wanted to discredit rigid high-support prices. His policies, Democrats declared, had driven 55,000 Southern farm families off their farms, "with no homes and limited employment possibilities."

All this, the Secretary said yesterday, constituted "a diversionary move to hide the real issue—that the old rigid program fails to meet the needs of the farmer * * *. The criticism stems from the fact that I refuse to ignore facts, and instead, obey the law."

The various production control programs "are working real hardships on farmers," Benson conceded. "But such controls are inseparable from the rigid support programs" with which his critics have been identified.

"We were 10 years too late, in my judgment, in moving from a wartime to a peacetime program."

Under the mandatory high price props established in wartime to stimulate production, the Nation's basic crops were supported at 90 percent of parity. The flexible system, pushed through by the Eisenhower administration and put into effect this year, allows supports ranging from 82.5 to 90 percent of parity. In 1956, unless Congress acts, they can fall as low as 75 percent.

While he resented "some of the comments" in the Committee report and during debate on the House floor, the Secretary said that, by and large, the money appropriated to run Department programs for fiscal 1956 is "satisfactory to us."

He noted that "no serious cuts" had been made in any vital program. In some instances he believed more money had been voted than the Department could use.

For instance, he expressed doubt that $75 million worth of milk could be used in the free-lunch program. Fifty million dollars was provided for that purpose in the current budget, but "probably not all of this will be used."

Benson reported that the farmers' share of the consuming food dollar is now 43 percent, compared with 38 percent in 1939, 40 percent in 1940, and 53 percent in 1945 (during wartime).

While conceding that total farm income had fallen off during the last few years, the Secretary pointed out that per capita farm income increased slightly last year, to $918. In 1953 it was $914. There were fewer farmers in 1954 than in 1953, he explained.

---

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

For five programs covered by agreements to date, total market value is $107 million and CCC cost is $145 million, with a net difference of $38 million.

For wheat the market value is $49 million, and the CCC cost is $80 million, leaving a net difference of $31 million, or 82 percent of the total difference.

For cotton the market value and CCC cost are both estimated to be $30 million.

For other commodities the market value is $28 million and the CCC cost is $35 million, leaving a net difference of $7 million, which is 18 percent of the total.

| Commodities | CCC cost | Market value | Difference | Percent of difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wheat | 80 | 49 | 31 | 82 |
| Cotton | 30 | 30 | | |
| Other | 35 | 28 | 7 | 18 |
| Total | 145 | 107 | 38 | 100 |

## AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND FOR THE PRESIDING OFFICER TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess following today's session the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House and that the Presiding Officer to sign duly enrolled bills passed by the two Houses.

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

## DECLINE IN PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to an Associated Press dispatch today telling of a decline in farm product prices, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The Agriculture Department reported today that farm product prices declined four-tenths of 1 percent between mid-February and mid-March.

Lower prices were reported for hogs, strawberries, and milk, but somewhat higher prices for chickens, cattle, tomatoes, cucumbers, oranges, and cotton.

The mid-March level of prices was 4.8 percent below a year earlier and about 24 percent below the record high set in February 1951.

Prices paid by farmers in mid-March, on the other hand, increased about one-third of 1 percent, largely reflecting increases in prices farmers paid for livestock bought for further feeding and fattening. The prices paid by farmers were also about one-third of 1 percent higher than a year ago, but 2 percent below the record high set in May 1952.

Farm prices as a whole averaged 86 percent of parity in mid-March compared with 87 percent a month earlier, with 90 percent a year ago and with a record high of 123 percent in October 1946.

Mr. President, in retail food stores and markets, the prices of many commodities today are at all-time highs. I say "many" commodities. Nevertheless, we are witnessing a continuous drop—and it has been a gradual, continuous drop—in the parity ratio and farm income. On the other hand, the prices of things farmers buy, including foodstuffs purchased from the markets, have been increasing.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

## THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a letter which I received recently from the Director of the United States Information Service, Mr. Theodore C. Streibert, dated March 22, 1955. I should like to have the Senate know, that in the early part of March, I addressed a communication to the United States Information Agency, pointing out that word had reached me that our Finnish language broadcasts emanating from Helsinki, Finland, were being curtailed because of an inadequate budget, or inadequate appropriations, or the lack of proper use of the appropriations or the proper application of them, for the Voice of America broadcasts.

I was disturbed about it, Mr. President, because only a few weeks prior to that the newspaper in West Berlin which had been sponsored by the United States Information Agency had also closed down. Word had reached me that our efforts in news coverage for Vienna, Austria, were being curtailed. So I took up with the United States Information Agency the problem particularly as it related to the Finnish language broadcasts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which I received from Mr. Theodore C. Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency.

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

MARCH 22, 1955.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of February 28, in which you inquire about the activities of the United States Information Agency in Finland. The interest of your constituents in seeing that Finland is encouraged to maintain her democratic tradition and western orientation is shared by the United States Government.

Your information that the daily, Finnish-language Voice of America program was discontinued because of budget limitations is correct. The daily short wave radio program to Finland was started on January 1, 1951, and terminated on September 13, 1953. This program, as well as the BBC program, was subjected to partial Soviet jamming from January 1952 until its termination. The problem of jamming, together with budget considerations, led to the decision to terminate the program. The possibility of reinstating the broadcasts has been reviewed twice during the past year. The Agency is hopeful that fiscal year 1956 funds will permit restoration of the program. The yearly cost of a one-half hour shortwave daily Finnish-language program amounts to approximately $50,000. The Agency is now awaiting a reply from Helsinki to a January 1955 query in regard to resuming the broadcasts. The only VOA program that can be heard in Finland today is the worldwide, English language, 1-hour program.

In Helsinki, we have a staff of five American officers administering a press, film, information center, and exchange-of-persons program to reach diversified audiences throughout Finland. Significant American foreign and domestic policy pronouncements, news, and features translated into the Finnish and Swedish languages are distributed daily to the Finnish press. A Finnish-language magazine, Aikamme (freely translated as "Our Times"), a vehicle for western news in word and pictures, is published monthly in an edition of 17,000 copies. United States Information Agency documentary films are loaned to indigenous organizations for showings to over 1 million Finns each year. Our information center contains 7,000 volumes of American books, some in the Finnish and Swedish languages, and 250 current United States periodicals, which are borrowed by Finnish readers. Over 30 traveling loan collections, each consisting of 100 books by American authors, are rotated among Finnish public libraries. In 1955, under the Finnish War Debt Act (Public Law 265) and the Fulbright Act (Public Law 584), 143 Finnish students, teachers, scholars, specialists, in a variety of professional fields, will receive grants for study tours in the United States and 32 Americans will go to Finland. The Agency, under the Finnish War Debt Act, supervises the purchase (a yearly expenditure of $50,000 to $75,000) of educational books, technical publications, and laboratory equipment, for distribution to Finnish educational institutions in Finland.

In competition with the United States information and cultural exchange activities in Finland, the Soviet Union and its satellite countries are directing a formidable propaganda program to Finland. Each week, the U. S. S. R. and its satellites broadcast a total of 43 hours and 10 minutes of shortwave radio programs to Finland. The programs are as follows:

| | *Weekly program hours* |
|---|---|
| U. S. S. R. and Soviet occupied: | |
| Estonia (Finnish) | 21.50 |
| Poland (Finnish) | 11.30 |
| Hungary (Finnish) | 10.30 |
| Total | 43.10 |

In addition, Swedish-language programs beamed to Sweden from the U. S. S. R. and Poland reach a potential audience of 400,000 Swedish-speaking Finns in southern and southwestern Finland.

The Soviet Union has announced that it is building a TV station, which will start operations in December 1955 at Tallin in Soviet-occupied Estonia. A TV station at Tallin, which is located approximately 45 miles from Helsinki across the Gulf of Finland, may reach 1 million potential Finnish viewers in southern Finland. Soviet-made TV sets are being offered to Finnish purchasers at greatly reduced prices.

A study of Soviet-Finnish exchange visits offers an interesting contrast in the Soviet Union's increase of Finnish visitors to the U. S. S. R. since the death of Stalin. In 1952, 200 Finns visited the Soviet Union and 300 Soviet citizens went to Finland. In 1953, 2,300 Finns visited the Soviet Union and approximately 200 Russians visited Finland. These unofficial visits were made by such delegations as sports teams, dance groups, musicians, journalists, and agricultural workers who were sponsored by the Finnish-Soviet Friendship Society. The agency does not have statistics of Soviet-sponsored visits for the 1954 calendar year, but unofficial reports indicate a continuance of the 1953 levels.

The Finnish-Soviet Friendship Society claims that in 1953 an audience of 400,000 Finns viewed Soviet films at 8,000 showings and that 600 Soviet-sponsored lectures, festivals, and exhibits reached 330,000 Finns. Soviet-Finnish Friendship Month, November 7 through December 6, which has been observed annually in Finland for the past 10 years is an occasion for concentration of Finnish-Soviet cultural and special events.

In January 1955, the Soviet Union opened Leningrad to Finnish tourist traffic; in February 1955, 100 Finnish tourists participated in the first of a projected series of conducted tours to Leningrad.

The Finnish Communist Party, which directs an elaborate system of Communist and pro-Soviet propaganda, is estimated to have about 40,000 members. The Communist press in Finland comprises 11 newspapers and 10 magazines published by the Soviet Government, satellite governments, local Communist organizations, and binational societies. These publications are directed at a wide range of ages and intelligence levels. All these satellite countries, except Albania, are represented through binational societies in Finland.

Should you wish to discuss further the subject of this letter, I shall be pleased to arrange a meeting in your office or in the agency at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE C. STREIBERT,
*Director.*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would make note of this one comment of Mr. Streibert. He states:

The Soviet Union has announced that it is building a TV station, which will start operations in December 1955, at Tallin on Soviet-occupied Estonia. A TV station at Tallin, which is located approximately 45 miles from Helsinki across the Gulf of Finland, may reach 1 million potential Finnish viewers in southern Finland. Soviet-made TV sets are being offered to Finnish purchasers at greatly reduced prices.

A study of Soviet-Finnish exchange visits offers an interesting contrast in the Soviet Union's increase of Finnish visitors to the U. S. S. R. since the death of Stalin. In 1952, 200 Finns visited the Soviet Union and approximately 300 Soviet citizens went to Finland. In 1953, 2,300 Finns visited the Soviet Union and approximately 200 Russians visited Finland.

Mr. President, here is an instance of our information agencies, literally at the portal, at the front door, of the Soviet Union, being curtailed, while the Soviet Union establishes one of the largest television broadcasting stations in the world to beam its broadcasts and its telecasts to more than a million people in southern Finland.

A few days ago it was my privilege to hear one of the most distinguished military men of our time, one of the great generals of this country, testify to the effect that the Soviet Union was spending more money to jam American broadcasts to the iron curtain countries, in an effort to stop the flow of American radio broadcasts into those countries, than we were spending for all our information programs all over the world. I suggest we had better reexamine our policy. If we have forgotten that the struggle in this world is for men's minds, then we have forgotten the key point and the key issue in the battle which is going on between the Communist conspiracy and those persons in the world who believe in freedom.

I wish to pay tribute to the United States Information Agency for the good work it is doing. I feel this agency has suffered many growing pains, and at times, I may say, it has suffered greatly from the assault of Congress. It is about time we reevaluated the worthwhileness of the program and its effectiveness; and if we shall find it to be effective, as I believe we shall, we should support the agency with the funds necessary for a worldwide information service, in order that we may tell the true story of American policy, and inspire hope in the hearts and minds of those behind the Iron Curtain.

We are losing the political warfare struggle. I think the record ought to be made crystal clear that while we are spending our time, and rightly so, on weapons to give us a shield of strength in the field of defense, we have not concentrated sufficiently on bringing the message of progressive and liberal democracy to the peoples of the world.

Prominent citizen after prominent citizen, military adviser after military adviser, and statesman after statesman have reported to the Congress that we are running behind in the struggle of ideas; that we are not doing what we ought to do with our information services.

I say this is a disgrace to our country. A nation which prides itself on its television and radio programs and other means of communication ought to be ashamed of itself for losing out or running second best in competition with the Soviet Government. I will never agree that a dictatorship of the proletariat is more financially able and more capable of outlay than we are to provide adequate information service for the people.

Mr. President, again I desire to speak to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

## INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish now to address myself to one final point, which relates to the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Montana and speak in behalf of the proposed resolution calling for creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, which I had the honor of cosponsoring originally 2 years ago, and am again proud to cosponsor in this session.

The International Food and Raw Materials Reserve proposal has been before Congress for nearly 2 years. It is time we faced one of our critical problems squarely and moved ahead in a constructive way to take advantage of the great potential good our abundance could do in the world.

The concepts involved in this resolution have their roots in the still unsolved problems of extreme human need, starvation, economic stagnation, and poverty throughout the world, in the midst of surpluses of raw materials that cannot be sold at prices that will return an adequate stable income to producers.

Justification for this proposal could well be made on moral and humanitarian grounds. We must avoid a situation where we are wasting productive resources by piling up more food, fiber, and other raw materials than we can use while our fellow human beings are suffering deprivation and want from lack of the same resources or products of such resources.

Justification for this proposal could be equally well made on its implications to our foreign policy. We cannot long maintain friends and allies if we persist in sitting atop vast and bulging warehouses overstuffed with food and fiber at a time when millions, hundreds of millions, are milling about below us in hunger and want—easy prey for those who would incite them against us.

But even stronger justification can be made from the standpoint of bringing economic stability out of the chaos that now affects all world business and trade dealing in any way with food or raw materials. It is from this standpoint of seeking to achieve greater world stability in raw materials that I wish to direct my remarks today.

The human suffering and relative stagnation enforced upon producers of raw materials by the extreme ups and downs in the prices of raw materials, and consequently in their realized and expected incomes, is one of the most persistent and perplexing of modern economic problems.

If we find the problem serious in our highly-developed Nation, we should be able to understand how it is even more seriously present and damaging in the lesser-developed nations.

Wide swings in raw-material prices present prospective investors in raw-material development, whether persons, firms, or States, with a very large range of variation in expectations as to returns that can be earned by opening up and developing an augmented raw-material supply.

This condition is one of great risks, when at any moment not only might part of the investment be rendered valueless, but earnable returns may even fail to cover day-to-day operating costs, and the entire enterprise will have to be shut down, with attendant loss of income and human suffering.

Faced with such great uncertainty in expectations, both States and individuals are hesitant to open up or expand enterprises that are currently profitable but which may at any time dip drastically below the break-even line, through no fault of the enterprise management itself. The multiplication of this kind of a situation throughout farming and all other raw-materials industries put a very severe damper upon the rate of economic development in these industries.

This slowing down of the rate of expansion in raw-materials industries not only reduces the supply of such materials to meet human needs and to fuel-manufacturing and other secondary industries. It also holds down the purchasing power of persons and firms on the raw-materials sector, and thus cuts down sales, scale of operation, and consequently the income and purchasing power of the industrial and service segments of the economy. Consequently, the entire economy idles along at a lower rate of production and expansion than needs to be the case. In the more highly industrialized nations the symptoms are seen in chronically depressed industries, such as farming and coal mining in the United States.

Among the lesser industrialized nations, a drop in raw material prices can bring an entire nation dangerously close to bankruptcy, and can directly cause a widespread drop in personal income and the standards of living of the entire population.

It is only natural that the economic segments and nations involved in these debilitating circumstances would take evasive and protective action, just as an intelligent bomber pilot takes evasive action from destructive antiaircraft fire. Such protective or evasive action when taken unilaterally by different nations helps to solve the problems caused by fluctuating raw-material prices only at the cost of reducing the magnitude of international exchange of commodities, and thus results in causing all nations to lose the advantages of specialization. All the people in all nations have less real income and a lower standard of living than they might otherwise be able to attain.

Through the administrative machinery of an international food and raw material reserve or bank, the stabilized prices of each different raw material that enters importantly into international trade would be negotiated and agreed upon. The reserve would thereafter stand ready at all times to buy any raw material commodity offered it at the agreed-upon stabilized price, and would stand ready to sell such commodities at the agreed-upon stabilized price.

The industry of advanced nations is chewing up basic resources at a tremendous and rising rate. For example, the United States, which has 7 percent of the world's population and 30 percent of the world's natural resources, accounts for 70 percent of the world's manufactured goods. The United States is using up its resource base at a very rapid rate, and very much faster than is the rest of the world. To be secure in our rising living standards and to retain the resource base for an expanding economy, we must assure ourselves a stabilized source of supply of the raw materials for our manufacturing industry. The same situation is true in other industrious nations, such as the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan. The thought-provoking details for different commodities were thoroughly considered in the Paley report of several years ago.

Highly industrialized nations could depend entirely upon private industrial concerns to make long-term contracts with raw material producers in other lands; and this should be done. But it can be successfully and securely accomplished only under the protection and encouragement by governments and international economic accords.

The latter conceivably could be done exclusively through bilateral arrangements between the United States and foreign nations; one nation at a time, one commodity at a time. However, no supplier, private enterprise, or state, wants to become dependent exclusively on one buyer; nor does any importing nation or industrialist want to become dependent upon only one seller.

Through the International Food and Raw Materials Reserve, exporting nations can obtain assured long-term stabilized markets, and importing nations can obtain an assured, long-term, ample supply, at stabilized prices, of imports, on terms which will not injure domestic producers who must sell their commodities in competition with imports.

The International Food and Raw Materials Reserve would operate in coordination with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Many of the national restrictions we now have, which hold down greater international exchange of commodities, result from the desire of nations to preserve their monetary position in different currencies, particularly dollars and pounds sterling. The International Food and Raw Materials Reserve would completely eliminate this problem by operating in terms of all currencies on the basis of internationally agreed upon official exchange rates.

The International Food and Raw Materials resolution does not itself establish an international agency. The resolution merely calls upon the President to undertake negotiations with other nations to that end. Any agreements reached would, of course, be subject to review and ratification by the Senate of the United States, and the appropriation of any needed capital and other funds would have to be fully considered by both Houses.

The International Food and Raw Materials Reserve will help solve many of our Nation's most difficult problems of both domestic and foreign policy. It will make a major contribution toward permanent peace, by facilitating a more rapid rate of economic expansion. Its operations will stabilize world raw material markets. It will put abundant production to work.

Mr. President, wiser use of our resources and our productive ability to meet human needs is not only the road to economic prosperity; it is the road to international understanding and peace.

If the nations of the world can work together in seeking to improve conditions for all people everywhere, they will soon be on common ground in seeking to avoid the horrors of war.

Minnesota's farmers are proud of their production, but they want it used for human needs. They would welcome United Nations leadership toward greater international stability in food and raw material markets, and United Nations leadership toward shifting unneeded surpluses from one area of the world to other areas of acute need and want.

Mr. President, let us have more vision, instead of merely shrugging our shoulders and saying it cannot be done. It can be done, and it must be done, for peace and prosperity in the world.

## EXTENSION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is now in the process of evaluating the large amount of testimony it heard in the past few weeks on the Trade Agreements Extension Act, as embodied in H. R. 1.

On March 16, I appeared before that committee, for the purpose of explaining the amendment to H. R. 1 which I had submitted in the Senate on February 25, 1955. This amendment is in the nature of a substitute for H. R. 1, and is designed to bring the tariffmaking procedure of the Nation back into equilibrium again.

This the Watkins amendment does by—

First. Giving the President authority to reduce tariffs (a) on selected commodities by not more than 5 percent per year for 2 years, (b) in excess of 50 percent to that level over a 2-year period, and (c) by not more than one-half, over a 2-year period, of tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1945, on articles which are not now being imported, or which are being imported only in negligible quantities. It provides for the continued utilization of the administrative facilities and services of the executive branch of the Federal Government for the actual negotiation of trade agreements under standards and within limits of congressional delegation of authority.

Second. Revitalizing the United States Tariff Commission by establishing specific criteria which it is directed to consider in arriving at decisions on escape-clause proceedings. They are so designed as to insure that congressional policy in this respect is carried out.

Third. Returning to the Congress substantive control over our trade and tariff policy, by requiring the Tariff Commission to keep the Congress informed as to the effect, before their conclusion by the executive branch, of all proposed

reciprocal trade agreements. Significantly, in the case of escape-clause actions, it reserves to either House of the Congress the power, by a majority vote of its Members, to override the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, which in the absence of such a vote would become final.

Since that date, Mr. President, I have received from various industry spokesmen a considerable number of letters in support of my amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have two of the letters and a telegram printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOFT FIBRE MANUFACTURERS' INSTITUTE,
*New York, N. Y., March 23, 1955.*

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the thought you may be interested to see the statement which has been filed in behalf of this industry with Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, with respect to H. R. 1, I am enclosing a copy.

This is a short statement because this institute filed a complete presentation of its views with the House Ways and Means Committee when it had H. R. 1 under consideration.

The members of the soft-fiber-manufacturing industry cannot survive in this country if subjected to any further reduction in tariff duties, and we would like to see any extension legislation withhold further cutting powers from the President. However, we realize that there may be products domestically manufactured which can stand further tariff reductions.

Our institute is favorably impressed by the provisions and safeguards, particularly the return to Congress of final authority, as contained in your amendments proposed as a substitute bill for H. R. 1. Consequently, we have, in effect, made our statement to the Senate Finance Committee an endorsement of your amendments.

We trust that we have properly understood your proposals. If, perchance, our brief analysis of certain provisions in your substitute measure are in error, we shall appreciate having someone on your staff put us right.

We wish you every success in your endeavors to have the Senate Finance Committee endorse your substitute measure.

Sincerely yours.

GEORGE F. QUIMBY,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

---

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
*Washington, D. C., March 25, 1955.*

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Thank you for your letter of March 22 and for copy and explanation of your amendment to H. R. 1. We had the pleasure of hearing your excellent presentation before the Senate Finance Committee in which you set forth the need for such an amendment to the pending legislation.

We agree fully with your statement that "the pendulum of tariff-making authority has simply swung too far toward the expediency of administrative negotiation and execution by the executive branch." As far back as 1940 and 1943, in statements to congressional committees, the American Mining Congress declared that "Congress, representing the people, should review and pass upon all trade agreements before they become effective."

In view of the large number of trade agreements now in operation we believe strongly that Congress should have the power to scrutinize and approve or disapprove revisions in existing trade agreements. Accordingly, we feel that for effective congressional regulation of import trade the authority to act on "escape clause" recommendations of the Tariff Commission should be transferred from the executive branch to the Congress.

We are deeply appreciative of the fine work that you are doing to assure our Nation of a strong and healthy mining industry.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS,
JULIAN D. CONOVER,
*Executive Vice President.*

---

BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH., *March 21, 1955.*

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.*

Hopeful that a statement of our views will strengthen your hands in your effort to resituate the determination of the peril point in our trade agreements in the Congress and the Tariff Commission where it properly belongs. We the undersigned members of the Promontory Grazing District Advisory Board express our confidence in our congressional delegation and urge you all to use your utmost efforts to oppose and defeat these do-gooders who are destroying the livestock business. We desire also to register our complete support of our friends of the mining industry. We are both Democrats and Republicans with a common problem. Livestock and mining must have immediate relief from ruin.

Alonzo F. Hopkins, Lawrence B. Johnson, Leo McKinnon, Ralph Ellis, Willard Petersen, Ben Groll, Fred James, Ted Kimber, Les Carson, Archie Rose, William Young.

Mr. WATKINS. Also, Mr. President, there have appeared in many newspapers throughout the country editorials and articles which report in detail the essence of my testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, and urge adoption of the Watkins amendment. I also ask unanimous consent that three such articles and editorials—from the Journal of Commerce, Baltimore Sun, and the Salt Lake Tribune—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Journal of Commerce of March 17, 1955]

SENATE BALKY ON TRADE BILL, JOHNSON SAYS

WASHINGTON, March 16.—The Senate Finance Committee moved toward conclusion of public hearings on a bill to extend the reciprocal trade program, as the Senate leadership predicted the measure "is in for a tough fight" when it reaches the floor.

While the committee sat for the 11th day of public hearings on the measure (H. R. 1), listening to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, Utah, recommend a complete overhaul before submitting it for final approval, Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas told newsmen he believes the bill is in for "rough sledding" in Senate debate.

STRONG OPPOSITION DEVELOPS

The majority leader's statement, made following a conference with the Democratic policy committee, was recognition of the strong opposition developing in the Senate against the measure, which passed the House last month by the narrowest of margins.

Senator JOHNSON, who said he himself had taken no position on the measure as yet, although he is a member of the Finance Committee, noted that both Republicans and Democrats felt the administration-backed measure should at least be amended.

The bill would extend the 21-year-old trade program 3 more years and give the President authority to cut tariffs 5 percent a year.

WOULD REGAIN POWER

Expressing sentiments favored by a strong group of Senators, Senator WATKINS, the committee's first witness, asserted that Congress' "constitutional authority" over Tariff Administration "should be recalled from the executive branch of the Government."

He urged adoption of an amendment to H. R. 1 in the form of a substitute bill he offered last month. The substitute would set up an independent seven-man Tariff Commission whose decisions would be subject to congressional control alone.

"The pendulum of responsibility over tariff and import quota adjustment," he declared, "must swing toward greater control by the Congress."

The Watkins amendment, which would recognize continuation of the trade-agreements program, would remove the President from the tariff-adjustment mechanism.

A revamped commission would make recommendations for cancellation of tariff concessions which could be vetoed only by a majority vote of one House of Congress within 60 days.

Senator WATKINS, whose proposal was cordially received by committee members, said the plan "would bring the tariff-making procedures of the United States back into equilibrium again." It would prevent Executive domination and at the same time would not represent a "return to the cumbersome and slow procedure" of legislative rate making.

The Watkins amendment would replace current procedure whereby USTC recommendations for withdrawal of tariff concessions and findings as to the "peril point" to which tariff levels can be reduced, can be overruled by the Chief Executive.

The proposal would also strictly define criteria for finding injury to domestic producers by import competition.

BATT APPEALS FOR BILL

The committee also heard a former Government official appeal for passage of the bill to bring "stability into United States tariff policy."

William L. Batt, who served as chairman of the War Production Board in World War II, said that if Europeans had a voice in United States trade policy making they would choose a policy "of tariff stability with little or no change upward or downward."

Our trading partners, he said, would prefer this to a policy of possible tariff reductions which may be subject to "constant uncertainty of revision upward."

Mr. Batt also cautioned legislators about being swayed by arguments for more tariff protection because of American defense needs "managerial ability is the vital element in rapid mobilization for war," he said.

LEAD, ZINC IMPORTS HIGH

Asking the committee to give full consideration to the Watkins amendment was Miles P. Romney, manager of the Utah Mining Association. "Excessive imports" of lead and zinc, he said, "still depress" the domestic industry in spite of the Government's stockpile program for these two commodities.

The situation in western lead and zinc mining is so bad now, he said, that it is time to seek the more far-reaching measures of relief promised the industries last summer by President Eisenhower when he ordered a stockpiling program begun in lieu of raising the tariff on competitive imports as recommended by the Tariff Commission.

Also opposing passage of the bill were J. G. Lerch, representing various small man-

ufacturing industries; Norman Zokowsky, International Handbag, Luggage, Belt, and Novelty Workers Union; John Breckinridge of the Pin, Clip, and Fastener Institute; Karl D. Loos, representing various nut and fruit growers; Gordon Sprague, Western Condensing Co., and Frank Masterson, Industrial Fasteners Institute.

---

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 17, 1955]

MORE TARIFF POWER SOUGHT FOR CONGRESS—WATKINS OFFERS AMENDMENTS TO RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

WASHINGTON, March 16.—It was made official today that President Eisenhower's foreign-trade program is in trouble in the Senate.

Senator JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, Senate majority leader, so stated after the matter had been discussed at a Senate Democratic policy meeting.

He said it was "obviously in for rough sledding," thus confirming reports which have been around for some days that substantial changes may be made in the bill before it gets out of the Senate Finance Committee.

GOING BACK TO EARLY 1900'S

Earlier today the Finance Committee listened at length to Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, outline a series of amendments to the bill which, he said, would give Congress power to save domestic industry from injury while at the same time avoid going back to the old-fashioned log-rolling methods of the early 1900's.

JOHNSON said that a considerable number of Senators in both parties favor amendments and that "it's going to take a major operation to get it passed."

The legislation, which would renew the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, and give the President certain liberalized powers, has already passed the House.

HEAVY PRESSURES USED

Heavy pressure has been put upon the Senators to do something for distressed industries and to impose restrictions on the President's right to ignore recommendations of the Tariff Commission.

Declaring that Congress "de facto has abdicated its constitutional authority in the field of tariffmaking," WATKINS proposed that Congress take back responsibility for operation of the escape clause and that it lay down specific criteria to guide the Tariff Commission as to whether imports damage or threaten to damage any specific industry.

WANTS 2-YEAR EXTENSION

The Utah Republican also proposed that the trade act be extended only for 2 years, instead of 3 years, as asked by the administration and approved by the House.

The Senator's proposals found a substantial welcome from a considerable number of Finance Committee members.

There have been growing indications for some days that the committee is leaning strongly toward substantial revisions in the trade legislation to tighten up administration of the escape clause.

At the moment it also appears likely that the committee will vote for only a 2-year extension of the act.

MORE DATA SOUGHT

WATKINS told the committee he agrees that actual trade negotiations can be better handled by the executive than the legislative branch, but the law should provide that Congress get more complete data on agreements than at present.

He would also amend the law to require the Tariff Commission to give Congress a report on all peril-point investigations.

WATKINS laid down 11 specific factors which the Tariff Commission would have to take into consideration in deciding whether an industry was suffering an import injury.

QUOTES EXPERT OPINION

These include such items as unemployment, layoffs, price and sales declines, rising inventories, profit declines, decline in the flow of investments into plant expansion, decline in the domestic article proportionate share of the domestic market, and essentially to national security.

In pleading for his amendments the Utah Senator asserted that expert opinion now holds "that a reduction of American tariffs cannot bring about any spectacular increase in United States imports, or be of decisive importance in the world economic picture."

Moreover, he said, if there is to be any appreciable increase in United States exports, it will depend on continued expansion of economic activity in this country.

BATT FAVORS RENEWAL

The committee also heard testimony by William L. Batt in favor of renewal of the Trade Agreements Act on the basis asked by President Eisenhower.

Batt, who was vice chairman of the War Production Board in World War II, and United States representative on the Combined Raw Materials Board and Combined Production and Resources Board, stated that this Nation's security will be strengthened by getting more export trade, but it cannot have more export trade without more imports. He urged the committee not to attach any restrictive amendments to the pending trade bill.

Miles P. Romney, manager of the Utah Mining Association, testified in support of Senator WATKINS' proposed amendments on the ground that the mining industry has not been able to obtain adequate protection under the existing operation of the escape clause.

---

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of March 27, 1955]

WATKINS WOULD RESTORE TARIFF EQUILIBRIUM

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the Democratic leader, recently said that the House-approved bill extending the Reciprocal Trades Agreement Act faces rough sledding when it reaches the floor and that both Democrats and Republicans feel that the measure should be amended.

We heartily agree that amendment is necessary. We also endorse amendments proposed by Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS which, as he told the Senate Finance Committee, would swing the "pendulum of responsibility over tariff and import quota adjustments" toward greater control by Congress.

Administration-backed legislation extends the Reciprocal Trades Act for 3 years and gives the President power to cut tariffs by as much as 15 percent during that period in return for similar concessions in foreign markets.

Senator WATKINS would limit the extension to 2 years and would make important changes which, while not altering the fundamental purposes of the act, would give Congress the final say on the application of the escape clause.

Mr. WATKINS presented telling arguments before the Finance Committee, and, according to the Baltimore Sun, his proposals received substantial welcome from a number of committee members.

For a better understanding of just what Utah's senior Senator has in mind, it is necessary to review the history of the Reciprocal Trades Act. Before the First World War, Congress undertook to write complex tariff acts including schedules covering thousands of products. As the magnitude of the task increased, Congress set up the Tariff Commission as a board of expert advisers and later gave the Commission power to recommend specific increases or decreases in tariff rates, thus providing a flexible policy.

Passage of the Reciprocal Trades Act in 1934, however, began the gradual disintegration of control by Congress over tariff-making procedure, with the executive branch of Government establishing rates through trade agreements. The defect here was that there was no means of providing relief if a particular concession proved injurious to a domestic industry. To correct the fault, Congress made the escape clause mandatory in trade agreements with the Tariff Commission having power to recommend revisions, subject to approval of the President.

But what happened? According to Mr. WATKINS, of 56 escape-clause applications filed in 1948–54, the Commission recommended action in 12 instances and the President accepted only 5 of the recommendations. Escape-clause relief clearly has not proved adequate.

Senator WATKINS would have the executive branch continue the negotiation of trade agreements. But instead of permitting the President to say whether or not escape-clause relief should be granted, he would transfer the decision to Congress. The Tariff Commission would continue to make recommendations—but to Congress, not the President—and the recommendations would take effect unless vetoed by either House of Congress within a 90-day period. Power to amend a trade agreement would be taken from the branch of Government which made it and transferred to Congress.

This plan is of particular interest to westerners who have seen what happened to escape-clause relief for the lead-zinc mining industry. The Tariff Commission unanimously recommended upward revision of rates, but the President—"for reasons that seemed satisfactory to him"—in Mr. WATKINS' words—held to the contrary. The lead-zinc industry continues depressed and as Otto Herres, chairman of the National Lead and Zinc Committee, remarked, once prosperous properties have become marginal mines.

Senator WATKINS believes in the principle of the Reciprocal Trades Act but his proposed amendments run counter to the views of some of those whose shibboleth is trade not aid. The fact is that tariff has been made too much of a cure-all for international ills and that the United States has been turned into a whipping boy. As a matter of fact, the United States is not now a high tariff country. The average rate, as measured by the ratio of customs receipts to total imports, is the lowest it has been in this century. How many nations of Western Europe have as good a record? And how many of them will admit amid their complaints about American tariffs, that currency restrictions and special trade blocs are a far greater hindrance to the free, international exchange of goods?

Extension of the Reciprocal Trades Act should be carefully studied by the Senate. We realize that everything possible should be done to help the economy of friendly nations. But we also must emphasize that American interests deserve consideration, too. When a trade agreement operates to the serious damage of a domestic industry, then relief is called for. Under the present system such relief is not always available. For these reasons we believe that the tariff-making equilibrium should be reestablished under the plan proposed by Senator WATKINS.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have submitted this amendment because I believe it provides a compromise machinery which not only will make for freer international trade, but also will provide relief to efficient domestic industries if the findings of an expert body,

the United States Tariff Commission, reveal that they are being damaged by foreign imports which occupy an unfair competitive position.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF PANEL ON THE IMPACT OF THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has established a panel on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, to be composed of eight members, drawn from the fields of science, engineering, industry, and power.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release announcing the establishment of the panel, together with two accompanying documents, one being remarks made by me before the joint committee at the time when it was considering the establishment of the panel, and the other being a statement of the terms of reference for the panel, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Establishment of a panel on the Impact of the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy was announced today by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The special eight-man panel, drawn from the fields of science, engineering, industry, and power, is charged by the joint committee with four functions:

First, to appraise the present and future impact of peaceful applications of atomic energy on the American way of life, economy, industry, and natural resources, including the effect on employment.

Second, to consider the impact of such applications on economies and industries abroad and their interlocking effect on our domestic economy and industry.

Third, to study the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission as they affect the foregoing in both the AEC programs aimed at developing peaceful uses of atomic energy and the AEC role as the regulatory agency of the new field.

Fourth, to recommend legislative and policy actions needed to speed the proper development of peaceful uses of atomic energy under both Government and private auspices.

"Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 the joint committee is charged with holding hearings on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry and is required to make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy," Senator ANDERSON said. "Because of the vastness and complexity of the subject, the joint committee has, by unanimous vote, established this panel, directing it to report back by January 31, 1956."

Members of the panel are: Robert McKinney, chairman, editor and publisher, Santa Fe New Mexican, former Assistant Secretary of the Interior; Ernest R. Breech, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.; George R. Brown, Brown & Root, constructors, Houston, chairman, Texas Eastern Transmission Co., former member, President's Materials Policy Commission; Sutherland C. Dows, president and chairman, Iowa Electric Light & Power Co., Cedar Rapids; John R. Dunning, physicist, dean of engineering, Columbia University, director, Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies; Frank M. Folsom, president, Radio Corporation of America; T. Keith Glennan, president, Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, former member Atomic Energy Commission; Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer, Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles, civil and hydraulic engineer, geophysicist, former member Material Resources Planning Board and President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

"All aspects of American life will eventually feel the impact of the atom," Senator ANDERSON said. "But to our committee four aspects seem immediate importance:

"In industry there will be changes in present patterns of fuel and power, raw materials, manufacturing techniques, employment, and domestic and foreign trade.

"The revolution which started in the inorganic sciences will carry over to the life sciences, and will open new horizons for improving the Nation's health and food supplies.

"We will have serious educational problems, not only in training people for many new technical jobs, but also in educating ourselves and our children generally for transition into the atomic age.

"We must make sure that individual initiative and enterprise are free to develop the atomic age, unimpeded by public or private monopoly.

"The joint committee has traveled to atom bomb tests, atomic laboratories, reactors and factories, and has even held a meeting underneath the sea in an atomic-powered submarine. Every day it becomes more apparent to us that atomic energy will have the impact of many new resources and frontiers discovered all at once—the physical dimension of a vast new public domain. The domain is too big—too important—to be left to the mercy of chance, speculation and limitless personal gain. It must be watched and nurtured, so that the domain is developed in the public interest, and developed by private enterprise with all the vigor, ingenuity and daring with which Americans have always won each new frontier. Properly guided, we can expect a new Renaissance."

---

REMARKS OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, RELATIVE TO FIELD FOR SPECIAL PANEL

There are some aspects which I think should be considered in a study of the coming impact of the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

The first of these is power.

Immediate development of low-cost atomic-powered electric generators can avert dislocations which otherwise may endanger the national welfare. Faced with sharp increases in population and in energy demand, the United States will eventually have power requirements which present fuels cannot meet. If a rational, orderly program for reactor construction is not begun now, a crash program may be necessary later.

Even if by wise and prompt action we escape domestic power shortages, other derangements which we cannot escape may come from abroad. The present highly industrialized nations—and therefore the most advanced and powerful—are those countries which won the 19th century Industrial Revolution because Providence put them on the top of large fuel deposits. Since solid fuel was more costly to transport than other materials used in mass manufacturing, the fuel-owning nations forced the rest of the world to deal with them on their own terms.

In the age of atomic reactors, however, it will often cost less to export atomic power plants than to import raw materials. Future processing plants will grow around the sites of raw materials, rather than around the sites of fuel deposits, as in the past.

Other industrialized nations, besides the United States, are pressing to become leaders in the manufacture and sale of atomic powerplants for export. Around the winners of this race, underdeveloped, power-hungry nations may group themselves in new satellite orbits, far different from present alliances.

Regardless of who wins the race, these worldwide dislocations are inevitable: (1) Reduction in the costs of many end products, which are manufactured from raw materials cheaply fabricated at point of origin; (2) dislocations in fuel, power, transportation, employment, manufacturing and service industry patterns; (3) industrial, political and social revolutions—and population explosions—where important resources are located in backward countries; (4) serious problems of conversion and unemployment, accompanied by economic, political and social unrest in centers of population surrounding obsolete industrial complexes.

### CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS

If man can extend his new-found ability to create new elements and new forms of existing elements, and consequently begins to have some real measure of control over the properties of matter, then we will have left behind the ages—Stone, Bronze, and Iron—in which man was the creature of the materials around him, and will truly have entered upon the time when all that has gone before is prehistoric.

Raw materials will be tailored to suit end products and uses, thus eliminating the present jerry-building of products to suit available materials. There will be many and rapid changes in raw materials, fabrication processes, end products, and end uses. Although the impact of developments here is presently unpredictable, the field is at least subject to exploration. After all, Greek "atomist" philosophers preceded today's atomic physicists by 2,400 years.

### LIFE SCIENCES

Diseases hitherto incurable—including cancer, the last and most dread of the great scourges—are beginning to give ground to medical research based on atomic products. The personal impact will be to reduce the burden of human misery. The social impact will be to outdate present life-expectancy tables and add fuel to the coming population explosion.

Radiation has its baleful aspect: the possibility that too much of it may cause malignant genetic variations in men, animals and plants. The benign effects of radioactivity in developing new strains of foods and fibers by genetic mutation, on the other hand, will have far-reaching impact.

A long term possibility is the dislocation of products of nature by manmade "agricultural" products, should atomic science enable man to discover and reproduce the cycle of photosynthesis.

"Tritium dating" should increase our knowledge of ground water supplies. Harnessing atomic electric power to seawater purification plants, if practicable on a commercial scale, would have considerable impact.

### THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

One impact of the peacetime applications of atomic energy will be recurrent waves of inventions, new processes and new applications, cumulatively compounding at rates more explosive than the world has yet seen.

Unlike any previous single natural resource, atomic energy will have the effect of many new resources and frontiers discovered all at once—the physical dimensions of a vast new public domain. The domain is too big—too important—to be left to the mercy of chance, speculation and limitless personal gain. It must be watched and nurtured, so that the domain is developed in the public interest, but developed by private enterprise with all the vigor, ingenuity and daring with which Americans have always won each new

frontier. Properly guided, we can expect a new Renaissance.

NATURAL RESOURCES

As our conventional natural resources near depletion, atomic applications are transferring the burden to new elements and materials. They are also aiding in the discovery of new resource deposits, among them some in short supply like oil. Perhaps many of the conventional resources covered in the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission should be reconsidered from the standpoint of how they fit into the emerging picture.

EDUCATION

Our present preatomic society is already experiencing serious shortages in technically skilled manpower. Greater shortages are around the corner in all phases of life affected by atomic applications: industry, agriculture, the natural and physical sciences, etc. The field of education will feel the brunt of the impact.

The opportunities of a peacetime atomic age will be given less to us than to our children. The first job is to train the men and women to train our children—a new generation of American-trained educators to take up the torch from the brilliant minds, many of them European, who brought to the United States so much of our present atomic knowledge.

Next, these teachers must transmit these opportunities to our children—transmit them in such a way that scientific book learning and vocational training (which so often tend to be dehumanized) go hand-in-hand with moral growth based on the humanities.

In the grades which we give our children, we should perhaps classify them on aptitudes as they finish elementary school, to determine their talents and bents in time to channel them into the vocations in which they can be the happiest and do the most good. Children showing suitable aptitudes could be offered special guidance through their high-school years and, on graduation, be given scholarships by individuals, philanthropies, business, and Government in colleges of their own choosing, if their aptitudes have satisfactorily developed.

CONCLUSION

It would seem that the panel appointed to study the impact of peacetime applications of atomic energy should consider, among other things, these aspects:

Lessening and/or increasing natural resource shortages; creation of new materials and new properties for old materials.

Dislocation in fuel, power, transportation, employment, manufacturing, and service-industry patterns, and population structures.

Strengthening or weakening of the free-enterprise system.

Impact of the coming revolution in the life sciences on the population and the food supply.

Education problems in training technicians specifically, and conditioning the whole society generally for living in a peaceable atomic era.

---

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PANEL ON THE IMPACT OF THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hold hearings on the "development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry" during the first 60 days of each session of the Congress. The joint committee is also charged by law with conducting "continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy." Experience during the recent statutory hearings has indicated that the developing atomic industry and the impact of the use of atomic energy generally is far too vast and complex to be dealt with solely by these means.

The joint committee has concluded that an independent panel of consultants will be the most effective means to assist in carrying out the responsibilities with which it is charged.

SCOPE OF PANEL INQUIRY

The panel is charged with four main duties:

1. To appraise the present and future impact of all aspects of the development of atomic energy on our way of life, our economy, our industry, our natural resources, and including the effect upon employment. While this appraisal will be concerned principally with the peaceful applications of atomic energy, it obviously must take into consideration its military applications as they affect or concern peaceful uses.

2. To consider also the effects of the application of atomic energy upon economies and industries abroad. While the study will be concentrated upon United States industry and economy, it must take into account the interlocking effects that such development and application abroad might have on our own economy and industries.

3. To study the activities of the AEC as they affect the foregoing both in the AEC programs aimed at developing peaceful uses in atomic energy and in the AEC role as the regulatory agency of the new field.

4. To recommend to the joint committee any legislative or policy actions needed to speed the proper development under both Government and private auspices of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

AUTHORITY OF PANEL

In carrying out its study the panel will be authorized by the joint committee to review such documents, and to receive such briefing, as the chairman of the joint committee and the chairman of the panel mutually deem necessary. Staff and clerical assistance will be provided by the joint committee as needed. Travel and per diem expenses of the panel will be paid by the joint committee.

The panel is authorized and directed to prepare and submit no later than January 31, 1956, a report on its activities and findings. Such report shall be suitable for public release by the joint committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, an interesting thing in connection with this matter is that the definition of peace has now undergone a significant change. The word "peace" now has a completely new meaning for the world, for it means more than the absence of armed conflict. It now means a chance for an abundance of all things, which was not possible until the coming of the atomic age. It is now possible to have atomic peace, as well as atomic war.

Mr. President, I was very happy to note that the Atomic Energy Commission, through its chairman, Adm. Lewis Strauss, issued a press release following appointment of the panel, and pledged the full cooperation of the Commission toward attainment of the continued gains sought by it in establishing the panel. I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued on last Saturday by Admiral Strauss be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN LEWIS L. STRAUSS, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The panel appointed by the congressional joint committee to study the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy will, of course, have the fullest cooperation of the Atomic Energy Commission in its endeavors.

Last year a panel of distinguished citizens, under the chairmanship of Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, was appointed by the joint committee to look into the military aspects of the atomic energy program. That special panel served a very useful function.

The panel which has now been selected by the joint committee to examine the peaceful applications of atomic energy is in logical sequence to the previous action. Its work should be no less useful.

This constructive step furthers a policy established some time ago by the Atomic Energy Commission whereby industrial study groups and other advisory councils have been set up to aid in developing and expanding the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Such advisory groups, created under this policy, are providing valuable assistance to the Commission in its purpose to bring about the earliest and fullest development of atomic energy for man's benefit, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The joint committee's selection of this citizens' panel to look into the civilian aspects of atomic energy will surely be construed abroad as further evidence of support for President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me call particular attention to the last paragraph of Admiral Strauss' statement:

The joint committee's selection of this citizens' panel to look into the civilian aspects of atomic energy will surely be construed abroad as further evidence of support for President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan.

Mr. President, we need to provide an opportunity to live in atomic peace. By so doing, the world may soon erase the age-old causes of wars, and rumors of wars. In that event, I believe the world may find that it has conquered itself with its own abundance, built upon atomic knowledge.

Certainly it is worthwhile to make a most serious and determined effort to achieve this goal, and the members of the joint committee wish to make that effort.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for making what I regard as a very splendid suggestion and proposal. The action taken indicates that the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and all the other members of the committee have wisely taken leadership in the field of the peaceful use and development of atomic energy.

I have read the statement the Senator from New Mexico has made, and I read with keen interest in the press the announcement of the appointment of the panel. Not only is the proposal a sound one, but the selection of the distinguished members of the panel seems to me to indicate that great care, consideration, and thoughtfulness have gone into this endeavor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that in the Joint Committee

on Atomic Energy, the vote was unanimous; and every member of the fine Joint Committee is entitled to whatever credit may be due for the results.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for the statements he has made, as well as for yielding to me in connection with them.

## EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I submit a series of amendments, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which now is under consideration by the Finance Committee.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, today the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and I are submitting for Senate consideration a series of amendments to H. R. 1, a bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, as passed by the House of Representatives on February 18, 1955.

The congressional intent in trade legislation has often been expressed. It is to expand our foreign trade, while, at the same time, offering reasonable safeguards to protect our domestic industries against unfair or unreasonable competition from abroad.

The President of the United States expressed this view in his letter of February 17, 1955, to the minority leader of the House of Representatives. He there made clear the basic philosophy of his administration regarding the trade-agreements program. The President said, in advocating extension of the trade-agreements program:

> Few programs will contribute more fundamentally to the long-term security of our country than the foreign-economic program submitted to the Congress on January 10. This program, built around H. R. 1, will powerfully reinforce the military and economic strength of our own country and is of the greatest importance to the well-being of the free world.

But with respect to safeguarding domestic industry, he stated unequivocally:

> I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interests to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our workingmen and women. * * * No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve.

We agree with that philosophy.

Mr. President, since colonial days, New England has been an important exporting area. At the same time, thousands upon thousands of domestic manufacturing installations have grown up in the area. These have flourished under a system of reasonable tariffs whereby the high wages paid to workers in New England have, by such tariffs, generally been offset sufficiently to place the workers of New England roughly on a competitive basis with less highly paid workers abroad.

We believe that the amendments presented here today are moderate. They are not designed to raise high walls of protection, but they would bring the entire program into balance, by offering fair recourse to domestic businesses when injury is grave.

These amendments would not impede the President or the Department of State in granting concessions where essential for the betterment of international trade, but they do write into the law perfectly proper safeguards. The moderate tone of these amendments has been derived from statements in the President's letter of February 17, 1955, as quoted above. Any reductions would be gradual and selective, as the President has recommended. While we have had assurances from the President as to the administration of this law under his supervision, we must remember that the President personally cannot administer every law, and that no law can wisely be written for only one President.

We must remember, also, that in the past the administration of the program has not been wholly in accord with what we have considered to be congressional intent. In the hearings on H. R. 1, before the Senate Committee on Finance, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] stated, in effect, that the Senate does not wish to have the program administered by "lovable visionaries." That is our feeling, too. Were the Congress to write into law the moderate amendments which we propose, the program's administration would be greatly strengthened, the authority of the President would be made quite clear, and the responsibility of Congress under the Constitution would not be vitiated.

There are described below the principal changes we propose for H. R. 1. We believe these to be the most practicable and necessary of the many changes desired by American industries. We feel that these moderate changes are not inconsistent with the policy outlined by the President in his letter of February 17, 1955.

### 1. STRENGTHENING OF ESCAPE CLAUSE

The findings of the Tariff Commission as to the existence of injury would be made final and binding on the President. However, the President would be given the power to disregard the recommendations of the Commission when he determines that the national security requires that no action be taken. In past administration of the trade-agreements program, the President has frequently disagreed with the findings of fact as to the existence of injury made by the Tariff Commission. In each case where he has not followed the recommendations of that Commission, he has justified such action by disagreeing with the findings of injury. The proposed change would require that the President justify any failure to carry out the recommendations of the Commission as being necessary in the interests of our national security.

The Tariff Commission would be required to make a finding of injury when it determines that increased imports have constituted a significant contributing factor to serious injury or a threat of serious injury to an industry. The Commission and the President have in the past interpreted the act as requiring a finding that increased imports in and of themselves have caused serious injury. In many cases where imports have increased and taken over a substantial part of the domestic market, the President has refused to take any action, on the ground that the injury to the domestic industry was in part caused by other factors, such as a change in consumer preference. The proposed change would recognize the fact that in every case of injury there are many contributing factors, and would require the Commission to make a finding of injury where increased imports are a significant contributing factor to the injury.

The Tariff Commission would be required to consider as one evidence of injury either an increase in imports over a representative period prior to a concession, or an increase in imports over any representative period after a concession. The Commission has in several cases refused to compare the current rate of imports with the rate of imports prior to a concession, and has limited its consideration to the trend of imports after the concession. Obviously, any determination as to the effect of a concession on imports must include a comparison of preconcession imports with postconcession imports.

The Tariff Commission would be required to consider as an evidence of injury higher domestic rates and prices for labor and raw materials than those of foreign producers. Higher domestic costs for labor and raw materials are a factor which must be considered in determining whether a reduced rate of import duty will threaten serious injury to the domestic industry. The Commission is not now required to make a finding on this point, and in some cases it has refused to do so.

The terms "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products" and "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles" would be defined as meaning "that portion of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles." This definition, which would apply to the term wherever used in the Extension Act of 1953, would require a finding of injury when production of a particular product is shown to have been injured by imports, even though the industry producing such product has not been "injured," due to offsetting profits on other items.

The "factors" set forth in section 7 (b) of the Extension Act of 1951, for consideration by the Commission, would be designated as "evidence of injury."

2. GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Approval or disapproval of GATT or any supplanting organization would be disclaimed by eliminating the new language added by H. R. 1 to section 350 (a) (1) (A), and by adding a new section 8 to H. R. 1.

The said new language in subparagraph (A) of H. R. 1 is not needed to authorize the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements, and its inclusion in H. R. 1 might be construed as indicating approval of GATT. The elimination of this language and the inclusion of a specific disclaimer of GATT will avoid any such construction.

3. SUBDIVISION OF CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES

The request that the President avoid the subdivision of classification categories in making concessions would be eliminated. A gradual and selective approach would be allowed. A mandate by Congress to avoid the subdivision of classification categories may well result in the State Department's granting of concessions on a large number of individual products included in a basket clause, merely to make a concession on one individual item. Such action might injure the producers of a number of items; whereas by subdividing the classification category, the same purpose could be accomplished without endangering the producers of products other than the one on which it is desired to make a concession.

4. DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The requirements contained in section 2 of the Extension Act of 1954, that no action be taken to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements, would be expanded to require the President to withdraw or modify past tariff concessions, when necessary to be done to prevent injury to domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements.

Mr. President, I desire now to discuss another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

## THE UNITED STATES POLICY OF COOPERATION WITH REGIONAL DEFENSE STRUCTURES IN EUROPE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, ever since the Vandenberg resolution of June 1948, the United States has had, as its enunciated policy, cooperation with regional defense structures in Europe. The August 30, 1954, defeat of the EDC by the French Parliament caused worldwide consternation, and threatened disruption of our national defense strategy. In order to clearly determine the future direction of American action, reliable facts on European political and economic developments and attitudes were needed. With this in mind, our distinguished former colleague, now our Ambassador to the Philippine Republic, Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, as the then chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, consulted with me, as the then chairman of the full committee, in regard to sending Gen. Julius Klein, one of Illinois' most distinguished citizen-soldiers, to Europe as a special, nonpaid consultant to that subcommittee.

General Klein was well suited to the task assigned him. He has drawn upon his experience as a citizen-soldier, international correspondent, world traveler, editor, and public-relations consultant to bring to the Senate the results of his extensive study tour through Western Europe. A much-decorated combat veteran who served in the Pacific under General MacArthur and Admirals Nimitz and Halsey, General Klein was the author of the original Army combat public-relations plan. This project, drafted before Pearl Harbor, was the foundation of our psychological warfare. After completing his tour of duty in the Pacific during World War II he served with distinction after the armistice in a military capacity as special assistant to the late Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, participating in the unification program which resulted in the establishment of the Department of Defense.

The late Senator Taft, long a personal friend of General Klein, had recommended to the Republican National Committee his appointment as National Defense Consultant, a post he held with distinction. General Klein is to be commended for his selfless devotion to country—in giving months of his time, at no cost to his Government, in the preparation of this report. General Klein's report was first published as a "Confidential Committee Print" and later it was made public. Certain classified portions of General Klein's findings have, of course, been deleted. Copies of the report have been made available to Members of the Congress and to executive department heads. Many of the recommendations of the Klein report have already been put into action. But much is still to be done. I commend to my colleagues, especially to members and staffs of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Appropriations, the study of this report and its recommendations which are so important to the welfare of our country. I am sure that General Klein will continue to cooperate with the various committees of Congress in personally appearing before such committees when needed.

Although General Klein's area of study was Europe, geographical and political realities impel the conclusion that security of this front is dependent not solely on factors within Europe but developments and conditions elsewhere. Thus, General Klein took advantage of his presence in Europe to speak with authorities there on extra-European problems which directly affect European policies and actions.

Many features of the report have particular current interest. Some of the policies recommended have already been adopted. I cite a few.

Our distinguished Vice President, Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON, who has done such an outstanding and commendable job in developing Latin-American friendship in his recent visit to our good neighbors to the south, stated that his Caribbean good-will tour convinced him that administration of the foreign-aid program would be greatly improved by putting it under the American Ambassador in each country. Mr. NIXON added that technical aid under the command of Ambassadors would produce better—and more economical—results for the American taxpayer.

What Vice President NIXON is urging is in consonance with a prime recommendation of General Klein's report that our overseas programs should be supervised by the Ambassador in each country rather than through an administrative labyrinth of separate and independent agencies. The Nation's press has taken particular note of this recommendation in both news and editorial columns, there apparently being widespread agreement with his proposal.

Other recommendations contained in General Klein's report are also under way. For example, President Eisenhower has recently designated Hon. Joseph Dodge as a high-level official to coordinate American overseas operations. General Klein had pointed out the great need for welding our diplomatic and administrative agencies overseas into a cohesive organization to minimize duplication and contradiction, under a top-level official designated for that purpose.

Legislation for the return of property vested during World War II in the Department of Justice or the Alien Property Custodian, in the form of the Kilgore-Dirksen bill, S. 995, has been introduced in this body, and a series of discussions between American and German officials on this topic has just been concluded. This is a subject to which the Klein report has contributed much in the way of clarification and meaning, especially in terms of America's relations with its Western ally, the Federal Republic of Germany, whose cooperation we seek, and whose friendship I know we have. The linking of West Germany to the European defense structure is a major recommendation of the administration.

General Klein's recommendations on international two-way travel and exchange of persons have already been noted on the floor of the other body by Representative THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, and further work on this subject is being done there.

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has already included in their record of hearings on Federal aid to education General Klein's conclusions on the necessity of scientific and technological training of American youth. The Klein report clearly perceives the dangers inherent in the comparatively rapid progress in such training by the Communist world, and sounds the alarm for American education.

The Klein recommendations on the strength of our Armed Forces have been reenunciated by key members of the Congress and the military.

While in Europe General Klein received many complaints from responsible European businessmen and opinion

leaders who were desirous of visiting the United States for business, education or pleasure, and who found innumerable hindrances in the way of legal and administrative regulations and redtape to their visits to this country, visits which would have been beneficial to the United States. General Klein recommended that our present laws on this subject be reexamined with a view toward facilitating and expanding the opportunities for foreign travel to the United States with all safeguards of our interests.

The Public Relations News, the widely-read trade organ of the public relations profession, singled out for special comment and note General Klein's conclusions and recommendations on our overseas information program.

Assistant Secretary of State I. W. Carpenter, Jr. observed in a recent letter that the Department is proceeding with a planned revitalization of its foreign service and that the President recently proposed improving the salary levels of Foreign Service officers and employees, all goals outlined in General Klein's report. "Other portions of this study will be given careful consideration in the Department," Mr. Carpenter promised. Similar cooperation has been pledged—it might be noted—from other Executive agencies.

Also of particular interest to this body is the recommendation by General Klein that the "Congress maintain in Europe a professional staff of modest size, appointed by and responsible to congressional committees concerned with operations there." This staff would aid Members of Congress visiting Europe on official missions, who would study and observe the administrative aspects of American programs in Europe and report to appropriate congressional committees at times when pertinent legislation is being considered, thus facilitating a continuous flow of information to the Congress.

Further recommendations of General Klein which merit study are: centering of off-shore procurement in a single operating agency, the General Services Administration; employment in a force under their own national banners of anti-Communist refugees from Iron Curtain countries; integration of the Middle East into the European defense structure; strengthening the United Nations; congressional consultation with General Douglas MacArthur; further inclusion of Spain in off-shore procurement programs and others.

When the Klein report was first released to the public recently, it was received with widespread editorial praise, both national and international, both in America's great metropolitan communities and in its smaller cities, representing the grass roots. For example, not only did the Miami Herald and the Boston Herald see fit to comment editorially on the recommendation that European statesmen should visit these shores more often instead of our Secretary of State making such frequent trips abroad, but journals in smaller communities—such as the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register and the Asheville (N. C.) Times, to name but a few—singled out this Klein recommendation for editorial commendation.

The New York and Chicago American, in referring to the recommendation that General MacArthur be consulted on global defense policies, stated:

Not many Americans will reject the opinion of General Klein that "it is essential that counsel be taken with one who has consistently demonstrated a comprehensive grasp of the total problem that confronts us."

And the Chicago Sun-Times, while disagreeing with some of General Klein's findings, acknowledged his qualifications and ability to conduct the study mission given him by the Senate committee based upon his experience with military and national defense problems.

Not all editorial comment was favorable, however, as General Klein was soundly criticized by the Russian Communist organ Pravda.

Many national and foreign leaders—both in and out of government—saw fit to commend General Klein's report. For example, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, one of General Klein's former war commanders and one of our country's most distinguished naval heroes wrote:

First, I congratulate General Klein on such a complete and accurate account of affairs in Europe.

Second. Let me state that I am in accord with General Klein's observations and recommendations—particularly as regards—

(a) The unfortunate practice of bypassing our ambassadors abroad.

(b) Our unfortunate habit of talking abroad by visitors who are not responsible for the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some of these fine commentaries. I refer to the commendations of the report from Polish General Wladislaw Anders and from such distinguished Americans as Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, Secretary of Air Harold Talbott, Assistant Secretary of the Army Hugh M. Milton, United States Information Agency Director Theodore C. Streibert, Ambassador John C. Hughes, journalist Herbert Bayard Swope, Past National Commander of the American Legion Edward A. Hayes and others. In these critical days of international tensions, we should make use of all sound information available.

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

Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, who led Poland's forces against Nazi Germany during World War II and who suffered betrayal and imprisonment at the hands of the Russians, wrote:

"I wish to congratulate the committee upon the penetrating insight with which General Klein has grasped and expounded the wide range of problems facing the free world of today, the United States and Western Europe especially. His acute analysis of the situation, as well as the clear logic of the conclusions and recommendations which follow, call for real admiration. General Klein's attitude, so definitely and decidedly anticommunistic, is, at the same time, an outstanding example of how American patriotism and true solicitude to safeguard the interest of one's own country can be blended with a deep understanding of the vital needs of other nations.

"With reference to the existing conflict between East and West, while looking for any element of strength which might be in favor of the West and trying to find the most practical and economical means of putting it into best use, General Klein rightly stresses the possibilities in this respect of a potential force at hand in the masses of exiles from countries now under Soviet domination, especially Poles. His recommendation No. 13, concerning anti-Communist exiles and refugees, proves how fully he understands our situation and deserves our true appreciation and real gratitude."

Secretary of the Air Force Talbott described the Klein report as "really a fascinating report" and he added "I marvel at the amount of work which was covered in such a short time."

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, one of General Klein's former war commanders and one of our country's most distinguishel naval heroes, in the spirit of John Paul Jones and Admiral Dewey, wrote:

"First, I congratulate General Klein on such a complete and accurate account of affairs in Europe; and

"Second, let me state that I am in accord with General Klein's observations and recommendations—particularly as regards—

"(a) The unfortunate practice of bypassing our Ambassadors abroad; and

"(b) Our unfortunate habit of talking abroad by visitors who are not responsible for the executive branch of our Government."

Excerpts from the observations of Assistant Secretary of State I. W. Carpenter, Jr., are of interest·

"I have read those portions which are most closely related to the administration of the Foreign Service and its relationship with other agencies of the Government. I am confident that the observations which General Klein has made will be useful to the Department in considering the development of our future plans for the administration of the Foreign Service.

"I found it especially gratifying to note General Klein's commendation of the success which marked Ambassador Hughes' program to effect saving through judicious personal and administrative revisions. In connection with this, I am glad to report that the officer who was principally responsible for assisting Ambassador Hughes in the administrative aspects of the United States mission to NATO and European Regional Organizations, Edward C. Crouch, has recently joined the staff of the Department as Director of the Office of Budget. I am confident that Mr. Crouch's previous experience in various Foreign Service assignments will pay us real dividends in achieving a better administrative organization here in our Washington headquarters.

"I believe the committee will also be pleased in the near future with the Department's plans to revitalize the Foreign Service Institute and strengthen the training program for its Foreign Service officers. Definite announcement of these arrangements will be made shortly.

"You have probably noted in the President's recent message to the Congress that the administration is proposing to improve the salary levels of officers and employees of the Foreign Service at the same time that the general pay scale for other Federal employees is revised.

"I have mentioned a few of the steps which are already underway to accomplish some of the goals outlined in General Klein's report. Other portions of this study will be given careful cansideration in the Department.

"On Mr. Hoover's behalf, I should like to thank the committee for its courtesy in sending him a copy of this report."

Assistant Secretary of the Army Hugh M. Milton stated that General Klein in his report had "indeed focalized the attention of the committee, as well as the American people, on some very important facets of international affairs." He said that he was "impressed with its very factual approach and

its comprehensiveness," and added, "No doubt the committee has received many commendations on the thoroughness of this report."

United States Information Agency Director Theodore C. Streibert, referring to the section of the Klein report which concerned his department, commented:

"We are glad to have these constructive recommendations and suggestions, and to the extent that they fall within our own powers we will give them the most careful and thorough consideration."

Ambassador John C. Hughes, the United States permanent representative to the North Atlantic Council, commenting on the Klein report, said:

"It is a most comprehensive one and makes most interesting reading, particularly to those of us here who have been faced with the many problems and situations which are so clearly set forth."

Pulitzer-prize-winning journalist, pioneer radio newscaster, and one-time assistant to Bernard Baruch, Herbert Bayard Swope, stated of the Klein report:

"I am impressed by the clarity, interest, and importance of General Klein's thought and its expression. Congratulations."

One of America's most distinguished soldier-statesmen, Gen. John Hilldring, commented:

"It is an excellent document. I hope they do something with it."

Capt. Edward Hayes, past national commander of the American Legion and Chicago civic leader, said of the Klein report: "It not only analyzes with amazing clarity the complex European political scene, but even more important, it contains recommendations for the welfare of our country which should be carefully studied by every American in high office charged with the planning and execution of our Government's policy. I sincerely hope that the Klein report is followed through and not allowed to collect dust in a Government file."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hope that the executive departments—Defense, FOA, State, Commerce, and others—will also study this report. Much that General Klein has recommended can be accomplished administratively. Some legislation may be needed. I hope where this is merited the departments concerned will forward their recommendations to the Congress for action.

Let me conclude by stating that I am certain that I bespeak the thoughts of many Members from both sides of the aisle in expressing our appreciation to General Klein for a job well done.

I believe reports which are made by volunteer assistants and people who have devoted a lifetime to the study of operations, and who know how to express themselves once they have completed their investigations and ascertained the facts, constitute valuable contributions to the successful operation of the committees of Congress, which are attuned to the responsibilities for the enactment of legislation and the appropriation of money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to receive a copy of the report to which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has referred, namely, the so-called Klein mission report, which was written by Gen. Julius Klein as a result of his special assignment by a subcommittee of the Senate.

I also received a summary of the recommendations contained in the report. I received that summary from the Foreign Operations Administration, with a covering letter from the executive secretary of the Foreign Operations Administration.

There are several items in the report which merit very careful consideration. In fact, the whole report offers food for thought and constructive suggestions for use by Congress and the executive branch of the Government.

I take particular joy in mentioning the report of General Klein because I have known this fine American for a number of years. I recall first meeting him in the city of St. Paul when he was the commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States and when I served as mayor of Minneapolis. I have had a personal friendship with him ever since that day. I have welcomed his advice and counsel on many issues, even though I must say in all candor that our politics are not exactly alike, he being a rather vigorous Republican, and I, I hope, can qualify as a full-fledged Democrat.

General Klein enjoys the good will and respect of both Democrats and Republicans. After I had read the report, I suggested to General Klein that he move into the Democratic Party. He did not accept the suggestion. I decided to judge the report on its merits.

I should like to refer to a few items in the report. First of all, Mr. President, I believe the recommendation concerning the role of American Ambassadors abroad, and the duties that should be assigned to them, is very helpful indeed and very sound. For example, General Klein recommended:

(a) That we redefine, especially for the governments of foreign countries, the functions and responsibilities of our Ambassadors, reinvesting these officials with the primary authority they should properly exercise in countries where they are stationed.

I am sure the basis for the recommendation is the confusion which must confront foreign countries in the face of our having Ambassadors and other representatives stationed in their countries representing various agencies of our Government.

I take note of the fact that the present occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has on several occasions in the Senate appropriately and, I may say, pointedly, referred to the difficulties that are encountered in our foreign-aid programs and in our foreign policy itself because we have several persons in various foreign capitals who hold the rank of ambassador.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator's comment is interesting, because it is not only confusing to Americans in the administration of their affairs abroad, but it causes a certain bewilderment among officials of foreign governments in wondering what American official they should deal with. It is a situation which could be very easily corrected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I believe the second part of the recommendation of the Klein report is something that the Senate will be discussing very shortly if it agrees to dissolve the Foreign Operations Administration at the end of the present fiscal year.

I am sure the presiding officer has strong feeling on the importance of tying in more closely the operations of our Government abroad with our established representation in foreign countries.

General Klein further suggested:

(b) That we broaden the jurisdiction of our ambassadors and provide them with the necessary staffs to permit them to assume actual and final authority for cultural, economic, informational, and other activities now being carried on in countries where they are stationed by other agencies, thus permitting substantial savings in our total overseas program by reduction or elimination of agencies whose functions would be absorbed by the embassies.

His final recommendation in this connection is:

(c) That assignment of United States missions to deal with specific European problems be held to the minimum required by clearly discernible emergency situations.

General Klein visited only the countries of Europe. However, as the Foreign Operations executive secretary noted in his transmittal letter to me:

Although his trip was through Europe, several of his conclusions and recommendations involve United States activities in other parts of the world, and many would appear to apply equally in other regions.

The Klein report makes reference to specialized training, or training in the field of science and technology.

I quote from what General Klein reports:

Military experts and educational authorities are concerned over the Soviets' known emphasis on the training of Russian youth in science and technology. The gravity with which they regard this situation leads me to recommend:

(a) That steps be taken at the earliest moment to maintain our country's lead in the development of trained scientific and technological personnel.

(b) That a high-level conference of military authorities and educators be called for the purpose of devising a program, similar to the World War II plan that utilized educational facilities for meeting military specialists needs, to initiate the training of scientific and technological manpower required for future security needs.

(c) That such a program be sufficiently flexible to allow for the productive integration of those selected for training in the Nation's peacetime industrial facilities, as well as for the specialized military service that would be expected of them.

4. RECOMMENDATION FOR STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

For all its defects and shortcomings in the face of Communist obstructions and intransigence, the United Nations continues to offer a forum of world opinion before which the free world and the dictatorships can be judged by the ordinary peoples of the earth. For many millions of people, the United Nations still represents an instrumentality for striving to avert the threat of a world war. In Europe, it is regarded hopefully if not optimistically.

I therefore recommend that United States policy continue to aim at strengthening the United Nations. The alternative would be to concede, in effect, that international disputes cannot be settled by peaceful means.

Let us remember, however, that the League of Nations lost the confidence of world opinion because of its failure to deal firmly with the aggression in Ethiopia. The United Nations cannot safely ignore repeated violations of international law and its own obligations without forfeiting the confidence of free peoples.

Mr. President, whether or not we agree in full with the recommendations, the fact is that the concern which this report demonstrates over the inadequacy of our present educational program for the training of specialists—scientists and technicians—is one that we in Congress must take under serious consideration.

There is a definite need that something be done to improve the situation in our higher educational establishment for the recruitment and training of qualified people in the field of science and technology and, indeed, in other fields as well.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to go through these recommendations one by one. I do feel that the recommendations and conclusions should be studied very carefully, particularly by the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, by the members of the Committee on Armed Services, and by the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

I have had the privilege of studying these recommendations. I commend his United Nations recommendations most highly.

I wish to call particular attention to some thoughts that General Klein expresses with regard to offshore procurement. This is an area in which we need to do some rethinking. His recommendations in that field certainly merit our favorable consideration.

The emphasis on the overseas information program contained in the report is in line with what I said earlier today about the inadequacy of what we are doing and the importance of stepping up our efforts and coordinating them on a much more systematized basis.

I call attention particularly to the suggestion in the report that our overseas information personnel be brought home on a regular basis, so that they will be in constant touch with developments in this country.

They should not be stationed overseas for such prolonged periods of time that they lose intimate touch with the local American political scene.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The point the Senator has touched on, of keeping American representatives in the Foreign Service in close touch with America, is a very pertinent point. They should not be kept overseas for so long a time that they lose their feel for their own country. They should be returned to America so that they may get the feeling for their country that they can get only by being in the country. It is not enough to bring them back for a short visit of a week or two. We should follow through on that recommendation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. I point out the fact that today we passed the Foreign Service bill on a voice vote. That bill was considered in the Committee on Foreign Relations and that committee took into consideration the recommendations contained in the Klein report.

Another point that was raised in the report—and I am sure it would be well to follow the suggestion—is the recommendation on the establishment of congressional consultation with American foreign correspondents.

I quote from the report:

Experienced American press and radio correspondents have acquired a fund of knowledge about the personalities and political undercurrents affecting European attitudes and policies which can be of immense value if properly utilized.

He goes on to say in his report:

I, therefore, recommend that appropriate congressional committees consult with a selected number of experienced American press and radio correspondents covering European capitals. Subject to the consent of their editors, these correspondents should be consulted in executive session so that responsibile legislative committees may be in a position to augment normal sources of information about Europe and so obtain a complete and balanced picture of American problems in Europe and the manner in which these problems are being met.

Mr. President, General Klein further makes one particular point about which I have felt keenly for some time, namely, that increased attention should be paid to political opposition parties in Europe while adequate relationships be maintained with the party which is in power in the respective European countries. I feel that the word of caution which is stated is one that would bear very careful consideration by policymakers of our country.

Mr. President, I conclude by simply saying that we find it most helpful in the Congress when private public-minded citizens like General Klein are assigned to tasks of observation and study. I, for one, found this report much more helpful to me than some official reports that we receive. This is not to say, nor should it be so interpreted, that every word, paragraph, suggestion, or recommendation is one with which I would agree, but I do feel that it affords a freshness of approach, and I feel that General Klein should be commended for what I consider to be diligence and perseverance almost beyond the call of duty. He has presented to the Members of the Senate thoughtful patriotic suggestions which should yield significant results in the days to come.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Minnesota in expressing commendation of General Klein for the very useful and thoughtful report which he has made and which I hope all Members of the Senate will read. In dealing with other nations we have been needing for a long time more viewpoints of individual citizens who have great ability and who can ferret out and get to the bottom of problems so as to improve our relationships with other nations. The mission and the report of General Klein are of that kind.

I had the opportunity of being in Europe last fall when he was there making his study. He did it without fanfare. He went to the bottom of the problems and secured information not only from diplomats and public officials, but from individual businessmen and citizens.

When I was advised that the Senator from New Hampshire had asked him to make this study and report, I immediately wrote congratulating him, because I knew it would be a useful undertaking.

It has been my pleasure to know General Klein for a number of years, and I know him to be a fine citizen. While he has large private interests, he is always willing to take on an additional public duty, whether compensated for it or not. He has been a friend of mine for a long time, and he is a man in whom I have great confidence.

As has been said by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], General Klein is a Republican, but he has many friends among both Democrats and Republicans. I think it should be pointed out that his report is not a partisan report. Many of the 24 or 25 recommendations are critical of what is taking place. Many of them are critical of the handling of our foreign relations and our military system by the present administration. But they are all backed up by facts which General Klein found.

He has been helpful to the administration in the conduct of its diplomatic affairs and its military missions. So the report will be of continuing benefit, both to the Congress and to the executive department, because it is thorough, well considered, and forward looking. It lets the chips fall where they may, regardless of whether it pleases the agency being discussed or whether it does not.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss each one of the recommendations, but many of them have been covered by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Minnesota. There are 2 or 3 which I should like particularly to discuss. A portion of the report deals with the fact that American officials are handicapped by a lack of coordination between their operations and those of agencies charged with administering the expenditure of American funds abroad.

The report calls for drastic realinement of United States military, economic, and administrative policies and procedures to insure that American manpower and resources are put to maximum use at minimum cost to overcome the Communist threat in Europe.

It charges that in addition to France, Great Britain, and Italy were responsible in substantial measure for Europe's failure to pool its forces under the EDC plan. The report goes on to warn that the Western European Union substitute for EDC, which permits the maintenance of national armies by the participating countries, faces immense difficulties because of lingering doubts about the course an independently rearmed Germany will pursue in the future.

General Klein, a much-decorated veteran with Pacific combat duty under General MacArthur in World War II and military experience dating back to serv-

ice on the United States Military Mission to Gemany after World War I, was Consultant on National Defense to the Republican National Committee in 1949 and has also served as special adviser to members of the Senate Armed Committee. His study of the European scene led him to warn that "the United States today is the main line of resistance against Communist aggression and although we cannot afford to withdraw from Europe, common considerations of self-interest dictate that the primary emphasis of American military spending be based on our own defense needs."

While advocating maintenance of strong ground and naval forces, the report places special stress on increased appropriations for United States air power, the one military arm in which we cannot afford to be second best in the world of today. And although the report recognizes a need for prudence to maintain a safe balance between the country's economic resources and its military requirements, it warns that we dare not risk a national epitaph that will read: We could not afford to survive.

The report is sharply critical of United States operations overseas, stressing particularly that there is a need for Congress to be more fully informed about how American money is spent in Europe and whether the objectives for which United States funds have been allocated are being achieved. The report urges that Congress maintain direct contact with American operations in Europe through "a study staff of modest size, made up of professionals appointed by, and responsible to, congressional committees concerned with United States activities in Europe." The proposed "study staff," which is not envisaged as a new agency, would have the limited task of observing and reporting to congressional committees on the degree to which maximum efficiency and economy are being applied to American programs in Europe. Its authority would not extend to ongoing operations in diplomatic and military fields, nor would it exercise any responsibility in areas within the purview of the executive branch of the Government. One of its primary functions would be to provide comprehensive reports to congressional committees in advance of annual hearings on matters involving the conduct and financing of American overseas programs.

In European countries, where economic needs are a factor, "American money talks louder than American diplomacy," the report asserted, adding:

> Unless there is a well planned, carefully supervised correlation of the two, American statesmanship and American dollars will go for naught.

Foreign Operations Administration missions are operating independently "and not in support of American political objectives." FOA ministers or chiefs of missions meet with Ambassadors, but their primary responsibility is to their parent agency in Washington. Ambassadors, no matter how competent and well informed on political and economic realities in Europe, do not exercise control over FOA officials. The result is that foreign aid funds in many cases are not serving the objectives for which they were originally allocated.

Some American officials in Europe are more inclined to plead European causes in Washington than to further understanding of America's policies in Europe. Thus, while the United States has many admirers of America's individual qualities, "we do not have many friends who are convinced of the rightness of our attitudes and the policies on which they are based."

The United States Foreign Service overseas has fallen into serious disrepair because no serious effort has been made at home to develop a reservoir of trained personnel. Inadequacies in the Foreign Service were largely responsible for the failure of the United States to maintain the flow of information which would have enabled our foreign policy planners to anticipate the French National Assembly's defeat of EDC and to have planned alternative steps accordingly.

American leadership in Europe has suffered because the United States has failed to delineate its foreign policy clearly. Conflicting policy statements by American political leaders have proven both confusing and alarming to Europe.

The United States information program in Europe requires reorientation. There is a tendency to place more emphasis on American policies than on the interpretation of these policies in terms of Europe's welfare and security.

The report observed that—

> It is not enough to tell the ordinary people of Europe what is bad about communism; it is vital to bring home to them what good can accrue to them from democracy.

The report urged decreased emphasis on the encouragement of purely political defections from Communist countries. Instead, it argued, United States appeals should be aimed at scientists, engineers, technicians, and industrial managers "whose escape from Communist bondage could serve to weaken the industrial, technological, and economic capacities of the Iron Curtain states."

The West cannot turn its back on political defectors, the report said "but insofar as possible, they should be encouraged to stay and fight Communist tyranny on their native soil."

European economic recovery has reached a stage where American policy must shift from aid to trade and loans instead of grants coupled with increased private overseas investment. In addition, the report said, there is a need for safeguards to protect American industry engaged in defense production and American business and labor suffering from economic contractions in the United States. American policy, the report held, must be flexible enough to protect American industry where needed and to permit lifting of temporary trade restrictions once depressed segments of the American economy have recovered sufficiently to hold their own in competitive markets.

Lack of coordination in American purchasing programs in Europe, including such operations as offshore purchasing, has been costly to the United States in waste, duplication, and overlapping because of failure to make use of experienced agencies such as the General Services Administration.

Failure by the United States to meet the challenge of Government-subsidized foreign shipping and airlines is hampering the further development of United States maritime and air-transport facilities, vital alike to the Nation's peacetime economy and as needed auxiliaries to United States naval and air forces in time of emergency.

Principal recommendations of the report called for increased military self-reliance by the United States, consolidation of American overseas operations, greater centralization of administrative functions and the adoption of policies to encourage Western European nations in seeking solutions to their own military and economic problems.

The report also recommends that Gen. Douglas MacArthur's views be invited by both our highest policymaking authorities and appropriate congressional committees to aid in the shaping of a consistent, clearly formulated global defense policy for the United States.

A high-level conference of United States military authorities and educational leaders to devise a program for insuring America's lead in the development of trained scientific and technological manpower. The report called attention to the World War II plan that utilized American educational facilities in the training of military specialists and urged adoption of a similar program now "in view of Soviet Russia's known emphasis on the training of Russian youth in science and technology." The report points out that Russian schools are graduating scientists and technicians at a rate of more than 2½ to 1 over American educational institutions.

Recommendations for an overhauling of American administrative and diplomatic procedures overseas are these:

Centralization in actual practice of cultural, economic, and informational activities under American Ambassadors in Europe. Many of these functions, hitherto exercised by special missions and Federal agencies, would be turned over to the Ambassadors "with the aim of effecting substantial savings in our total overseas program." The report held that coordination of these activities by Embassies would make for greater effectiveness in the conduct of American diplomacy. At the same time, the report urged that "the assignment of United States missions to deal with specific European problems should be held to the minimum required by clearly discernible emergency situations."

Revitalization of the United States Foreign Service through development of a reservoir of trained Foreign Service personnel. The report called for reevaluation of existing salary levels, the borrowing of skilled specialists from private American business, cultural and educational institutions for reviving the Foreign Service Institute as an institution on a par with such establishments as the Army, Navy, and National War Colleges.

Increased attention by United States diplomats and congressional committees on overseas surveys to the views of European opposition parties, which can be a

valuable source of information of European policy trends. The instability of some European governments, the report points out, makes it apparent that it is a mistake to gage European opinion solely by the views of parties in power at the moment. Thus adequate sampling of French political opposition might have forewarned the United States in advance of French opinion trends on such issues as EDC and Western European Union.

Communist Parties in Italy and France, the largest Red organizations west of the Iron Curtain, can be expected to wage the bitterest last-ditch resistance against any efforts to bring about effective participation by these countries in the defense of Western Europe.

Meanwhile, the report stresses, it would be a mistake to overlook the apprehensions of millions of non-Communist Europeans over the prospect of German rearmament. A primary obligation of the United States and her western allies, the report said, "Is to see to it that the new German Army becomes the servant and not the master of the German Government and that limitations and controls on the German military establishment, as set forth in the Brussels Pact, are adhered to faithfully."

General Klein's report merits the closest study by committees of the Congress and by executive officers of the Government. His recommendations, wherever possible, should be followed to their conclusion and the report should not be allowed to be simply filed away without the most careful study of the findings contained therein. Reports such as General Klein's can serve a useful purpose for our country. He, indeed, has earned the appreciation of the Senate Appropriations Committee for his efforts.

Another portion of the report deals with something about which we have been hearing much recently, namely, that an attempt should be made to increase the interchanges of visitors between the United States and foreign countries. General Klein found that the average citizens with whom he talked in other countries knew little about Americans; and what they knew was based on misconceptions often exploited by the Communists themselves. He said that these adverse impressions were not softened by the visits of the more affluent American tourists, who can afford free-spending vacations.

So in the report he recommends:

First, the intensification of the interchange-of-persons program at all levels.

Second, the encouragement of European tourist and business travel to the United States through cooperation with the established American travel industry.

Third, the reexamination of existing law with a view toward facilitating and expanding foreign travel to the United States.

Fourth, an evaluation of the present exchange student and foreign visitors program to ascertain whether the Nation is receiving the fullest possible benefits from it.

The report has been widely commented upon in the press, and usually the comments have been favorable. There may be some parts of it with which I do not agree; but certainly it presents a fresh, unbiased, and well-considered view.

I am thankful that there are citizens unconnected with public life upon whom we can call to make inquiries of this kind. I hope more such inquiries can be made in the future, because it is necessary to have more of the person-to-person approach in our diplomacy and dealings with other nations.

I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire and others who were responsible with him for making this mission and study possible. I think much has been contributed to the realm of our knowledge of what is taking place in Europe, and of how we can better further the objectives in which all are interested.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I think the report has highlighted various matters which should receive the attention of some of the committees of the Senate. Some of the recommendations have been adopted since the report was made.

I agree with two things the Senator has mentioned, particularly the necessity of improving travel facilities. Many Americans who travel abroad carry the message of the American way of life, and at the same time they spend much American money abroad. But it is certainly to our interest to have visitors from other lands come to the United States. In my own State of New Hampshire, in particular, one of the largest groups of visitors have come across the border from Canada. Recently, when I was in North Carolina, I was very much interested to observe the large number of Canadians who were visiting there.

So not only can the interchange of travelers effect a better understanding of our country, but it can also be an asset to the United States to have foreign visitors come here.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. The fact that there is such an extensive interchange of visitors between the United States and Canada, because it is so easy to travel from one nation to the other, has done much to make for a better understanding between the two nations and to bring about what I suppose is the most cordial and friendly relationship which has ever existed between two great countries.

I know that sometimes there is opposition to allowing, perhaps even people from behind the Iron Curtain to come to the United States; but it has been proposed that there should be an interchange of farmers between the United States and Soviet Russia.

I think that if it can be made possible for the people of other nations to see the United States and to get a good picture of it, we need have no fear of the kind of impression they will receive once they have observed America and the conduct of American public affairs.

I hope that in revising our laws to make easier the exchange of visitors and students, these recommendations will be given close and serious consideration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in congratulating Brig. Gen. Julius Klein for the able and illuminating report he has made with respect to the problems which confront the United States in its relationship with other countries.

When I was Assistant Secretary of War for Air, under Secretary Patterson, General Klein was Secretary Patterson's special representative. He and I got along with each other extremely well. I was much impressed with his ability and his desire to serve the United States.

Later, when I became Secretary of the Air Force, General Klein was adviser to me, and in that capacity he always showed fine ability and deep understanding with respect to the problems of the military, and their relationship to the civilian economy, and to civilians in general.

As I remember, last March, at the time the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire and I were on a bi-partisan trip in Europe, we found in one of the capitals of Europe five persons from the United States having the rank of Ambassador. In the course of his report General Klein points up how ridiculous that type and character of foreign representation can be, so far as the best interests of the United States are concerned.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I recall the incident to which the distinguished Senator from Missouri has referred. I remember the five persons holding the rank of Ambassador. Although they were all good men, and all were performing proper functions, I think there was no question in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Missouri or of myself that their duties somewhat overlapped. Certainly there was bewilderment on the part of the officials of that country, and of other countries, as to whom they were dealing with, or the proper sphere in which each Ambassador operated. The condition was brought home to me very vividly, and it is for that reason that I now recall the situation which the Senator from Missouri has described.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire may remember that one of the highest officials of the Government of that country told us that at one time he became so confused that he called up one of the five ambassadors to ask with which ambassador he should take up a particular matter.

Earlier this afternoon, on the floor of the Senate, we had the honor of the presence of the United States Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Luce. At the time the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire and I visited Turin, Italy, an overwhelming majority of the members of the union in great Fiat works in that city voted Communist. I was delighted to have Mrs. Luce tell me today that yesterday the vote was reversed, and the majority of the workers in that plant voted anti-Communist. The Fiat plant is, by all odds, the largest in Italy, and possibly the largest in Europe.

Mr. President, when the Senator from New Hampshire and I were in Italy we expressed our concern with respect to the situation which then existed. It is my understanding that General Klein considered it to be very serious. I believe the result shows concentration on his suggestions for certainly the work done by our distinguished Ambassador, Mrs. Luce, in bringing about a cancellation of contracts with companies in which the unions went Communist after they were given orders from the United States, was most effective. It seems to me that if we will follow some of the important recommendations in General Klein's report there will be a better understanding between the United States and other countries. I am sure we can all read and study his report with interest and to our own advantage and the advantage of our country.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to add a word to what the Senator has said about Italy, and express my pleasure at the reversal at the Fiat plant, which we observed when we were over there. I take this opportunity to commend the American Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Luce, because I believe that she has had a very thorough understanding of the problem in Italy. She had the courage, after sizing up the situation, to take action to carry out her judgment, and, in most cases that I know of, her judgment has been correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from New Hampshire is entirely correct. He will remember that, with his approval, I inserted in the RECORD a statement he was kind enough to show to me some weeks ago, which evidenced the fact that our Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Luce, was courageous enough to cancel a certain contract, although there was a large cancellation charge, of more than a half million dollars, as I recall it. She was determined that industrialists of the United States should not place orders for work in plants in Italy which were dominated by Communists. I think the latest action on the part of the industrial workers at Turin indicates that Mrs. Luce's efforts along those lines have been rewarded.

## APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair wishes to make the following announcements of appointments:

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 10, sections 1055, 1056, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. POTTER a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1083, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. DIRKSEN a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Pursuant to the provisions of title 14, section 194, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. BUSH a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

MEMBER OF NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, section 393–a, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. BENNETT a member on the part of the Senate of the National Historical Publications Commission.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 58, agreed to on February 20, 1950, the Vice President appointed Mr. KUCHEL a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 420, 83d Congress, approved June 18, 1954, the Vice President appointed Mr. THYE a member of the board of directors of Gallaudet College, formerly the Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Vice President appointed Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. SALTONSTALL members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MEMBERS OF NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 742, 83d Congress, approved August 31, 1954, the Vice President appointed Mr. SCOTT, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. BENDER members on the part of the Senate of the National Monument Commission.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Pursuant to Public Law 109, 83d Congress, approved July 10, 1953, the Vice President appointed Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. BUTLER members on the part of the Senate of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to fill existing vacancies thereon.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL USE OF INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Pursuant to Public Law 558, 83d Congress, approved July 29, 1954, the Vice President appointed Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. DUFF members on the part of the Senate of the Commission on Governmental Use of International Telecommunications.

MEMBER OF WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

Pursuant to Public Law 705, 83d Congress, approved August 30, 1954, the Vice President appointed Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey members on the part of the Senate of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Vice President appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to fill existing vacancies thereon, the following-named Senators:

From the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. DIRKSEN.

From the Committee on Finance, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION POLICY

Under the provisions of Public Law 414, 82d Congress, the Vice President appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. JENNER.

MEMBERS OF NAVAHO-HOPI INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

The Vice President appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the Navaho-Hopi Indian Administration Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. GOLDWATER.

## POLICY WITH RESPECT TO FORMOSA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Congress has written a blank check for the President in dealing with the Formosa situation. It was done at his request and principally to demonstrate the unity of the Nation. But the fact that the Formosa resolution exists places a burden and responsibility on the President of the United States which I expect he will one day regret he has. There are forces in his administration so powerful and apparently so eager for a war with China that they are becoming almost impossible to resist. That the United States should be plunged into a war over Matsu and Quemoy ought to be unthinkable. Yet there are those in high places in the present administration itself who are plotting and planning to bring such a war about, whatever the risks involved.

President Eisenhower has himself wisely limited the final decision as to the United States action. But the conclusion is inescapable that the present war party is attempting to create a situation and an atmosphere in which the President would have no choice but to follow them.

These plotters tell us that we can fight a limited war with China without risk. They tell us that we can fight a limited war with precision atomic bombing and get away with it. There is one school which wants to blast and destroy China's industrial capacity. There is another, and apparently more official school, which merely wants to use atomic weapons against China's airfields.

In either case we are told that Russia will not come to the aid of her ally China because of fear of massive retaliation herself. If this conclusion is based on intelligence reports rather than wishful

thinking, it should be pointed out that in the Korean war, just before the entry of the Chinese Communists, either our intelligence was wrong or our interpretation of that intelligence was wrong. It should be pointed out that in the Indochina war either our intelligence was wrong or our interpretation of that intelligence was wrong.

Now, as to interpretations of Russia's intentions, our intelligence, if that is what it is, can well be wrong again.

Russia is bound to Communist China by strong treaties. We know that treaties are a matter of convenience to Russia, and that if she deems it in her interest not to abide by them, she does not abide by them. But in this instance, Russia's interests and those of Communist China are bound together. If Russia stood idly by while we destroyed the industry of China or even her air force, it would mean the end of her hold on all her satellites. It would very probably weaken the control of the Communist leaders at home. The Russian leaders know this, and we know that they know it.

It is said that Russia does not now have the means of delivering atomic or hydrogen bombs on this continent, and that she would thus be paralyzed by fear of bombs that Russia knows we are now capable of delivering. I do not know that Russia cannot deliver bombs on this continent, and I doubt that anyone else knows other than the Russians. But if Russia cannot deliver bombs on this continent, there are plenty of places vital to our interests and the future of humanity where she is perfectly capable of delivering the bombs we know she possesses.

If Quemoy and Matsu have become important, it is in large part the doing of military leaders in this administration. They have encouraged the Formosan Chinese to commit a large portion of their armed forces and equipment to the defense of those islands. Their loss would be a great one to the Nationalists, but we are largely to blame for their being there.

I may say at this point that while we may have so-called precision atomic weapons, a possible enemy may not. If we attack with these so-called precision weapons, he may feel inclined to attack with the only kind available to him. One or two of these falling on Formosa may make debate over its defense academic.

It should be pointed out to the administration, which at its very outset paid a high price for a cease-fire in Korea, that any military action on the part of the United States against China proper is very likely to reopen the war in that ravaged land where our troops still face the troops of China.

The remarkable thing about this plotting and planning for war is that the plotters and planners must know that the vast majority of the American people are against them. The mood of America, no matter how warlike some of our leaders wish to make us seem, is deeply pacific; and, as a matter of fact, we know that we are not going to have any allies, or substantial allies, if we get into a war over Quemoy and Matsu.

In the Evening Star of today, on the front page, appears an article by Crosby B. Noyes, European correspondent of the Star. He states:

> European reaction to the lively possibility of war in the Far East encourages two reasonable predictions:
>
> That our European allies will not fight to defend Chinese offshore islands from Communist attack.
>
> That war in the East will not bring about a major blowup in the Western camp.

The second possibility may be beyond our control.

Referring further to the article, it states also that among the latest of European governments:

> There is also a strong tendency to question the argument that as defense of the Matsus and Quemoy is necessary to prevent the crumbling of anti-Communist morale throughout southeast Asia. On the contrary, it is suggested that open intervention of the United States to save the islands would have a disastrous psychological effect on the neutral states in far more critical areas. So far as Formosa itself is concerned, the thought is that if the Nationalist regime cannot survive loss of the offshore islands it is probably too shaky to survive long anyway.

Some people wonder at the great popularity of President Eisenhower. They express amazement that an administration which obviously has not done very much can have such a popular leader. I believe that the explanation for the President's popularity is precisely that he has not done very much. The American people are tired of war and they want a period of uninterrupted peace and quiet. The source of the President's strength appears to lie in the fact that he is not rocking the boat. I believe that the President senses this fact; if not, he had better get briefed on it. Such a briefing could well be given in the Pentagon and the State Department as well.

Mr. President, although the President may not seem to be rocking the boat, the tragic fact is that in his administration American foreign military policy has degenerated into rule by fear. The tremendous good will toward our Nation and our people which was ours at the end of World War II has been dissipated into the mists of history. Nobody in the State Department or the Pentagon ever talks any more about good will or neighborliness. Instead, they rattle their atomic bombs. These days, one hears coming from the State Department, not the cooing of the doves of peace, but the sharp click when someone cocks a hydrogen bomb.

The simple truth is that the world cannot afford another great war. Not a standard or a value that we know could survive one, even if a few pockets of people could manage to hold out against blast and fire and deadly radiation. If we get involved in a "little war" over Quemoy and Matsu, and if we then use atomic weapons, it is difficult for me to see how we can avoid a chain reaction which would start explosions around the world.

It is time we started talking, for a change, about peace. We should put in a deep, dark closet all of Secretary Dulles' bellicosity.

I am encouraged that, at last, exploratory talks looking forward to a meeting of the great powers have begun. At that meeting, if it takes place, the discussions will doubtless not be as free and as frank as they might have been before Secretary Dulles began the era of kiss-and-tell diplomacy; but we ought to talk about peace, whenever and wherever we get the occasion.

Yet, Mr. President, what do we hear but talk of war and rumors of war?

Mr. President, it is often said that the American people have always liked the Russian people, but have never liked their governments. The Russian people are brave and talented.

There is also a long history of friendship and understanding between the American people and the Chinese people. We have never had any difficulty in getting along with them as people.

The people of America—and I know it very well—have a hope for peace as long, as wide, and as deep as any on earth.

These things are true. It is time that the men in the Kremlin took them into account. It is time that the men in Peking took them into account. And it is time for the men of the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House to take them into account, too.

Mr. President, I wonder whether any other Member of the Senate desires to speak at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not so informed.

## RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if no other Member desires to address the Senate at this time, then, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Friday, April 1, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 30 (legislative day of March 10), 1955:

### Diplomatic and Foreign Service

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:

Andrew V. Corry, of Montana.
Edward C. Crouch, of the District of Columbia.
Paul B. Taylor, of the District of Columbia.
Orville H. Transtrum, of Idaho.

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:

Edward J. Bash, of Mississippi.
Gerald S. Bushnell, of Virginia.
Edwin J. Madill, of Michigan.
John W. Piercey, of Washington.
Robert L. Whitaker, of Oregon.
Alexander Yaney, Jr., of Virginia.

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:

Anthony J. Dreape, of New Jersey.
Ernest J. Hortum, of Virginia.
Sanford Menter, of Texas.
Patrick O'Sheel, of West Virginia.
Charles J. Stanley, of Ohio.
Joseph A. Tambone, of New York.

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:

William G. Bowdler, of Virginia.
Miss Evlyn F. Brooks, of Virginia.
Miss Ollie G. Edmundson, of Missouri.
Edgar F. Garwood, Jr., of Florida.
Lyle R. Piepenburg, of Wisconsin.
Miss Ruth Schneider, of New York.
David Scott, of Maryland.

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:

James L. Carson, of Oregon.
Charles A. Kiselyak, of Washington.
Frank E. Schmelzer, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Nestor D. Sanchez, of New Mexico, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all majesty and mercy, whose eternal glory and goodness are manifested unto us in the beauty and splendor of the spring season, together we render unto Thee the tribute of praise and thanksgiving.

Grant that in these days of crisis and confusion we may spend more time in waiting upon Thee, seeking divine guidance, and yielding ourselves in renewed consecration to the glorious task of establishing peace on earth and good will among men.

We pray that our beloved country may be worthy of being used by Thee in giving moral and spiritual leadership to the great enterprise of building a world order that has in it the brotherly spirit.

May we never lose faith in the possibility of bringing in that blessed day of peace, for the Lord of hosts is with us and the God of righteousness is our refuge and strength.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## DISPOSAL OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION STOCKS ABROAD

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am pleased to note in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 30, 1955, a news item appearing on page 1, written by Staff Reporter Aubrey Graves, that the Secretary of Agriculture announces the sale of 600,000 tons of wheat and 160,000 bales of cotton to Yugoslavia, Turkey, Chile, Peru, and Pakistan. This is an indication that the wise advice given by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, is being heeded. Of course, the Secretary could sell these commodities for dollars.

It is an indication also that the Secretary may at last no longer be sitting on his set-asides. That will be good news for my farmer neighbors.

The Secretary may talk all he wants about the so-called rigid price-support program affecting exports, but I, too, say the record speaks for itself. That record based on facts presented by the Secretary's own Department clearly indicates he has not used the authority he has under existing law to dispose of Commodity Credit stocks.

It is interesting to note that he is quoted as saying that the amount appropriated for the Department programs for 1956 is "satisfactory to us." He also is quoted as saying that he believes more money was voted than the Department could use. To substantiate this point he called attention to the fact that the Department would be unable to use $75 million worth of milk in the free-lunch program.

Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Appropriations did not increase this item over the budget request of $50 million. The Secretary appears to be confused with the bill, H. R. 12, now being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, not the House Committee on Appropriations.

It would be interesting had the Secretary informed the reporter concerning the per capita income of 1953 of $914 and of 1954 of $918. The explanation he gives is that there are fewer farmers, which could hardly be cited as a great accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration. The realized net per capita income for 1953 was $949. It was estimated that $35 was sold from previous inventory. That is where the Secretary gets his figure of $914 per capita income for 1953, by subtracting the $35 from the $949.

It is also interesting to note that the net per capita income for 1954 was $903. It is estimated that farmers are carrying approximately $15 in inventory which may be at some future time sold. Adding $15 to $903, we get $918, the figure which the Secretary uses with great pride showing a slight increase of per capita income.

Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for the policies of the Washington Post and Times Herald; for that reason I have every reason to believe that this paper will fulfill its obligation of giving to readers the correct information.

Mr. Speaker, I include the above-mentioned article from the Washington Post and Times Herald at this point in the RECORD:

BENSON TELLS OF SURPLUS SOLD ABROAD—WHEAT AND COTTON ARE DISPOSED OF IN LARGE LOTS—MORE DEALS PENDING

(By Aubrey Graves)

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson announced yesterday the sale of 600,000 tons of wheat and 160,000 bales of cotton to Yugoslavia, Turkey, Chile, Peru, and Pakistan.

In return for these surplus commodities, which the Commodity Credit Corporation bought for $145 million under price-support programs, the Government will receive $107 million, payable in the currencies of the purchasing countries.

Sales of another $150 million worth of other CCC stocks to still other countries, the Secretary added, are well along toward completion, and negotiations are in various stages of progress looking to similar disposal of another $200 million worth of goods.

These foreign-trade developments were Benson's answer to recent Democratic criticism that he has been dragging his feet in disposing of $7 billion worth of excess food and fiber now in Government hands.

"Records," he said, "will show that the Department is moving vigorously to dispose of surpluses in overseas markets. * * * Exports for the first 8 months of fiscal year 1955 are already 15 percent ahead of the same period a year ago."

The Democratic-controlled House Appropriations Committee charged last week that Benson was not pushing foreign sales because he wanted to discredit rigid high-support prices. His policies, Democrats declared, had driven 55,000 southern farm families off their farms, "with no homes and limited employment possibilities."

All this, the Secretary said yesterday, constituted "a diversionary move to hide the real issue—that the old rigid program fails to meet the needs of the farmer. The criticism stems from the fact that I refuse to ignore facts, and, instead, obey the law."

The various production control programs "are working real hardships on farmers," Benson conceded. "But such controls are inseparable from the rigid support programs" with which his critics have been identified.

"We were 10 years too late, in my judgment, in moving from a wartime to a peacetime program."

Under the mandatory high-price props established in wartime to stimulate production, the Nation's basic crops were supported at 90 percent of parity. The flexible system, pushed through by the Eisenhower administration and put into effect this year, allows supports ranging from 82.5 to 90 percent of parity. In 1956 unless Congress acts, they can fall as low as 75 percent.

While he resented some of the comments in the committee report and during debate on the House floor, the Secretary said that, by and large, the money appropriated to run Department programs for fiscal 1956 is "satisfactory to us."

He noted that no serious cuts had been made in any vital program. In some instances he believed more money had been voted than the Department could use.

For instance, he expressed doubt that $75 million worth of milk could be used in the free-lunch program. Fifty million dollars was provided for that purpose in the current budget, but probably not all of this will be used.

Benson reported that the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar is now 43 percent, compared with 38 percent in 1939, 40 percent in 1940, and 53 percent in 1945 (during wartime).

While conceding that total farm income had fallen off during the last few years, the Secretary pointed out that per capita farm

income increased slightly last year, to $918. In 1953 it was $914. There were fewer farmers in 1954 than in 1953, he explained.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, may I state that I was absent yesterday due to a death in my family, so I did not answer the rollcalls.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any of my colleagues who so desire may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks in eulogy of the late Walter White.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and myself.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5240.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you today what is left of the independent offices. This bill carries appropriations of $5,845,595,375 and covers some 16 or 17 agencies. There is some legislatoion in the bill. Historically the independent offices bill has carried legislation through the years and it is the understanding of the committee there will be a point of order made against some of the legislation. If so, the point will be good and when that language goes out, I do not see anything in the bill to give anybody the slightest bit of trouble. We, of your committee, have certainly not had any trouble. On the Democratic side there has been peace and harmony, and certainly on the Republican side under the leadership of our distinguished and very able ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. It has been a pleasure to work with him and the members of the minority.

Mr. Chairman, there are 3 or 4 items in this bill, which perhaps may deserve special pointing out to the membership of the House generally. Not that it is going to give you any trouble, but we think it ought to be specifically pointed out. There are some 3 or 4 instances in this bill where your committee has thought it in the best interests of the country and the taxpayers to increase the amounts recommended in the budget. Of course, in most instances, there have been decreases in the budget. A sizable increase is one of $250 million for the retirement fund in the Civil Service Commission.

A study of this fund has been going on for some 18 months. That study has been completed now for perhaps 6 months. There are no funds in this year's budget for the Federal contribution toward that retirement fund, while at the same time the Federal employees have contributed 6 percent of their salaries to that fund, which totals in the neighborhood of $190 million.

However, in the President's budget message he said that he intended sometime during this session of the Congress to send up a budget estimate in the neighborhood of $216 million. The committee saw fit to put $250 million in this bill. It was testified by Chairman Philip Young of the Civil Service Commission that in order to get the fund on an actuarially sound position, it would take about $772 million a year, federally appropriated funds. In other words, the fund is actuarially short today $10,600,000,000. In the fund today there is approximately $5.6 billion. Last year the fund paid out to beneficiaries of the fund $480 million. It is estimated this year you will pay out to beneficiaries from that fund approximately $487 million.

It should be pointed out that during this time, last year and this year, Federal employees every month have had deducted from their paychecks 6 percent, and their total contributions, to use round figures, is about $194 million this year, as was true of last year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Why is the fund at present actuarially unsound?

Mr. THOMAS. That is a good question, and I am glad the gentleman asked it. It stems from two causes. In the first place, the Federal Government has not kept up with its part of the load every year. No. 2, there has been added year after year hundreds of beneficiaries who have not paid their part. We call them "free riders." The "free riders" and the Federal Government's failure to contribute each year its part makes the fund unsound. I do not think that will give anybody any trouble. It is a debt that the Federal Government is going to have to pay. Whether we get the fund on a sound actuarial basis or whether we contribute what is withdrawn every year, it will have to be paid. Either way is satisfactory to me individually, and I expect it would be satisfactory to the membership of the House. But the point is that there is some legislation pending before the legislative committee which has jurisdiction, and your subcommittee urges that distinguished committee to get together and bring to this House a bill taking one road or the other.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He referred to the free riders. I would like to know if the gentleman could tell us briefly who those free riders are.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; if you will give us time to go back to the record, we can dig them out.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Just in a general way.

Mr. THOMAS. The year before last the legislative committee added a group that took from the fund—I forget the exact amount—maybe $25 million or $30 million by way of increased annuities for retired Federal employees; in other words, they retired at a certain annuity and it was increased by the Congress, and that increase was taken from this fund without any offset being added. That has been going on—it is nothing new—it has been going on for 20 or 25 years.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentleman says there is a $10-billion deficiency in this fund now?

Mr. THOMAS. Ten billion six hundred million dollars.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In a 10-year period?

Mr. THOMAS. No; today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And the employees are contributing 6 percent of their salaries?

Mr. THOMAS. Those classified employees who are under the retirement system are paying it every month; it is deducted from their paychecks.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. In other words, we guarantee certain benefits.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And that is not considered in the national debt as such.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a matter of bookkeeping. It certainly is an obligation, a contractual obligation; and I venture to say there is not a man on this floor who is going to deny that, and there is no one here who wants to wipe it out.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It does not come under the general limitations of the national debt? This is over and above the figure we usually refer to as the national debt?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot give you an exact answer on that question. As a matter of fact, we went into it quite extensively at one time. When you get the General Accounting Office and the Treasury working on the problem you get two different approaches. What the answer is, I do not know, and I doubt if the Treasury knows either.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I presume that the Committee on Appropriations as well as the legislative committee may be giving some thought to putting this on a pay-as-you-go basis. I was hoping that some day we might reach the point where that could be possible.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the legislative committee has it on their agenda and as soon as time permits they are going to consider it. I am sure they will come up with a satisfactory answer, as they usually do.

I would like to call the attention of the House to a table on page 3 of the report, and I hope you will all turn to that table for it is by far the most important table in the report and tells more than all the words in the report combined. It shows the employment situation in these old-line agencies. Over the period of the last 10 years it shows that the high number of employment was 289,257 employees. During the last 10-year period these agencies have reduced the number of employees—and that includes the fiscal year 1956—to 235,539. I think that is a compliment to these agencies, yet in a good many instances the Congress has increased the duties of many of them. Yet with increased duties and with a 15 to 20 percent decrease in employees, they have carried on and have done a very fine job. I think that is quite a compliment to the employees in these agencies and they deserve a great deal of credit.

I want to point out one more significant fact to the membership of the House. These agencies have been cut just about to the point where they cannot be cut any lower and still carry on their functions. All in all, they have done a fine job.

The big money item in this bill is in the Veterans' Administration. I hope that the membership will turn to the bill and read it carefully. It has been broken down into component parts. The administrative costs have been set out in one paragraph, and that carries hundreds of items; then the medical administrative cost is carried in a separate appropriating paragraph; then the medical, hospital, and domiciliary care are carried in a separate paragraph; then there are the various benefit and insurance programs, and so forth, and they are carried in separate paragraphs.

I would like to announce to the House that the medical program for in-patient care and out-patient care and for administrative costs of the whole medical program have not been cut 1 red cent. That cost for in-patient care has increased $25 million this year over last year, and you have brought into use and occupancy during this fiscal year some 4,000 additional beds that you did not have last year.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think it should be pointed out to the House it is true that the Appropriations Committee did not cut 1 cent, but it should also be pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget cut the requests of the Veterans' Administration by $8 million on the basis that the cost of groceries is going to go down the next year. I hope that will be true, but certainly if the cost of groceries does not go down it will be necessary to appropriate another $8 million for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is never my policy to defend the Bureau of the Budget, because I do not think they need any defense at my hands. Mr. Rowland Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is one of the many outstanding men in the Government service. While he is modest, even shy, he does a tremendously good job. To say that that very able and distinguished man is cutting out groceries for the veterans is a little bit misleading. As I say, I am not defending his action, I was not present, I do not know what was in their minds, but out of the many hundreds of items in an appropriation of this size a mere $8 million is not very much.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I certainly did not intend to leave the impression with the Members of the House that Mr. Hughes was taking food away from the veterans; but I read your hearings and in those hearings the Veterans' Administration said that they were cutting off that amount of money because they thought the price of rations was going to go down. Of course, that is only an estimate on Mr. Hughes' part.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not want to leave the impression that the gentleman was taking that tack, either. I hope they do not tinker with the type of food in the Veterans' Administration hospitals, because I will let you in on a little secret. Our committee visits a good many hospitals every year, and we like to go out in the kitchen and get a meal now and then, and frankly, I think it is as fine a food as I have ever tasted, and with their dietitians, they certainly do a fine, fine job.

Now, there is one very small cut in the Veterans' Administration, to use round figures, of about $5.3 million. It figures about a 3⅓ percent cut on general administrative expense. Those costs do not touch the medical program in any way, including medical administration. It cuts general administration expense for the insurance programs and general administration. Not a dime is taken from the actual benefits to the veterans, and no one wants to do that.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Appropriations Committee for increasing the funds for renovation and repair of some of the older Veterans' Administration hospitals. The state of maintenance and repair of these hospitals has been a matter of concern to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for some time.

In January of this year the Committee on Veterans' Affairs initiated an investigation to develop factual information on the state of maintenance and repair of Veterans' Administration hospitals. The information gathered by the committee was printed on March 15, 1955, as House Committee Print No. 27. In its investigation the committee found that the Veterans' Administration has nearly 1,800 buildings in use for hospital and medical purposes. Three hundred and forty-one of these buildings were constructed during the period 1880 to 1900. Three hundred and fifty-five buildings were constructed between 1900 and 1920, and 1,035 buildings were constructed between 1920 and 1940. Many of the larger Veterans' Administration hospitals are of temporary-type construction, and were transferred to the Veterans' Administration from the Department of Defense following World War II. The Veterans' Administration Mount Alto Hospital in Washington, D. C., is in a converted girls' school, and the hospitals at Coral Gables, Fla., and Oakland, Calif., are converted hotels.

The committee's investigation disclosed that there are 56 Veterans' Administration hospitals which will require major modernization. Detailed estimates on the cost of this program are not available at this time; however, it is apparent that the modernization program for these 56 hospitals will cost in excess of $150 million. The following hospitals have been found to be in need of major renovation or modernization: Alexandria, La.; American Lake, Wash.; Aspinwall, Pa.; Bath, N. Y.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Bay Pines, Fla.; Bedford, Mass.; Biloxi, Miss.; Bronx, N. Y.; Canandaigua, N. Y.; Chillicothe, Ohio; Coatesville, Pa.; Columbia, S. C.; Coral Gables, Fla.; Danville, Ill.; Dayton, Ohio; Des Moines, Iowa; Downey, Ill.; Fort Harrison, Mont.; Fort Howard, Md.; Fort Lyon, Colo.; Fort Meade, S. Dak.; Gulfport, Miss.; Hines, Ill.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; Kecoughtan, Va.; Knoxville, Iowa; Lexington, Ky.; Long Beach, Calif.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Lyons, N. J.; Marion, Ind.; Mountain Home, Tenn.; Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Newington, Conn.; Northampton, Mass.; North Little Rock, Ark.; Northport, N. Y.; Oteen, N. C.; Outwood, Ky.; Perry Point, Md.; Portland, Oreg.; Roanoke, Va.; Roseburg, Oreg.; St. Cloud, Minn.; Salt Lake City, Utah (general, medical, and surgical); Sheridan, Wyo.; Tucson, Ariz.; Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Tuskegee, Ala.; Waco, Tex.; Wadsworth, Kans.; Walla Walla, Wash.; Whipple, Ariz.; White River Junction, Vt.; Wood, Wis.

Some of the Veterans' Administration hospitals were found to be in such a poor state of repair or so poorly planned and arranged that large expenditures for modernization are not justified. In these cases, replacement sometime in the future will be necessary. The hospitals in need of replacement are as follows: Augusta, Ga.; Cleveland, Ohio; Coral Gables, Fla.; Downey, Ill.; Vaughan, Hines, Ill.; Jackson, Miss.; Long Beach, Calif.; Martinsburg, W. Va.; Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.; Oakland, Calif.; Oteen, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; Temple, Tex.; Washington, D. C.; Wood, Wis.

The committee found that there has been an expansion of beds and medical facilities at many Veterans' Administration hospitals without a corresponding expansion of service facilities, such as laundries, heating facilities, mess facilities, and quarters for the hospital staff. The Veterans' Administration initiated a program of safety and fire prevention several years ago; however, much of that program remains to be done. The committee's report identifies fire prevention projects which will cost in excess of $9

million. Unless action is taken to accelerate from the present plan of action, some of these projects would not be completed before fiscal year 1958 or 1959.

It has been estimated that the plant facilities of Veterans' Administration hospitals are worth more than $2½ billion. A very minimum amount has been spent during the past few years to protect this plant investment. I am very happy to see that the Appropriations Committee recognizes this need and has increased the appropriation item for major repair and replacement. The Bureau of the Budget, acting under general directions issued by the administration, rejected the Veterans' Administration request for expansion of this appropriation item and approved $13,815,000 for modernization and rehabilitation hospital buildings. The Appropriations Committee has acted to restore the amount requested by the Veterans' Administration and has raised the amount to $30 million. In doing so, the report states that priority attention is to be given to repair and renovation of neuropsychiatric hospitals, and the report specifically directs that $2.9 million be allocated to begin renovation of the VA neuropsychiatric hospital at Downey, Ill. The committee is certainly correct when it states that there is a great amount of work to be done and that there is no need for delaying this program.

In testimony before the Appropriations Committee, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. H. V. Higley, stated that a long-range plan is now being developed with the Bureau of the Budget for the next 6 or 8 years which would permit an orderly solution of this problem. The Administrator has correctly warned that piecemeal legislation and appropriations in this field will be wasteful.

In conducting its investigation the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was concerned with renovation and repair which if not done would, first, cause the quality of patient care to suffer; second, significantly increase overall operational cost or per diem cost; third, accelerate the deterioration of the facility at an abnormal rate; or, fourth, a combination of the above factors which would have an overall detrimental effect on the medical-care program. It is believed that a long-range renovation and replacement program based on these factors will result in an economic handling of the Federal Government's obligation to care for veterans. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is happy that its efforts in this field have been useful. We are pleased that our investigation was completed in time to be made available to the Appropriations Committee for the guidance of that committee in acting on this important part of the Veterans' Administration budget.

The hearings before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee included the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and there was considerable discussion before the committee concerning the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was created pursuant to Public Law 108, approved July 10, 1953. Through various task forces it has studied the operation, organization, and policies of the Government in certain broad areas of Government function.

The Task Force on Federal Medical Services consisted of 15 doctors, including the Chairman. The Staff Director of the task force was also a doctor. The task force included in its study the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans' Administration. It is considered significant that the membership of the task force did not include persons with specialized knowledge in the field of veterans' affairs. The recommendations of the task force are published and circulated despite the fact that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, composed of prominent citizens and members of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, superimposes its judgment on the recommendations of the task force to the extent that certain recommendations of the task force are omitted or modified by the Commission.

The title of the reports of the Task Force and the Commission, "Medical Service," implies that the scope of the inquiry would be restricted to medical matters; however, recommendations in the reports include such items as comments on disability allowances for veterans and codification of laws and regulations relating to veterans' benefits. There follows the text of the recommendations of the Commission relating to the veterans' medical program and comment concerning the recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

In order to effect the above responsibilities, the President should appoint a Federal Advisory Council of Health, to be comprised of members of the medical professions together with lay members of distinguished records in fields other than the medical profession, and to serve at the will of the President. The Council should have a small staff but should depend upon other agencies of the Government for information.

In recommending the creation of a Federal Advisory Council of Health, it is not clear where this Council is expected to succeed where others have failed. A Federal Board of Hospitalization was created in 1921 and, after a number of years of relative inactivity, ceased to function. In 1942, the Board was reactivated within the Bureau of the Budget to advise the Director of the Budget with respect to Federal hospital programs. In 1948, the Board was terminated. Since 1948, general responsibility for coordinating Federal hospital construction and operating programs has been exercised by the Bureau of the Budget.

During the 83d Congress, bills were considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to create a Federal Board of Hospitalization, which had as its purpose the coordination of Federal medical activities with reports to be made to the Executive and the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget made the following comment concerning such a Board:

Inasmuch as existing agencies within the Executive Office of the President are now dealing effectively with the coordination of hospital construction and utilization programs, is is our opinion that the establishment of a Federal Board of Hospitalization is unnecessary. Accordingly, the Bureau of the Budget recommends against favorable consideration.

After hearing extensive testimony on the subject, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs terminated its hearings without favorable action on the proposal.

The success of a commission or council such as the proposed Federal Advisory Council of Health would be greatly influenced by the amount of support and interest given its activities by the President and the vigor and personality of its members. Aside from these two intangibles, there appears to be no significance to the recommendation for a Federal Advisory Council of Health not previously considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

That the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration consider the recommendations made by the task force as to closing of certain hospitals and obtain the advice of the proposed Federal Advisory Council of Health on these recommendations; that all hospitals determined to be surplus be closed immediately.

The task force listed 19 hospitals which it recommended be closed because these hospitals "have such a small bed capacity, are so poorly located, or have such a low rate of bed utilization that their continued operation is uneconomic and ineffective."

It is noted that the Commission did not give an unqualified endorsement to the recommendation of the task force, but recommended that the Administrator consider the recommendation and seek the advice of the proposed Advisory Council of Health. It is noted that most of the hospitals recommended for closing are practically new, 5 being 4 years old, 4 being 5 years old, and 2 being 6 years.

The 19 hospitals recommended for closing are mainly general medical and surgical hospitals; however, these hospitals do have about 175 beds for mental patients. The Veterans' Administration is progressing with a plan which permits the utilization of the closed wards for mental patients in general medical and surgical hospitals and relieves the load on facilities in NP hospitals where active psychiatric care is available. Closing of the 19 hospitals as recommended would eliminate 175 NP beds badly needed for the care of the mentally disabled.

Four of the hospitals recommended for closing are located at Miles City, Mont., Minot and Fargo, N. Dak., and Sioux Falls, S. Dak. If these hospitals were closed, veterans in North Dakota would be required to travel hundreds of miles either to Minnesota or western Montana for treatment. Although the level of occupancy and per diem patient cost of operation of Veterans' Administration hospitals is significant, there is some obligation to provide an opportunity for medical care to all veterans of the Nation, regardless of their location.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

(a) That all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals be

rescinded except for those now under construction or under contract.

(b) That the Veterans' Administration dispose of by sale or otherwise any hospital which, in its judgment, can no longer be operated effectively and economically; and that the proposed Federal Advisory Council of Health on behalf of the President review the manner in which the hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration are being used and make recommendations for disposal or more economical utilization of the hospital plants.

The recommendation of the Commission that outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional Veterans' Administration general hospitals be rescinded except for those now under contract or under construction in practical effect means that construction of the Veterans' Administration hospital to replace the antiquated Mount Alto Hospital in Washington, D. C., would be revoked. Adherence to this recommendation would preclude replacement of 16 Veterans' Administration hospitals now scheduled for long-range replacement. Eleven of these hospitals are of temporary World War II construction, nearing the end of their period of usefulness, 2 are converted hotels, 1 is a converted girls' school, and 1 has buildings over 60 years old.

It is not clear whether the recommendation is also intended to preclude major renovation projects, which in many instances replace major buildings and facilities. A modernization program now under study involves 55 Veterans' Administration hospitals and probably would require in excess of $150 million. Most of the hospitals being considered for major renovations have reached the point where failure to make timely repairs will accelerate the deterioration of these facilities at an abnormal rate.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

That the statement of a veteran of his inability to pay for hospitalization for nonservice-connected disabilities should be subject to verification; and that the Veterans' Administration be authorized to collect in case such a statement is not substantiated.

The Commission stated that the greatest of all problems in the administration of medical care for veterans are the non-service-connected cases. It could have been said with accuracy that an even greater problem is involved in determining service connection or service aggravation for diseases and injuries. If the procedures for determining service connection could be considered thoroughly accurate, the view of the Commission regarding care of veterans with non-service-connected cases might be more nearly justified. The fact is that determination of service connection is extremely difficult in many cases.

First of all, it is dependent upon documentary proof, such as records of examination, clinical records, statements by doctors, and lay affidavits of persons having firsthand knowledge of a veterans' disability. In those instances where records are destroyed, it becomes impossible to establish documentary proof of a disability or disease due to service in the Armed Forces. Medical records are practically nonexistent for the groups of veterans serving in the Spanish-American War and Philippine Insurrection, and they are very inadequate in the case of many World War I veterans. Generally, medical records were much better kept during World War II, but in certain areas where military reversals were suffered, such as the Philippines and north Africa or the Ardennes Forest in France, a great many medical records were lost and, in addition, many medical records were lost in naval disasters, and generally records are incomplete where a few individuals were detailed to special duty and were required to obtain their medical care from a source outside their own unit. The result is that it is impossible to establish service connection for many bona fide cases.

Another area of difficulty in determining service connection arises as a result of lack of medical knowledge as to cause and effect of disease and injury. Service connection is established based on known medical facts and is withheld in those areas where medical science provides no positive answer. In an effort to deal fairly with veterans, certain periods of presumption have been established, but the fact remains that little is known about the relation between strenuous periods of military service and disease, particularly mental disease. There is no way to establish a direct relationship between service and disease where no actual disease was incurred in service but where the veteran rendered strenuous service under extremely adverse weather conditions, lost weight, and deteriorated generally in physical condition. There are many such instances where it appears that a general weakening of physical condition resulting directly from strenuous military service weakened the veteran's general health and resistance to the extent that he became susceptible to some ordinary disease after his separation from service. In these instances, it is impossible to establish service connection.

The discussion of the Task Force and the Commission on the subject of care of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities emphasizes the amount of cost involved in the care of such patients and points out that on an average day in 1954, 65,000 out of the total of 109,000 occupied beds in the Veterans' Administration were occupied by non-service-connected cases. The Task Force and the Commission failed to recognize that a substantial part of the 65,000 non-service-connected patients are hospitalized for mental disabilities, tuberculosis, and other serious long-term chronic diseases, such as cancer, polio, paralysis heart disease, etc. In testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, spokesmen for the American Medical Association and other medical groups have not raised objection to the care of indigent veterans with mental disabilities and tuberculosis in Veterans' Administration hospitals. It has been recognized that the problem of care of this type of patient is public in nature and that State, municipal, and private facilities cannot care for the load now being carried by the Veterans' Administration. It has also been recognized that certain other serious long-term chronic diseases are so costly and expensive that they exceed the earning capacity of most individuals and that care of this class of patient inevitably becomes a public charge. A relatively small percentage of the veterans being treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals are there for short-term medical and surgical treatment.

The patient load of 108,000 patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals on a specified day in 1952 was analyzed. Of these, 0.6 percent were nonveterans—United States Armed Forces personnel, humanitarian cases, and so forth, 35.6 percent were veterans receiving care for service-connected disabilities; 11.4 percent were veterans discharged from a military service for disabilities incurred in line of duty or veterans in receipt of compensation for service-connected disabilities who are receiving care for other disabilities; 52.4 percent were other war veterans treated for non-service-connected disabilities.

There appears to be little basis for objecting to care of 47.6 percent of the patient load of 108,000, since this group was composed of humanitarian cases, Armed Forces personnel, veterans receiving care for service-connected disabilities, and veterans in receipt of compensation for service-connected disabilities who were receiving care for non-service-connected disabilities. The main criticism raised by the Commission relates to the war veterans receiving treatment for non-service-connected disabilities, or 52.4 percent of the patient load of 108,000 patients.

This group can be subdivided as follows:

Thirty-one and eight tenths percent—patients with conditions chronic in nature, such as mental disease, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, paralysis, heart disease, and so forth.

Twenty and six-tenths percent—patients with presumed nonchronic conditions.

The group of 20.6 nonchronic or 23,306 may be analyzed as follows:

Eight and five-tenths percent, or 9,184, were in receipt or had applied for a Veterans' Administration nonservice pension for a permanently and totally disabling nonservice condition. In other words, a veteran may have been admitted for a specific ailment, but at the same time was considered totally disabled. In addition, this class of veterans are in the very lowest income group, since to be eligible for a non-service-connected pension the income must be less than $1,400 a year for a single person or $2,700 for a person with dependents. More than half of these veterans were being treated for chronic conditions such as cardiovascular disease, cancer, neurological disease, or arthritis.

One and one-hundredths percent, or 1,198 patients, admitted as nonchronic, non-service-connected cases, had made a claim for a service-connected disability. This claim was pending an adjudication, and experience shows that a substantial percentage of these claims are successful.

This leaves about 10.8 percent, or 11,656 patients, which might be termed "non-chronic." Generally, the period of hospitalization for this class of patient is relatively short.

It seems obvious that in considering the problem of medical care of non-service-connected cases that a distinction should be drawn between the various types of cases, since the general responsibility and obligation of the public and the Federal Government are quite different in the various types of cases. It can be safely said that regardless of the source of care for a great many of the non-service-connected cases being cared for in Veterans' Administration hospitals, the expense involved must be borne by a public agency, either Federal, State, county, or charitable. The recommendation of the Commission for more definite criteria as to inability to pay seems to be more for application to the small group of about 10 percent which are hospitalized for non-service-connected disabilities on a short-term basis.

The Commission was not disposed to endorse the novel recommendation of the task force that treatment of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities in Veterans' Administration hospitals be limited to a period of 3 years after discharge. It is understandable that such a procedure could not be supported by the Commission, since there appears to be no justification for such an arbitrary approach to the problem.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

That veterans having service-connected disabilities but making application for treatment of non-service-connected disabilities be required to sign a statement of inability to pay (VA Form 10–P–10, together with its addendum).

At the present time, a veteran with a service-connected disability may secure hospital treatment for a non-service-connected disability without signing a statement of inability to pay. The Commission proposes to place the disabled veteran on the same status with the veteran with no service-connected disability and apparently without distinction as to the degree and nature of the veteran's service-connected disability, the responsibility of the Federal Government for rehabilitation of the disabled veteran, and without regard to the extra sacrifices of the individual.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

That the veteran should assume a liability to pay for care of his non-service-connected disability if he can do so at some reasonable time in the future. Such a debt should be without interest. Congress should pass appropriate laws providing for the collection of such obligations.

The proposal that a debt be established for the treatment of non-service-connected disabilities is unrealistic. In other instances where grants-in-aid are made by the Government to individuals, businesses, and corporations, no such procedure is followed. It might be just as reasonable to propose that persons in receipt of unemployment compensation, welfare payments, and other such payments from the Federal Government should execute a note and repay the funds received if their fortunes improve in the future.

The Commission report comments on the procedure of Veterans' Administration in collecting payments due the veteran as a result of the veteran's coverage by health insurance. The Commission's report seems to imply that the Veterans' Administration is delinquent, since it does not bill insurance companies where policies specifically exclude payments for medical services rendered to veterans in veterans' facilities. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs made an extensive inquiry into the question of reimbursement for medical services from private insurors and concluded that the Veterans' Administration's procedures were adequate. It does not appear that any purpose would be served by continually billing private insurance companies for services which are specifically excluded from their policies.

It is the obligation of the Veterans' Administration to offset expenses incurred in treating non-service-connected veterans by obtaining reimbursement where medical or health insurance exists. The fact that most of the larger insurance companies offering coverage for health and accident preclude payment to the Federal Government in their policies has no bearing on the relation of the veteran to his Government and his need for medical care. This is a matter of contract between two private interests. Insurance representatives appearing before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have pointed out that the clause restricting payment to veterans receiving care in public facilities could be removed with the result that the increased costs incurred would be reflected in increased premiums. Obviously, where the veteran's needs are covered by insurance, this should be taken into account in considering the ability of the veteran to pay.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

That outpatient care, whether prior to or following hospitalization, be furnished to indigent veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. (This does not include neuropsychiatric cases prior to hospitalization.) Such patients should also assume a liability to pay for their care if they can do so at some reasonable time in the future.

The Commission has recommended expansion of outpatient care by the Veterans' Administration prior to and following hospitalization. It is believed that this recommendation is aimed at reducing the length of stay in hospitals or eliminating the necessity for hospital care. It is doubtful that an expansion of outpatient care would make any material change in the hospital load for veterans; however, it would result in a substantial increase in costs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

That the Veterans' Administration emphasize its program of medical care and rehabilitation services for the aging veteran eligible for care, in order to reduce the number of chronic bed cases.

It is understood that the Veterans' Administration is doing research in the field of medical care and rehabilitation for aging veterans. The Veterans' Administration has recognized that the care of aged veterans will become an increasing problem as the typical age groups of World War II veterans reach upper levels. It is believed that some of the hospitals which the Commission has recommended for closing could be utilized for the care of older veterans who, while not requiring full-time medical and hospital care, do require occasional medical observation and nursing care. A program of intermediate care, particularly for the aged, probably would serve to shorten the length of hospital stay and such care could be furnished at a lower per diem cost.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12

That the medical-care functions of Veterans' Administration regional offices be consolidated with, and where practicable physically located within nearby Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration apparently concurs with the recommendation of the Commission that outpatient clinics in Veterans' Administration regional offices be consolidated with nearby Veterans' Administration hospitals. These consolidations have been attempted in a number of instances, with indifferent success. In other cases, they have apparently been successful. One or two examples have come to the attention of the committee where it is believed that such a consolidation, even though it may be more convenient for Veterans' Administration medical personnel, will actually result in a substantial reduction in service to the veteran, at no saving to the Government.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13

(a) That the responsibility and authority to establish and maintain medical criteria for disability, both initial and continuing, should be transferred from the Compensation and Pension Branch of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

(b) That the Department of Medicine and Surgery should also develop and maintain a mechanism for review of disability allowances based on the possibility of increase or decrease in disabilities.

The responsibility for creating realistic medical criteria for the measurement of disabilities, commonly referred to in Veterans' Administration as a "rating schedule," was in the Department of Medicine and Surgery at one time. It was removed from that section, since presumably it did not operate satisfactorily there.

The recommendation by the Commission implies that the development of medical criteria or rating schedules and their application is being done without adequate medical advice. As a matter of fact, doctors participate in the development of the rating schedule, all examinations for ratings are made by medical personnel, a doctor participates in the adjudication board which makes the finding of disability, and a doctor is also a member of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, which considers contested cases on review. The facilities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery are available for diagnostic study and medical recommendation.

Allegations come from various sources from time to time that the Veterans' Administration rating schedule is not realistic and that it is not based on current medical knowledge. It is difficult to analyze the merit of these contentions, except to say that there is no record of critical analysis of this type coming from a reliable source being filed with

the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on which it might conclude that the rating schedule requires major revision.

The Commission has commented that there is a need for periodic reevaluation of disability claims, and this is true. It should be the objective of the Veterans' Administration to pay all that is just under existing law and regulations and withhold payments not due. It is pointed out, however, that substantial reviews of this kind must be supported by large appropriations from the Congress if they are to be successful. It is believed that this matter deserves further consideration by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Appropriations Committee. Recent audits conducted by the General Accounting Office as to the accuracy of ratings by the Veterans' Administration have disclosed that approximately the same number of errors were made in one regional office causing the veteran a loss in compensation due as were made in favor of the veteran.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14

That all laws relating to veterans or veterans' benefits, and in particular to medical treatment and domiciliary-care benefits, be consolidated and enacted into a single, all-inclusive, comprehensive code; and that all existing rules, regulations, and Executive orders relating to veterans and veterans' benefits be brought together in one volume.

The Commission's observation concerning the need for consolidation and enactment into a single all-inclusive comprehensive code of all existing rules, regulations, Executive orders, and laws relating to veterans and benefits of veterans are certainly appropriate. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in cooperation with the Committee on the Judiciary, is working on such a project at the persent time. H. R. 3805 and H. R. 3806 were introduced on February 8, 1955, and are now under consideration by the committee.

The hearings before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee included a reference to the percentage of patient load in Veterans Administration hospitals which have service-connected disabilities and the percentage having non-service-connected disabilities. The Veterans' Administration witness was asked to state the percentage of service-connected and non-service-connected veterans in Veterans' Administration hospitals and stated that about 38 percent are service-connected and 62 per percent are non-service-connected cases. It was then pointed out that the Hoover Commission report uses a figure of 83 percent non-service-connected cases and 17 percent service-connected cases. The Veterans' Administration witness confirmed the accuracy of the Hoover Commission figures but offered no further explanation for the disparity between the two figures.

The facts are that about 37.6 percent of the patients in VA hospitals on any given day are receiving care for service-connected disabilities and 61.6 percent are receiving care for non-service-connected disabilities. If an analysis is made of the patients discharged from Veterans' Administration hospitals, a different figure is obtained. Sixteen and nine-tenths percent of patients discharged have been treated for service-connected disabilities and 83.1 percent for non-service-connected disabilities.

The reason for these differences may be found in the general differences between the diagnostic composition of the patients in hospital at any one time and the diagnostic composition of the group of patients discharged from hospital during a year. This difference, in turn, arises from the differences in the turnover rate among the various diagnostic groups.

For example: Of the patients in hospital at any one time 14 percent are tubercular, 57 percent are neuropsychiatric, 29 percent are general medical and surgical, but on the average the tubercular patients are replaced about 1.5 times a year, neuropsychiatric patients are replaced about 1.1 times a year, general medical and surgical patients are replaced about 11.7 times a year.

Therefore, among the discharges, 5 percent are tubercular, 14 percent are neuropsychiatric, and 81 percent are general medical and surgical. Since, as a result of difference in turnover rate, the proportion of general medical and surgical patients is higher among the discharges—81 percent—than among the patients in hospital at any one time—29 percent—and since the percent of general medical and surgical patients who are treated for service-connected disabilities is lower than for either tubercular or neuropsychiatric patients the overall ratio of service-connection is lower among the discharges—16.9 percent—than among the patients in hospital at any one time—37.6 percent.

Each of these series of percentages is correct; they, however, describe different aspects of the Veterans' Administration hospital patient load. The series of percentages which are based on patients in hospital describe the manner in which bed capacity is used. The series based on the discharges describes the patients who leave hospital.

It appears to me that this explanation is necessary if an accurate evaluation of the patient load in Veterans' Administration hospitals as distributed between service-connected and non-service-connected patients is to be made. It appears to me that the percentage distribution between the two classes of patients obtained from an analysis of a particular day of operation is more accurate for the purpose of determining the distribution of medical care and expenditures between the two classes of patients.

The language appearing on lines 3 through 14, inclusive, on page 31 of the bill, the so-called outpatient dental rider, is a perfect example of how not to legislate. In each and every case the rider has been hastily considered and has caused undue administrative difficulties for the Veterans' Administration and confused the veterans of World War II and Korea as to their rights under this dental program.

I would like to sketch the background of this particular piece of legislation on an appropriation bill—matter specifically barred by the rules of the House and I commend the Committee on Rules for its refusal to permit the waiving of points of order on this bill.

The second independent offices appropriation bill, 1954, H. R. 5690—Public Law 149, 83d Congress—as reported to the House on June 11, 1953, carried the following proviso in regard to outpatient dental care provided by the Veterans' Administration:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental care and treatment, or related dental appliances, when the dental condition or disability being treated is not compensable, unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after separation from service, or 1 year after the enactment of this act, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That when any such noncompensable dental condition or disability has once been corrected, additional care and treatment therefor may not be provided.

During the debate on the bill on June 17, 1953, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], offered a substitute for this language which was somewhat more liberal than the provision voted by the Appropriations Committee. This amendment was carried after a brief debate and provided as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 2 years after separation from active service, or 1 year after enactment of this act, whichever is later: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from some other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.

When the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill on July 8, 1953, the proviso regarding outpatient dental treatment had been amended to read as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after enactment of this act: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from some other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.

The effect of this proviso as reported in the Senate, as passed by the Senate on July 10, 1953, and accepted by the conferees was to materially tighten existing criteria regarding entitlement to outpatient dental care. From information obtained from the Veterans' Administration it appeared that one result was to bar the great majority of the veterans of the Spanish-American War from getting outpatient dental treatment, as provided for in Public Law 791 of the 81st Congress. In addition, it excluded certain

cases of veterans in training under Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress, as amended and extended, which provides for education and training for service-connected disabled veterans of both World War II and Korea. Under that law a man undergoing training under the provisions of Public Law 16 would otherwise be entitled to outpatient dental treatment to avoid interruption of his training without any requirement that the outpatient dental care be for a service-connected condition. The committee reported H. R. 6412 on July 23, 1953, to meet this situation. This measure became Public Law 494, 83d Congress, July 15, 1954.

When H. R. 8583, independent offices appropriation bill, 1955, was reported on March 26, 1954, it contained the following proviso:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge or by July 27, 1954, whichever is later: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from some other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.

The above language was stricken from the bill on a point of order. The following amendment submitted as a limitation was rejected on March 31, 1954:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree where such condition or disability is not shown to have been in existence at time of discharge, and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge or by July 27, 1954, whichever is later.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations approved the following proviso which was adopted by the Senate on May 19, 1954:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge or by March 31, 1955, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from such other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.

This amendment was reported in disagreement by the conference committee. The House on June 16, 1954, agreed to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which set the date at December 31, 1954, leaving the remainder of the rider unchanged. This was approved by the Senate on June 17, 1954.

It will be noted from the above history that Appropriations Committee had full warning and knowledge of the fact that the rider as passed in Public Law 428, would eliminate the outpatient dental care for Spanish-War veterans and trainees under Public Law 16, 78th Congress, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Spokesmen for the Appropriations Committee has said not once, but several times that they intended to exempt these two groups, but they did not provide for such an exemption in 1954 nor have they done so this year. It was necessary for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 83d Congress to sponsor and have enacted Public Law 494 which granted the exemptions for these groups which the then Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman said he had no objection to. But in the present Appropriation Bill, the Committee has made the same error and these two groups are once again subject to the provisions of the rider.

This is a perfect example, Mr. Chairman, of the folly of legislating by appropriation. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, last week unanimously reported a bill sponsored by the Gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] which will provide exactly the sort of control which most people admit is needed in this field. This bill, however, was reported after hearings had been held and all interested parties given an opportunity to be heard and present their suggestions. That, Mr. Chairman, I submit is the way the Congress is supposed to legislate. The Appropriations does not have jurisdiction over the substantive law of the various agencies though some members of the great committee apparently still persist in thinking only; that committee can act.

The Veterans' Administration operates five big programs. It has 172 hospitals and hospitalizes 107,000 patients each day. It has 2.6 million people on its pension and compensation rolls. It has nearly 6½ million insurance policies in force worth about $45 billion. It has over 3 million loans outstanding and a contingent liability of over $10 billion for these loans and has a half-million veterans going to school at Government expense. These tremendous programs affect the lives and welfare of nearly every family in the United States. Our main job is to see that they operate properly and that the veteran receives maximum benefit for the dollars expended.

I would like to comment on some of the problems that confront us in the operation of our existing veterans' programs. The administration of the compensation and pension program needs improvement. We had about 15 million World War II veterans discharged in a period of a year following World War II. The Veterans' Administration attempted to handle millions of claims in a period of a few years and rated many veterans on the basis of medical records furnished by the Department of Defense. It has never been possible to conduct a proper review of all the World War II claims. At one time it was expected that a majority of compensation cases would be reexamined and re-rated. The Appropriations Committee has curtailed the budget of the Veterans' Administration to the extent that a relatively small number of cases have been reexamined. I am not proposing reexamination as an undercover economy move. I am proposing reexamination so that those veterans not entitled to compensation may be removed from the rolls and those that are entitled to more may be increased. The General Accounting Office studied a thousand cases in one regional office and found over 200 errors. There were about as many errors of overpayment as there were of underpayment. Most of the corrections made by the Veterans' Administration occur in the Board of Veterans' Appeals, where cases are brought under careful examination upon appeal. In fairness to all concerned, we need to do more on the review program.

We have taken steps to prevent the accumulation of large estates for certain classes of insane veterans. We still have this same problem for veterans in Federal prisons and certain other Federal institutions. It is a difficult problem, but certainly it is rather foolish to continue to pay disability allowances to a ward of the Government over long periods of time when he has no family and then upon his death allow a very large sum of money to revert to a distant relative or to the State in which he lives.

I am sure that you all agree that the most serious problem confronting the veterans' medical program is care of the mentally disabled. I just received a list last week indicating that there are 326 unavailable neuropsychiatric beds in VA hospitals. Most of these beds are in places where it is difficult to recruit personnel. I believe that the VA has not exercised the imagination and initiative that they could have in utilizing these beds. We have insisted in 1 or 2 hospitals in Texas that they move mentally dilapidated patients who are not responsive to treatment into these beds. The presence of a psychiatrist is not necessary. In most instances, the only personnel needed are more nurses and attendants. The manner of a neuropsychiatric hospital where psychiatrists are available reports that for each patient of this type that can be moved from this hospital, that 3 or 4 acute cases can be treated in 1 year. I believe that if the Veterans' Administration would follow such a plan that several thousands of these incompetent, helpless patients could be moved from active neuropsychiatric hospitals to these vacant beds in the smaller general medical and surgical hospitals, thus free thousands of beds for treatment of acute cases. I expect to insist on more action on the part of Veterans' Administration along this line.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Then that cut simply means more efficient administration, and that is all?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. We think Mr. Higley is doing a fine job, and more power to him. He has only been there a year and a half, and we think he has done a fine job, and I think the longer he stays the better job he is going to do.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I do not think there is anything controversial in this bill. The other members of this committee have worked long and hard, and they know as much about it as I do, and more, too, and I am not going to take any more time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 5 of the bill and page 3 of the report I notice that unobligated moneys are made available for the screening of employees of international organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman's committee went into this business of the 11 employees of the United Nations who were fired and paying them some $180,000. I wonder if he ascertained where the funds were to be made available with which to pay these employees.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my distinguished friend that was a little over and beyond our jurisdiction in this particular bill. I certainly want to commend the gentleman for the fine and effective work he has done from time to time bringing out that point, but those funds come from a different source and are not in this bill. This item is to pay the cost of actually doing the work of screening, and the salaries are in another bill. Had they been in here, I expect we would have called the gentleman in and received the benefit of his advice on the subject.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman is providing money for screening employees of international organizations?

Mr. THOMAS. And if you notice, we gave them a sizable cut.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that. The amount of money is not set forth that you are giving them. But I still think it would be very wise on the part of this subcommittee, in dealing with an appropriation of this kind, to find out where the funds were derived from to pay these 11 employees.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask my distinguished friend to use his influence for the good of this House, with our very able chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, and I will guarantee you we will go into it and give results that will be very pleasing to my distinguished friend.

Mr. GROSS. I will be delighted to.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I have a question I would like to address to the gentleman. It has to do with contact offices. The gentleman recalls that each year we had a fight on the floor with reference to contact offices. I also see from the report they make no mention of it whatsoever. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the contact offices?

Mr. THOMAS. There are approximately 1,500 contact employees at a cost of $9 million; in addition to county organizations, veterans' post organizations, and your city and your county has a paid employee doing the same thing. But there is money in here for just 1,500, I think, at a total cost of $9 million.

Mr. BATES. Is that about the same as it was a year ago?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. We did not touch it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I should like to ask a question with reference to the appropriation for the Securities and Exchange Commission. The committee, I think very wisely, allowed $125,000 more for the appointment of personnel in field offices, than was appropriated last year. However, the bill contains a limitation on travel of $125,000, which is the same as the limitation contained in the bill last year.

Is it not true that the presence of more employees in the field offices will require more expenses for travel?

Mr. THOMAS. Not necessarily. The big load is in the city of New York. There they have the largest field office, and that is where a great amount of the work is done. Also, a great amount of work is done in San Francisco and in Chicago where they have some of the exchanges. Generally, I might say, the committee cut most of the agencies back to the travel figure of last year. I do not think there is a man on this floor who gets on an airplane or a train who does not realize that too large a portion of the traveling public is represented by Federal personnel.

There is pending, and we hope it will pass, some proposed legislation increasing travel per diem from $9 to $13. We are hoping that with that increase we can hold this travel to where it was last year. But if it is necessary to increase it, we are going to do it. We do not want to hurt anybody.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further for one other question, there is an item of $28,640 which the Bureau of the Budget estimated for overall Government statistics. It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget asked the Securities and Exchange Commission to participate in the preparation of certain Government statistics. Does the gentleman know whether this item was cut out completely or whether it was transferred to some other agency?

Mr. THOMAS. We have a little trouble with Government publications and Government statistics every year. The Department of Labor has some. Securities and Exchange has some. Congress has some. It is all over the lot. I hope that we can cut down on this matter of Government statistics. After all, a handful of people may read it. I doubt if there are half a dozen Members on the floor of Congress who ever read or study these statistical studies.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That brings me to the next item upon which the gentleman touches, that is, the printing of the decisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I understand they have not been printed since 1949, which of course not only makes it very difficult for some of the field offices who administer the law but makes it very difficult for practitioners who have cases before the Commission to know what the law might be.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the decisions are all printed individually as they come out, but this is to compile them all in a great big volume and have them handy, to the tune of $80,000.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I know the gentleman is familiar with the housing boom that is going on in our country today.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. In fact, we have more GI applications pending in the various regional offices than we have ever had in the history of the program.

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad my distinguished friend brought that up. He is not only a fine veteran himself but he does a lot of able and effective work on these matters.

Mr. AYRES. Would the gentleman rather have me complete my charge before he says how nice I am?

Mr. THOMAS. When I get through the gentleman will withdraw his charge.

Mr. AYRES. I am not so sure of that, but the gentleman is very persuasive and I might be tempted.

Mr. THOMAS. I will let the gentleman be the judge. If he is not satisfied, we will satisfy him, because he deserves to be satisfied.

Mr. AYRES. I appreciate the compliment.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right. This is a banner year by the guess of all the experts. They come up with a figure of not less than 1,300,000 housing starts. The Veterans' Administration is the No. 2 builder. The No. 1 builder is the home-loan banks, with its 34,000 building and loan associations. They do 37 percent of the entire construction. The Federal Housing Administration is No. 3. We have always felt that they were No. 1, but they are No. 3.

Getting down to the gentleman's point, the Veterans' Administration came before us and asked for only $14,500,000 to process all these VA applications for housing, less than they had last year. We pointed out to them, "Why, your workload is going to be on the increase." We forced on them $1 million more than they asked for and to be sure they got it we earmarked it for them. Does that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. AYRES. I was not going to criticize the gentleman for the amount of money he had in the appropriation. He has stated previously that Mr. Higley, the Administrator, was doing a superb job. I agree with that, in most of the fields under his jurisdiction. But there is no justification for a delay of 3 to 6 months on a GI loan application, and that is about the situation throughout the country today.

Mr. THOMAS. We agree with the gentleman, and that is exactly the reason we gave them $1 million more than they asked for. It is inexcusable.

Mr. AYRES. With the experience the gentleman has had here in Congress and the fine work he has done, what would be his suggestion to those of us who are

responsible to the veteran for getting his loan through more rapidly as to what we should do in order to correct this situation if money is not the problem?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the additional money will do it, plus maybe a little bit of increase in efficiency. When you go back to your good district, you talk to the boys in the home mortgaging section of the Veterans' Administration and ask them to see if they cannot push up the tempo on the approval of these loans.

Mr. AYRES. Here is where the inconsistency occurs. We hear from the administrator in the field that he cannot handle the loans any faster because he does not have the personnel. The Administrator here in Washington is saying that they have plenty of personnel, the only thing we can do then is to draw the conclusion that the Administrator here in Washington is wrong.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not sure they will tell you they have all the personnel they need. When we, in the committee, decided to put the extra million dollars in the bill and earmark it for them, I think the gentlemen in charge of the home program were very pleased and thought that they could cut down on that backlog, and I believe they will. I think they will do the job.

Mr. AYRES. You feel you gave them more than they actually wanted to operate the program?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

VA CONFUSION ON HOUSING

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] in his expression of concern over the apparent confusion in the Veteran's Administration on the subject of the housing program.

I understand that the hearings before the subcommittee reflect that VA officials were unaware that any bills are pending to extend the direct-loan program, although several bills have been pending since the first month of the session. The President's budget message should certainly have justified a VA request for funds for this needed program, in the absence of pending bills on the subject.

It is also difficult to understand VA failure to seek additional personnel to deal with a heavy backlog on GI housing loans, but the hearings reflect a complete failure to meet Department responsibility on this matter, although estimates for 1955 and 1956 point to an even larger backlog ahead.

Apparently this subcommittee is taking better care of veterans' housing needs than are the responsible officials of the VA, and this is a matter for some concern at this stage in our important veterans' housing program.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from Texas will be delighted, I am sure, to hear that I rise for the purpose of commending him and his fine committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I interject a few words to say that our friend, the gentleman from New York, in his usual good natured and amiable way, pushes us around, but we are glad to have you help us.

Mr. KEATING. The second noteworthy feature of my remarks at the moment is I commend you for forcing the Federal Power Commission to take some money that they did not ask for. I refer particularly to the fact that their budget estimate did not contain anything for the salary of a chief engineer who has been serving as United States representative on the International Joint Commission, which adjudicates these controversies arising between the Government of the United States and Canada. As I understand it, you have included the salary of such an engineer in the bill, and are instructing the Commission so far as the legislature has the power to do so, to continue to provide the International Joint Commission with a representative and one who, as I gather from your report, looks with favor on the protection of properties of United States citizens along the Great Lakes.

Mr. THOMAS. That certainly ought to be his job. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has personal knowledge of that item, and certainly it ought to be the duty of the member who is furnished to the Commission by the Federal Power Commission to look after our interests.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] was so alert in calling the attention of the subcommittee to that fact. I want to express to the subcommittee my gratitude for what they have done because this has been an extremely serious matter to all the property owners along the shores of Lake Ontario. Undoubtedly the gentleman's committee has heard a good deal about it. But it is essential not only that there be an engineer there from the Federal Power Commission but that he have in mind the protection of the interests of our own property owners. There has been altogether too much in this International Joint Commission—altogether too much, in my judgment, of domination by our Canadian friends. The present engineer representing the Federal Power Commission has been very alert and diligent in seeing to it that the interests of our own country are protected. This is such an extremely important matter to our people in my area that I wanted to thank the gentleman for what his committee have done and to tell them that it is deeply appreciated in the area I come from.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our distinguished friend the gentleman from New York for his very effective work. He is filled with good, old, common horsesense, and we are glad to cooperate with him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I notice about three-quarters of page 18 is devoted to the procedure of purchasing typewriters within the continental limits of the United States. How about the purchase of typewriters beyond the continental limits of the United States? Do the same procedures apply?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think we buy any outside of the United States. That is one of the purposes of the language, to see that we get them at rock-bottom prices.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is correct. I hope we are buying them cheap.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman concerning the increase in the amount allowed for veterans' loans. Does that apply to the administration of FHA loans?

Mr. THOMAS. They are two separate and distinct items, but we take care of that in the same way. We gave them about $7½ million more than they had last year, which is quite a sizable increase.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Two million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. No; $750,000 now, because we gave them a deficiency about 30 days ago of $5 million, and we added about $2½ million on top of that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The reason I raise the question is the demand for processing these loans.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I know it is tremendous in your district, and we hope this money will get the job done.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, you believe the amount of money allowed should provide the personnel to take care of these loans?

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question about it in my mind.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I have received several telegrams, of which the following is an example:

> I hear all attempts to obtain extension of outstanding FNMA 1-for-1 commitment have been rejected. We need legislation extending the FNMA 1-for-1 commitment. It is vital to our industry.

This is signed by a housing contractor.

Could you explain why that was rejected?

Mr. THOMAS. We cannot do any legislating. The gentleman knows it. Just before we adjourned last year there was a bill passed and FNMA really got a reorganization. For all practical purposes FNMA is a private corporation, and it is hoped to be privately owned outside of the $92 million the Treasury advances. The rest of it is all private capital. What the legislative committee will do I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentle lady from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. With reference to the money for prosthetic appliances for veterans, there will be no doubt about their getting the money, will there?

Mr. THOMAS. We usually put something in the report or in the bill itself requesting the Veterans' Administration not to reduce the expenditures in this fund. Perhaps there is no better

money spent in the whole budget than that money.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman has always felt that way. If I am not mistaken, you cut the appropriation with regard to the Republic of the Philippines about $100,000. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. That is purely a guess on two parts. We did not know how many veterans were going to be there, and we were not quite satisfied as to the actual cost.

They have a brand-new hospital that we bought and paid for. It is a lovely hospital. It will not be in full operation for another 6 or 8 months. We think they have ample funds to take care of it. If they do not, we will be around and see the gentlewoman and we can all get together.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted. I think it is money that is very well spent. I am delighted that you have appropriated the money you have for hospitals generally, and I am sure you found the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] very helpful.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, he is a wonderful man. He is a wheel horse on this committee.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. On page 5, Disaster Relief. Is it to be understood that these loans cover all individual cases that might happen throughout the States, or will the committee pay attention to individual bills that may be introduced and passed by the Congress?

Mr. THOMAS. This, of course, is the President's emergency fund, as we call it. There has probably been more money spent from it than ever before, but if we have a few more droughts and hurricanes we will have to come back and get several million dollars more for it. There is no attempt to limit, if that is the gentleman's question.

Mr. BONNER. That is the question.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for the question. Certainly there is no attempt to limit.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In view of the importance of the work being done by the National Science Foundation I am surprised to find that you have so materially reduced the figures in the budget estimate. I wonder if the gentleman could explain it to us in a general way.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I think so. We gave them exactly the same amount of money they had last year. They wanted an increase, in round figures, of $7 million more than they had last year to do two things: Subsidize research studies in colleges and universities; and to increase from 750 approximately to 900 the number of students they were going to send to college for further education.

We just figured they were traveling too far and too fast. I am sure if the gentleman will let me read some figures he will agree with me. These are grants to universities for specific studies.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman is always gracious.

Mr. THOMAS. This is in biology alone:

Alabama Polytechnic Institute for genetic biology, $18,000.

University of Alabama, for molecular biology, $13,000.

University of Arizona, for environmental biology, $8,300.

To the California Institute of Technology, for regulatory biology, $8,500.

To the University of California, for developmental biology, $20,700; for genetic biology, $7,000; for molecular biology, $41,000; and another item to the same institution for regulatory biology of $7,050, and one for systematic biology, $18,750.

Now, let us go to the next one in the same State:

The Kaiser Foundation, for regulatory biology, $13,400.

To Stanford University, for environmental biology, $7,100.

To summarize this, there are about 159 such contracts and about 80 percent of them are for biology. Does not the gentleman think we are going a little heavy in biology this year?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate the helpfulness of the gentleman in winning my argument for me. The National Science Foundation has to do with basic science, and we have got to build up in our America the reservoir of knowledge in that field. Certainly many of these things might seem unimportant as the gentleman reads them, and to those who may not be familiar with the province of basic science as differentiated from applied science. Does not the gentleman concede that the National Science Foundation is engaged in very fundamental and basic research of the utmost importance?

Mr. THOMAS. I concede that the Federal Government is interested, and this committee is very favorable toward research.

Let me point out to the gentleman that this Government this year is spending $2,041,000,000 for scientific research.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes, but if it were not for the contribution of scientific research we would not have any billions to spend.

Mr. THOMAS. We are agreed about that; it is very, very fundamental, but, after all, $2 billion is a very sizable proportion of our budget. This is a coordinating agency. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. It does not have a single laboratory.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Is the gentleman familiar with basic science? Or is he thinking more of applied science?

Mr. THOMAS. We are thinking of both.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. How can we make progress unless we increase our knowledge of basic science? I love the gentleman so much I am sorry that on this occasion I must wholeheartedly disagree with him.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, we will not fall out over that, because, after all, our ideas are one and the same: We are both for furthering the cause of science in this country, and this committee certainly has done it.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. And the gentleman from Texas is one of the great Americans of our time, even if he is a little off on science.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 27 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for some reason, whenever this bill comes to the floor I think of the floor leader of the California Senate during the years I served in that body who, in reply to various comments and criticisms invariably said: "Well, you elected me to keep you out of trouble."

I think that the Appropriations Committee, and perhaps this subcommittee, which has had before it as high as 30 agencies of the Government, has the job of taking the authorizations which we ourselves enact on this floor and translating them into an efficient and satisfactory method of spending the money. In the 9 years I have come to the floor as a member of this subcommittee, it has seemed to me that effective work has been done by the quiet persistent process of asking the representatives of the agencies to explain in detail how the money was spent, how they want to spend it in the successive year. I recall several reorganizations which have been effected through the interest of this committee. I recall several retirements, Mr. Chairman, which have taken place a little ahead of the intended time, which have been encouraged by this committee. I have also in mind extensions of the work of some of the agencies and the service they give which again have been encouraged by this committee.

As the chairman of the committee said—and it is a pleasure to serve under him as chairman—this year we have three members on the committee, the gentleman from Texas who just spoke, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and myself who have served there for several years. We have four very able and active new Members, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. They have found what we had already found, that this is a technical and detailed job. I for one have appreciated the support of my side of the table, as I know the gentleman from Texas has appreciated the work and support of his side of the table.

As the gentleman from Texas said, Mr. Chairman, this is about as nearly a noncontroversial bill as an appropriations bill can be in any year. There were only 2 matters, and both of those were referred to, on which there might have been a discussion, 1 of which I do not fully agree with. I have not agreed with it in preceding years, but not on the basis of money, Mr. Chairman; on the basis of policy, a policy which I think definitely must in the near future be reviewed by the proper legislative committee. That is the problem of what sort of a policy we shall have for the retirement fund of the civil service.

Now, let us take, Mr. Chairman, three types of retirement funds. There would

be the retirement fund of a private industry, the XYZ industry. That fund must necessarily be invested in sound securities satisfactory for any trust, for the very practical reason that the XYZ industry might decide to close its doors. Therefore the retirement funds that have been contributed by the employees on the one side and the employer on the other side must be protected. Then there are State agencies or quasi-governmental agencies that have retirement funds. I have in mind especially States themselves, which put their money into Federal securities, because that is a higher type of security, and they must maintain a fund.

When you come to the Federal Government I do not believe you, Mr. Chairman, or any Member of this body thinks the Federal Government is going out of business. I do not think there is any higher type of security in which to put the money than our own, actually the operations of the Federal Government.

What has happened? When this money is paid in year after year by the employees they think this is going—and I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the word "think"—they think this is going into a trust found to be held for their benefit. What happens to the money, Mr. Chairman? The employees' money is taken by the Federal Government and put into the Treasury. The trust funds, of which there are 10, as we all know, are given an IOU, and the money is then spent for the deficit expenses of the Government.

Now, where you spend money for deficit expenses which has been taken in to be put into a trust fund, you are in effect creating a fallacious situation. We do not have a trust fund. In fact, we are spending the money for something for which the people would have been taxed and should have been taxed. Had they been taxed, and were this put into the bill year after year as the exact amount of money that the Federal Government is responsible for, then we might be a little more cautious, Mr. Chairman, in the liberality in which we add people to retirement funds, vote increases to retirement funds, expand the expenses of Government, knowing that here is an amount of money we can spend without the people seeing it.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have to face the fact. As the gentleman from Texas said, this fund is some $5.6 billion below what it should be on the Federal side. If we are going to bring it to actuarial soundness, we have to appropriate about $770 million a year for 10 years, and all we have done this year is to put in a token payment of a quarter of a billion dollars—$250 million.

Now, my conviction has been for years that we should not attempt on the Federal level to create and hold an actuarily sound fund, because the money is being used for a purpose for which it was not appropriated nor gathered from the taxpayers and employees; that we should use the workers' contributions as they come in; that we should appropriate each and every year the amount of money required as it is needed and in that way avoid this double taxation which is the inevitable result of the present system.

Now, so much for that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, this fund the gentleman is talking about is not actuarily sound; is it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And according to the gentleman's statement, it will be less sound if we continue to pay these retirees as we are obligated and want to do.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Increasingly so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As it stands now, I believe the gentleman is telling the House that this account would be actuarily sound if we add about $5.5 billion. Is that right?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right; $5.6 billion if put in at once.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But there is an amount of about at least $5 billion earmarked for retirement funds now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. A little more than that—$9 billion.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Nine billion dollars I should have said. It is earmarked, at least, even though it is used for some other purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. It is nothing, as the gentleman knows, but a paper figure. The people will have to be taxed again to get that $9 billion whenever we actually need it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am getting at is this. The people of this country ought to be permitted to know in some way, and this includes the people who participate in this fund especially, that we are just short $5 billion in that fund.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words, if we are going to do what you would do in respect to life insurance or any other organization, we would have to appropriate $5 billion to make the thing even.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So we are just short $5 billion now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In this bill today you are not even contributing the share that you are supposed to contribute to take care of the expenses. In other words, put it this way. You are not contributing in this appropriation bill as much as the employees are paying in for 1 year, are you?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. The gentleman has presented the whole picture to the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So, the problem is continually growing larger.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish the gentleman's committee would hold hearings on it and make some decision as to how we should meet this situation. We would be very glad to help. All we can do is to point out where we are.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Except that the gentleman's committee can take into consideration the funds that are being paid in by Government employees and discuss the question of matching those funds; and if the committee is not doing that, will the gentleman please tell us why?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are not doing it because the funds simply accumulate. The funds are not used for the retirement system; that is, the funds that we would appropriate. They are used to pay the deficit expenses of Government, thus creating a deception upon the people.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What would the gentleman do with the funds?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would appropriate each year the amount necessary to appropriate for retirement.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then you would not have any money at all in any fund.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Eventually the gentleman is right. Of course, we would always have a safe margin in the fund, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. But, figuratively speaking, the gentleman is right. The Government would pay in the amount needed for that year. That would be an honest way to treat it from the standpoint of the employee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then you would not have what we call a retirement fund, would you?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We do not have one now. We only think we have.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Except we are using it for some other purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But we have it earmarked, do we not?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. We have deceived the people, because we have told the people that we are creating a trust fund when, in effect, we use it for the deficit financing of the Government, and we will have to go back to the people at some future time and tax them again, instead of now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The people of this country ought to know that they are $5 billion in debt to the people who have retired from the Government.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think they know it. I have talked to the representatives of retirement funds, and I think most of them agree with the position that I have taken.

I thank the gentleman from Kansas who has always been very helpful and very much interested in this subject.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to call the attension of the gentleman to the fact that the social-security fund is in exactly the same position as the fund for civil-service employees. The social-security fund is supposed to have $18 billion in it, and it has not a penny in it, only the I O U's of the Government and when they have to pay those, they must tax again the children or the children's children of those who are beneficiaries.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I question very much if the people would have voted that $18 billion and the $9 billion the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] was talking about, if they had realized the situation, that this was merely an evasion, on the part of the Government, of taxes which should have been imposed upon them.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not think they would have voted it. I thank both these gentlemen very much.

Mr. Chairman, I pass now to 1 other point; there were 2, 1 of which might have been a controversy at issue, but that has been removed from controversy by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. To go back for a moment to the matter of the retirement fund, do I understand the gentleman's description of the situation as it is now means that we should put in the fund enough to meet the entire obligations of all those employees of the Government who may retire each year, plus the amount necessary to meet the requirements if all employees should retire in 1 year?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer to the first half of the question of the gentleman from California is "Yes," and to the second half "No."

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then do I understand that there is not enough money in the fund to meet the requirements for retiring employees for the next year?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has reversed his question. There always would be enough to meet any retirements within any reasonable period, a year or more. But there would not be in the fund an amount of $14 billion or $15 billion lying unused. It is actually not there. It is represented only by I O U's from the Treasury, the actual cash money having been used in deficit financing and to avoid that much further deficit or further taxation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then, as I understand it, the purpose of the gentleman and his committee is to keep the fund in a liquid condition to meet all obligations without having a great surplus of funds lying here idle?

Mr. PHILLIPS. There has been no question about that. We have kept it in that condition, but we do so by not appropriating as much money as we probably should appropriate, under the terms of the act. I think the matter should be surveyed by the appropriate legislative committee and some determination made.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let us nail it down in this way. Under the present law, we feel we have an understanding that whatever funds have been paid in by a retiree will be matched and also paid into the Treasury by the Government of the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have not carried out that agreement.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; it is not quite that way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is almost it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Here is the situation. We have that understanding. We still have it. There is no change in it. Nobody is proposing a change in it. The question is simply whether you want us to pay it in cash now and let it be used for some other purpose or pay it in as we go along. We will pay that much money and probably more in the long run, because there are a lot of people getting what my distinguished chairman from Texas calls a free ride. They have not put in their equivalent part of the fund. They are getting a free ride. The taxpayers will pay it. Nobody is saying we will not pay our equivalent or more. It is a question of when we pay it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree we will pay some time, but we should have been paying it as we go along or adopt some other procedure or policy in dealing with this important problem.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If we were paying as we go along, the gentleman knows the money would not have been there when we needed it in the future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Was there any discussion during the committee hearings and consideration of the retirement fund concerning the possibility of using the reserve funds for investment in FHA guaranteed mortgages?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, there was no such discussion that I recall. Offhand I would have to check the law. I am not sure that would be a proper investment. I am now informed it is legal, so that is all right.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is it not true there are two types of retirement funds, one actuarially sound by contributions, the other by a taxing body which has the power to tax? Actuarially where it is not necessary to be sound because each of your taxing bodies levies a sufficient amount of taxes each year to meet the requirements of the retirements that year?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct and has expressed my opinion very accurately and very well. Will the gentleman discuss that with the gentleman from Kansas and convince him also that that is the proper method to handle this?

Mr. Chairman, I have one other matter I want to take up, and that is the matter of the repair and rehabilitation of veterans' hospitals.

I want, first, to say that a small agency, the ICC, about which we have spoken very critically in the past, has put itself upon a reorganized and efficient basis, and as a result you will see, Mr. Chairman, there was no cut in the budget.

The Veterans' Administration also has made remarkable progress, in my opinion, in the past 2 or 3 years. I happen to have a very high opinion personally of the present Administrator, Mr. Higley. I think he is one of the most able we have ever had in the history of the agency, and I think he is to be congratulated.

We have reached to all intents and purposes a saturation point in the general area of G. M. and S. hospitals. We need NP hospitals. We are building them. We have been a little delayed by some unexpected handicaps, but the money has been available.

Now we come to the question of the old hospitals which need to be repaired. While the budget did not ask for any money, the Veterans' Administration had asked the Budget Bureau for money which had not been allowed. The chairman recommended, and we all supported, an appropriation of $30 million which appears on page 34 of the bill. So, when the present survey is completed, the money will be available for immediate starts. The committee has indicated its interest in the rehabilitation of the NP hospital at Downey, Ill., and at Murphreesboro, Tenn. I know from personal observation that the hospital in the Washington area, that is the District of Columbia area, at Mount Alto, should be one of those at the head of the list. There is a problem of where it shall be located. I am also aware from information brought to me that the hospital in Bath, N. Y., in the territory represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is in very great need of certain repairs.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. COLE. I have been anxious to discuss this point with the gentleman from California because one of the veterans' facilities is in my district, in my home town, and is an old one. It was a State institution, for Civil War Veterans and was turned over to the Federal Government about 30 years ago. It is now approaching a condition where it must be replaced. There has been a recreation building at that facility that has been condemned for a year and a half and therefore not available for use by the veterans. I have endeavored to persuade the Veterans' Administration to include the replacement of that building in its fiscal 1956 construction program. The Veterans' Administration recognizes the need, but denies the urgency. I have discussed the matter and have had correspondence with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and I rise to inquire if it is possible that replacement of this recreation building might be included in the additional $16 million which the committee has granted the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of replacing the older Veterans' Administration facilities.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think it is a very necessary improvement myself. I think that the gentleman overlooks one extremely good argument, in my opinion, and that is it is largely a hospital for older veterans and that is a group of hospitals where we do need further facilities and the improvement of existing facilities.

Mr. COLE. May I ask the gentleman just one further brief question as to whether his statement of the urgency of this item for the facility at Bath is generally approved by the other members of his committee?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have not consulted the other members of the committee officially, but I am sure from the conversations around the table, and those whom I have consulted here today and the others, that they would be of exactly the same state of mind as the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman permit me to make inquiry of the gentleman from Texas as to whether he has any expression of opinion on this question? I do not desire to embarrass the gentleman, but I would like to just have an indication for the benefit of the Veterans'

Administration as to the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations on this particular point.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman from New York is asking me my personal opinion, I might say I do not know anybody for whom I would like to do a little something in any way that we can than the gentleman from New York. We understand that institution will cost about a half million dollars. It is over 50 years of age and it is very high on the veterans' priority list for correction. I hope the VA can do it for our distinguished friend, "STUB" COLE.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 more minutes to answer questions by these gentlemen.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman heard the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to the effect that the Veterans' Administration stated it had ample funds to operate the GI loan program, and through your committee you gave them a million dollars more than they requested.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. AYRES. Did you feel that the loan program, based on the testimony you heard, is being handled as rapidly as it should be?

Mr. PHILLIPS. On the basis of the testimony before our committee, I was under the impression that it was. What the gentleman says is very interesting. We should look into it, but certainly it is our belief that we have given them enough money to carry out effectively the program in which the gentleman is interested.

Mr. AYRES. The Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is going to make an investigation into the matter within the next few weeks, and I would appreciate the gentleman taking our report and impressing upon the Veterans' Administration that possibly they made a mistake in their testimony before your committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. A few minutes ago the gentleman was discussing matters of money in this bill for the renovation of veterans' hospitals.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLMES. Could the gentleman expand on that statement a little further?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We have had a program of building hospitals for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, Public Health, and so on, private hospitals with public funds, and veterans' hospitals. We have to make use of these hospitals, because while we have in some areas veterans' hospitals filled to 86 percent, the whole hospitalization of the area may be only 50 percent of the capacity and we have to make use of all existing hospitals. The next step is to study the veterans' hospitals, and those that should not be repaired, eliminated, or replaced, and to repair the hospitals in the best way possible and make the best use of the hospitals we have.

Mr. HOLMES. The moneys provided in this bill for the Veterans' Administration and renovation of those older hospitals that need renovation—how is that handled by the Veterans' Administration

Mr. PHILLIPS. The VA has a regular section that handles it; building, renovating, and repairing hospitals.

Mr. HOLMES. They have recommended with relation to a hospital in Walla Walla, Wash., that it would come under the funds that you are appropriating here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is a survey going on for that purpose.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I call attention to a hospital facility in Georgia. It is not in my district. It is in the district of the distinguished dean of our delegation, Mr. VINSON.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is this Dublin?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am familiar with it.

Mr. LANHAM. It is one of the finest hospital facilities I have ever seen, and it is filled to only about one-third capacity.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can answer that. It is one of the finest hospitals I have ever seen. It was built for the Navy. Congress gave it to the Veterans' Administration. It has everything but patients. In the last few years an effort has been made to use it for the aged and infirm. I have visited the hospital myself and I think the manager is doing a magnificent job there.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand it is not used to one-third of its capacity. There are plenty of patients in Georgia and Florida that ought to be in that hospital. The gentleman from California has been misinformed as to the lack of patients. It is a mistake to talk about building more hospitals when we have that facility and many others that should be utilized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. My reference to the lack of patients had to do with occupancy. I agree that patients could be taken to Dublin from the area immediately surrounding.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from California to give me 10 minutes?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I will yield the gentleman 5 minutes now. I think we can supply the other 5 minutes later.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] such time as he may require.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a provision under which it would be necessary to report new housing projects to the committees of the House and of the Senate. This is another example of the increasing number of instances in which Congress is attempting to take over at least a portion of the administration of the laws which we pass.

Under existing law, all real estate acquisitions and disposals by the military departments must be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate, and the department must come into agreement with those committees before acquiring or disposing of real estate. When we passed the Lease-Purchase Act, a somewhat similar provision was included. In the 1954 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act, a provision was included under which certain contracts must be filed with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a period of 30 days during which Congress is in session, before the contracts can become effective.

Last week, we had protracted debate in the House on the question of approval or disapproval of the proposal for the sale of the rubber producing facilities. The provisions of the Atomic Energy Act resulted in the Dixon-Yates contract being filed with that committee, hearings held on it, and opposing action taken by the committee, in the 84th Congress, as compared to the action taken in the 83d Congress. This experience should be sufficient to prove to all of us that it is not practical for the Congress to administer laws which it passes. A similar intrusion by the Executive upon the legislative powers would be very seriously resented by us. In addition, we are not so organized as to discharge properly the responsibility which we assume by provisions of this character. I realize that the present Housing Act has stripped Congress of effective control over the projects to be undertaken. The condition of the Housing Act may give semblance of the desirability to institute some congressional control. However, the method proposed of submitting projects to the committees of Congress is an evil equally as great, if not greater, than the evils sought to be controlled.

It has never been made clear exactly what character of proceeding the submission of these projects to committees is intended to be. If they constitute a step in the administration of a law we have passed, the function belongs in the executive department and not in the legislative department. If it is intended to be a legislative action, surely we cannot delegate that legislative function to the committees of the two Houses of Congress. If it is a legislative function, it must necessarily be handled by the two Houses of Congress, rather than their committees.

I sincerely hope that this provision of the bill before us will be eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], a member of the committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I should like first to express my gratification with having had the privilege of serving under the very able and very eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] as chairman of the subcommittee, and with having been able to serve with the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. It was a pleasure, too, to be associated with my other

friends on the majority side, Mr. EVINS and Mr. BOLAND, and with Mr. VURSELL and Mr. OSTERTAG on the minority side. This has been a very stimulating session.

I believe the bill we are reporting today is a good bill. It does not carry the drastic cuts that have marked this committee's activities in previous years. It gives recognition to the fact that the administrative agencies of government need funds with which to carry on their operations. This bill gives them funds in accordance with the requests made by the Bureau of the Budget. In many instances, particularly in the case of the regulatory agencies, I cannot escape the feeling that the Bureau of the Budget did not allow adequate funds to permit these agencies to carry on in accordance with the intention of the original legislation. I fear the public interest will not be protected.

Most of the agencies implied their fear, if they failed to state it directly, that our committee were bound by the order of the administration to carry on their operations economically. There is nothing wrong with this purpose, but they have gone much too far. I believe the Federal Power Commission needs more funds and should pay more attention to natural gas regulation. I think the cut went too far in the case of the Securities and Exchange Commission, even though the entire amount that was requested by the Securities and Exchange Commission was granted by the Bureau of the Budget.

I want at this time to make reference to the point of order which I propose to make later in the reading of the bill for amendment. The gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California have both stated that there will be no controversy in this bill as a result of the action of the Rules Committee denying the rule yesterday. I appeared yesterday before the Rules Committee in opposition to the proviso and I was pleased when the committee refused to grant the rule.

I shall move to strike out on point of order, the language found at the bottom of page 21, which proposes to compel the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the constituent agencies under his jurisdiction to come to the Banking and Currency Committees of the House and the Senate before any advance loans, contracts for capital grant, contracts for annual contributions may be expected. Public housing is controversial. But this amendment goes for beyond public housing, although that, too, is included. For example, the slum clearance and urban rehabilitation programs are slowed down by this language. College housing is another program that would be affected. Advance planning is another program that would suffer by the provision.

So when the time comes that the bill is read for amendment I propose to make a point of order to that provision to strike it out of the appropriation bill.

Many of my friends have asked me about the Federal public-housing program. You will recall that when the independent offices bill left the House last year there were approximately 35,000 housing units in the pipeline, the pipeline consisting of the number of valid annual contributions contracts that had been entered into by the Government and local housing authorities. It now appears that that number is actually 36,252. The Public Housing Administration will construct during this fiscal year only 15,000 of those units. The remaining 21,252 are yet to be approved for construction.

Of that number San Francisco has 1,698 units which are held in abeyance, Chicago 3,394 units which are held in abeyance, Baltimore has something like 683 units which are held in abeyance, Detroit 3,874, St. Louis 1,534, New York 675, Columbus 524, Cleveland 992, and Washington 1,067. The total of these is 14,441. The balance of the approximately 21,000 units are scattered throughout the remaining municipalities of the country.

As of this time, there has been not one unit of public housing approved under the Housing Act of 1954. The limitations that were imposed on public housing in that law have been so stringent that not one project has yet been approved, and the race is on to see whether by June 30, 1955, any units of public housing will have been approved. The proviso that was added to the Housing Act of 1954 was to the effect that contracts for construction of the 35,000 units could be entered into during fiscal 1955.

Those of us who come from the large metropolitan communities have seen the needs of our communities for good housing held up year after year because of road blocks located by appropriations, riders, and by lip service only by many in positions of authority. We have seen our slum programs held up because of relocation which is perhaps the great need of every good slum-clearance program, want desperately for the administration to take effective action to revive the public-housing program. Without it, we are set back indefinitely.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The present Commissioner of Public Housing is the former mayor of my city of Akron. I think he has done a splendid job in that capacity. From the experience the gentleman from Ilinois has had in the public housing field, does he not feel that there perhaps was a deliberate attempt on the part of those who are against public housing to see it come as close to being killed as possible?

Mr. YATES. Right now I think public housing is moribund. I think the gentleman to whom you have referred, the former mayor of Akron, has tried his best to keep the program moving. However, the restrictions and limitations that were placed in the act have pretty well tied his hands. From the estimate I have been able to obtain from the Public Housing Administration, of the 35,000 units which were authorized in the Housing Act of 1954, it is anticipated that not more than 13,000 units, if those, will be authorized for construction by June 30, 1955.

Mr. AYRES. From the interest the gentleman from Illinois has shown in the program, does he have any suggestions as to what can be done to make a live, workable program?

Mr. YATES. To make the program live and workable? I would like to see many of the restrictions in the act eliminated so that the municipalities and the Public Housing Administration can come to some basis which will permit the construction of the housing units. Right now the restrictions are almost insuperable. They just cannot work their way through them.

Mr. AYRES. But that would have to be done by changing the Housing Act.

Mr. YATES. It would have to be done by changing the basic law.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, the language inserted by the Committee on Appropriations into the section of this bill dealing with funds for the Housing and Home Finance Agency puts a new level of bureaucracy, if you will, on top of all of the existing layers of bureaucracy in connection with public housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, public works planning, and related activities.

In this case, the two legislative committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over housing matters, the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees, must review and approve every one of the thousands of individual advances, loans, capital grants, or public housing contributions contracts handled by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies.

Banking and Currency Committees have heavy work schedules on legislative matters, and the time involved in reviewing each of these individual loan or grant applications would be extraordinarily burdensome for the members of those committees, if not completely out of the question. The point is that this rider on the appropriation bill appears to be intended to place a new roadblock in the way of an effective housing program, by introducing new means of delay and obstruction.

Mr. Chairman, instead of further restricting these programs, we should repeal the restrictions of the past few years so that we can again have a really effective public-housing-construction program.

According to the figures supplied for the record of the hearings, only about 400,000 low-rent public-housing units of all kinds, including those transferred to low-rent use from war housing, will have been constructed in this country by the end of the 1955 fiscal year June 30.

Yet the Housing Act of 1949 set a goal of 810,000 units over and above those which had previously been authorized up to that time, and, in fact, called for as many as 135,000 units to be built a year.

The limitations and restrictions on public housing are now so severe that for all practical purposes the program is just about dead. The President has said he will ask for another 35,000 units in the coming fiscal year, but, according to the report accompanying this bill, the message containing the request has not yet come to Congress.

And the hearings on this bill raise all kinds of legal questions as to whether there is any authority for a single additional public-housing unit to be built

anywhere in the country after those now in the pipeline are completed.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I have introduced my bill, H. R. 377, to repeal the restrictions on public housing provided in several recent appropriation acts prior to this, and also those contained in the Housing Act of 1954. Passage of my bill would restore the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 allowing up to 135,000 units a year, depending upon Presidential requests and congressional appropriations.

That is the way the problem should be handled—not in this back-door fashion of legislative riders on appropriation acts and through limitations intended to cripple the program or kill it with vague and contradictory language which no one seems to be able to explain clearly.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in addition to joining in defeating this rider to the appropriation bill as an unwarranted invasion of the field of their jurisdiction, I hope the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee will soon arrange hearings on my bill to restore the public-housing program of the Housing Act of 1949, giving us a real program which can provide shelter for those most in need of housing.

As for this rider, I think the best thing we could say for it is that it would be monstrously cumbersome in operation, and an attempt to substitute two already very busy committees of Congress for a big, well-staffed administrative agency of Government in the disposition of what should be, under safeguards, only routine project applications.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, from the Chicago municipal area, I was deeply concerned by the legislative rider in the bill as it came from the committee and which fortunately has been stricken on a point of order. The reasons for my concern were, first, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I knew that we had neither time nor personnel sufficient for the task; and, second, as a resident of Chicago, I knew that the rider, bringing about a complete halt to all affected activities by reason of the inability of the Banking and Currency Committee to give the required clearances, would grievously harm the city of my home and of my affection. All of our dreams of a better, cleaner, more beautiful, and wholesome Chicago would die in the embrace of a legislative rider in a bill of appropriation.

H. R. 5240 as it came from the committee contained a legislative rider prohibiting the Housing Agency from exercising the authority previously granted to it by the Congress to enter into financial assistance contracts for slum clearance and urban renewal projects, public housing projects, college housing projects, et ceteria, which meet the standards specified by the Congress in the authorizing legislation unless and until each such contract is approved by the Committees on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

Such a legislative rider invades the basic constitutional principle of the separation of the executive and legislative branches of government by vesting in the legislative branch functions which are exclusively administrative in nature and which under our constitutional principles should be performed by the executive rather than the legislative branch. In the existing authorizing legislation the Congress has laid down the specific conditions which the various types of projects must meet before they would be eligible to receive the particular financial assistance which the Congress has authorized. The function of determining whether those conditions have or have not been met in the case of the thousands of individual projects is clearly an administrative function—not a legislative one.

It must also be observed that this legislative rider does not lay down any standards for approval or disapproval of projects by the legislative branch. It does not say that the legislative branch should approve if the projects meet all the tests specified in existing law. It leaves the matter of the approval or disapproval of each individual project entirely to the whims of the legislative branch. Cities and other local agencies, and colleges, which have to make financial commitments themselves to undertake projects can have no assurance that, even if their projects meet all the conditions specified in the law, their projects can be approved.

The constitutional principle of separation of powers—that administrative functions shall be performed by the executive, not by the legislative branch—developed out of the wise experience of the framers of the Constitution has stood the test of time and it has worked well. When we begin to invade that constitutional principle, we begin to undermine the very foundation of our system of government. We will make our system of government unworkable—unable properly to carry out necessary governmental functions. The committees of the Congress are not equipped in any way to perform such functions—to put it bluntly, the legislative branch is no more fitted to perform purely administrative and executive functions that the executive branch is fitted to perform legislative functions.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us for consideration today covers 17 departments of Government, carrying a total expense of $5,845,595,375. Of this amount, $4,463,126,000 goes for the care of the veterans and their dependents. The remaining amount appropriated for the various agencies of Government in this bill, excluding the veterans, is $1,382,469,375.

These figures, large as they are, would amount to a net decrease under the budget estimates of $44,194,625, if we had not written into the bill $250 million, which goes to pay the Government's part of the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The increase of the current year is primarily due to this large item, the increase of $168,900,000 for funds for strategic and critical materials, and an increase of $210 million for veterans' benefits.

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Testimony before our committee leads us to believe that the agencies involved have been doing a rather creditable job, and are generally discharging their responsibilities with an eye to economy, and with a minimum number of personnel.

During the hearings each agency was asked to insert a table in the record of the average number of employees for each of the past 10 years, or since the agency was created, and also a summary of the highest employment figure for each agency during the decade, 1947–56. The number of employees estimated for the 1956 budget, and the number of employees provided for in the bill are shown in the table that follows.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this table as a part of my remarks for the RECORD:

*Table of the comparative average number of employees for agencies in the bill, 1947–56*

| Agency | Highest annual employment during last decade | 1956 budget estimate | Recommended in bill |
|---|---|---|---|
| Civil Service Commission | 4,993 | 3,150 | 3,036 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration | 839 | 768 | 728 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,404 | 1,031 | 1,057 |
| Federal Power Commission | 817 | 702 | 702 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 676 | 640 | 629 |
| General Accounting Office | 13,895 | 5,932 | 5,924 |
| General Services Administration | 28,929 | 26,472 | 26,291 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 13,481 | 12,762 | 11,489 |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,248 | 1,916 | 1,916 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 7,600 | 8,430 | 7,631 |
| National Capital Housing Authority (total) | 357 | 282 | 282 |
| National Science Foundation | 170 | 187 | 170 |
| National Security Training Commission | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Renegotiation Board | 716 | 569 | 502 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1,187 | 730 | 712 |
| Selective Service System | 7,707 | 6,695 | 6,650 |
| Veterans' Administration | 204,732 | 168,863 | 167,820 |
| Total | 289,257 | 239,135 | 235,539 |

This table carried in the report indicates a substantial reduction of personnel. You will note that your committee has recommended, in column 3, 235,539 employees for these agencies, as against the high point for these agencies during the past 10 years, the larger number of 289,257 employees. This is a reduction of 53,718 employees in these agencies. The budget request for employees covering these departments to your committee was 239,135. We cut this to 235,539, which provides for a reduction under the 1956 budget estimate of 3,596. Your committee feels satisfied that these reductions are justified under the testimony, and these departments will be sufficiently staffed to carry on their work efficiently and effectively.

I feel it is the consensus of the committee that practically all of these departments of Government are in capable hands and that in practically every instance those in charge of the various departments are approaching their work with zeal and efficiency, are doing their best to discharge their duties in an effi-

cient and economical manner, and, generally, are doing a good job.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

I was particularly impressed with the alertness and the ability evidenced by those in charge of the General Accounting Office. This Office appears to me to be doing a most excellent job. Their services are of untold value to our Government from the standpoint of efficiency which they are able to bring about by better accounting practices and by the tremendous amount of money they have been able to collect for and to save the Federal Government.

CIVIL SERVICE AND SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSIONS

The Civil Service Commission, considering the volume and character of the work, is to be commended; and the Securities and Exchange Commission, with its very great responsibility to the public, shows every evidence of dedicated business management and efficiency in performance.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency is also doing a very splendid job.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

This tremendous organization, for which we provided $4,463,126,000, the committee feels has shown great improvement over the last few years in its business management, and is apparently carrying out the work of administration not only in an economic manner but in a way to bring the greatest amount of relief possible to our millions of veterans, and their dependents, which it serves.

The committee recommended the amount of $267,862,200 more for the VA for the fiscal year 1956 than was provided in the fiscal year of 1955 budget.

Appropriations for all hospital, insurance, and benefit programs were approved in full, and an additional $16,885,000 over the budget estimate has been added in the bill to start the rebuilding of some of the older hospitals. The only reduction made in this bill was for administrative expenses in nonmedical programs. We reduced this nonmedical program by $5,300,000. I believe a careful study of our report on the VA, which is before you, will impress you with the fact that our committee has earnestly tried to go as far as we reasonably could in providing for proper medical, hospital, and other care for our veterans.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The recent hearings on estimates for 1956 gave me an opportunity to observe the operations of the General Services Administration, under the able management of its Administrator, Mr. Edmund F. Mansure, a former successful businessman of Chicago, who is doing a blue-ribbon job in rendering an excellent service to the Government.

I was amazed to discover the magnitude of operations of GSA, and impressed by the earnest, businesslike way in which the complex problems involved in central management of property, supplies, and records of civil agencies of Government are being carried out by Mr. Mansure and his able staff.

GSA controls Government assets of over $8.3 billion, of which $5.6 billion is the Nation's bulwark of critical materials in case of war. It provides and maintains 130 million square feet of space as working quarters for Government agencies. It procures $400 million of supplies and equipment needed annually by Government agencies for their operation. It manages each year the reutilization or disposal of over $1 billion of excess or surplus real and personal property, and destruction of over 3 million cubic feet of Government records—3,000 boxcars full.

In addition, it could well be said that GSA operates and controls the biggest real-estate business in the world. GSA is responsible for the management and supervision of most of the Government buildings in the United States. Mr. Mansure has been able to reduce personnel, and at the same time extend the worthwhile activities of his organization. This agency, which a few years ago employed 28,929 people, is now operating with 26,472, a reduction of 2,457 employees.

Ever since it was established in 1949, GSA has demonstrated that vast sums can be saved by the departments and agencies in the Federal Government through application of sound business principles and practices. Savings and economies have grown steadily from year to year. In its last annual report, GSA accounted for $147.6 million in Governmentwide savings and economies.

Price advantages from centralized purchasing of supplies and equipment last year were worth $59.8 million. Reuse of personal property excess in various agencies by other agencies precluded purchases of over $57.5 million. For example, one agency needed 500,000 blankets. GSA came up with some excesses here and there, and arranged the transfer to the needing agency, and a purchase of $4.5 million was avoided.

The future holds an outlook for even greater savings, some of which can be accomplished by merely expanding current activities into untouched areas and fields when budgetary limitations are less restrictive. For example, one of the projects being undertaken by GSA holding great possibilities of savings is the control, through pooling, of commercial-type motor vehicles. The Government fleet consists of 228,438 vehicles which ran nearly 2 billion miles last year, at a cost of $185 million in upkeep, service, and depreciation. Through pooling, GSA expects to cut back the size of the fleet, get rid of excess vehicles, eliminate duplicating services, and reduce operating personnel. Other projects are in the planning stage.

Elimination of waste and extravagance in Government is an objective of every Member of the House, and I feel convinced that we have found in GSA a formidable weapon for carrying out these objectives in the fields of property and records management.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen of the committee who have preceded me have fully covered the major items in the pending appropriations bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, has furnished the committee with a clear, concise and informative statement of the contents of the measure under consideration. It should be added that when Chairman THOMAS has completed his statement there is little further that can be added, or needs to be added, by way of explanation of an appropriation bill coming from the committee of which he serves as chairman. He is, as we all recognize, an able and hard-working chairman and he has performed an excellent service in this instance as is his usual custom.

It has been a privilege to be associated with him in the work of the subcommittee. It has been also a privilege to work with Mr. PHILLIPS, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and all of the members of the committee.

It has been a refreshing and stimulating experience serving on this committee. This has been my first year of service on the Committee on Appropriations and I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all of the members of the committee for their kindness and helpfulness. The fine spirit of cooperation which all members have manifested in the work of the committee has been unexcelled.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, which the committee has brought before the House represents months of study and extended consideration of the needs and requirements of the 18 agencies of the Government comprising the category of independent offices.

It is readily apparent that the work of this committee is very important and certainly carries with it great responsibility when we consider that the committee has been asked to look into and analyze budget estimates for the fiscal year 1956 these 18 agencies totaling $5,639,790,000—with the amount recommended by the committee totaling some $5,845,595,375.

I am certainly not going to discuss all the items of appropriations included in this bill—as other Members have spoken and given an explanation of certain groups involved in the independent offices category—but shall mention only a few items principally the Civil Service Commission, the Civil Defense Administration, the regulatory agencies—Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Veterans' Administration.

As the committee report indicates, by far the major item included in the recommendations for the Civil Service Commission, as we know, is the sum which the committee has earmarked for Government payment into the civil-service retirement and disability fund—an amount of $250 million for 1956. There has been no specific recommendations for this purpose by the Budget Bureau—although the sum of $216 million was proposed for subsequent transmission to the Congress for approval. It is the view of the committee that set-asides for this

purpose should be resumed as there have been no payments by the Government into the fund for the past 2 years. It was, and it is, the feeling of the committee that the Government should keep pace with the contributions of Government employees into the civil-service retirement fund.

The Government must keep faith with its employees in the matter of retirement funds and the contribution proposed by the committee—while it is a step in the direction of building up this fund—is still far below estimated requirements, but, as indicated, it is a step in the right direction to even up this burden and to cut down the accumulating obligation.

It is my view that the committee has made wise recommendations also with regard to the funds needed by Federal civil defense. The committee has approved the sum of $53,400,000 for the continuing programs of this agency. This sum represents an increase of $5,375,000 of the amount appropriated for this purpose for 1955—the current fiscal year. It is felt that more emphasis should be placed on the use of matching funds by our States and municipalities since there appears to be no possibility of the Federal Government supporting every desire and demand and estimate of this program. The amount appropriated would seem to be all that this agency is in a position to use wisely at this time.

For our regulatory agencies, the committee has given close attention to the needs apparent in the forceful prosecution of the duties of these agencies intended by the Congress.

The Federal Communications Commission was allowed a recommended appropriation of $6,870,000 which is a substantial increase over 1955 as well as the budget estimate for 1956. The Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, as well as the Interstate Commerce Commission have likewise been given boosts in the amount of their appropriations—this to bolster a lagging enforcement policy and to meet the needs apparent to enable these agencies to operate within the framework of their duties outlined by the Congress.

Concerning the Veterans' Administration, as many Members will no doubt recall, Mr. Chairman, for the past several years—in fact each year since the end of World War II when appropriations for all phases of veterans' benefits and veterans' programs reached a peak—there have been reductions and cuts made in funds for all veterans' benefit programs—cuts in funds for compensation and pension, hospital and medical-care programs, education and training allowances, insurance, housing, and other benefits. This year I am pleased to report—for the first time in 10 years—there has been no cuts or reductions in amounts for these purposes under budget recommendations.

The committee in looking into the needs of the Veterans' Administration budget has reduced only one item, that of administrative cost by $5,300,000. This cut applies only to administrative expenses and out of a total budget for this purpose of $160,300,000—leaving a total of $155 million for administrative purposes. The total VA budget, for fiscal 1956, approved by the Bureau of the Budget is $4,452,370,000. The total funds recommended for all programs of VA by the committee is $4,463,126,000—a net increase of $10,756,000.

The committee after full and careful study of all programs administered by the Veterans' Administration wisely, in my opinion, increased Bureau of Budget recommendations for hospital and domiciliary facilities for needed alterations, repairs, and improvements for veterans' facilities from $13,800,000 to $30 million—an increase of $16,185,000.

Administrator Higley testified before our committee that the Veterans' Administration is currently making a survey of hospital facilities to determine what hospitals should be replaced and which hospitals need extensive modernization. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House simultaneously also has made a similar survey. The results of these surveys are already alarming.

In response to my own questioning, Mr. Higley testified that the approximate value of all VA hospitals amounts to $2½ billion and that the sums approved by the Bureau of the Budget for repairs, upkeep, and maintenance of a $2½-billion investment represents an extremely low minimum. The VA requested $20 million of the Bureau of the Budget for this year for this purpose, but these funds were denied by the Budget Bureau. The committee, as indicated, has increased this item by $16,185,000, making a total for this purpose—repairs, alterations, improvements, and modernization of hospitals and domiciliary facilities—$30 million.

The Veterans' Administration maintains at the present time nine old Army cantonment-type hospitals which have been described as firetraps, and all of these temporary hospitals are included in the VA long-range plan for replacement. Administrator Higley has estimated that the cost of this program would run about $175 million. In view of the huge investment in VA hospitals, the number of cantonment-type hospitals that are in need of replacement and the extensive repair and modernization program which is planned, but has been repeatedly delayed, I feel that the amount appropriated for this purpose is more than justified and that additional funds will of necessity have to be forthcoming when the VA gets this program fully under way.

This action was taken after careful and due consideration of the urgent need for increased bed capacity for all types of VA hospitals, including hospitals for care of neuropsychiatric patients, such as the veterans' facility at Murfreesboro, Tenn., where an excellent job is being done for veterans under restrictions of inadequate funds for needed expansion.

I want to repeat that it is my view that the committee has brought a meritorious bill to the floor, and I trust and urge that the Members affirm the work of the committee and its recommendations and pass the bill as written.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I have a brief question for the purposes of clarification. I note that the committee increased the appropriation over the budget request for restoring buildings that have been destroyed and building new facilities and hospitals. We have in my district the need for a hospital to replace one which was destroyed by a disastrous fire in June. With this additional amount, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me whether or not it is broad enough to cover situations of that kind where there was not enough time to get it up in the budget request.

Mr. EVINS. Yes, I would say to the gentleman that the $30 million approved for modernization, repair, alteration, and improvement of existing facilities might be used for replacement of a partially destroyed VA hospital, such as the North Little Rock facility in which you are interested.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. This is to replace one which was destroyed by fire.

Mr. EVINS. I should think the same funds could be used for that purpose if the facility is not considered as a new hospital plan or proposal. I shall add that there are no funds in this bill for construction of new hospitals.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would like to go along with the others in congratulating the committee for taking the long-range progressive viewpoint that it did in adding this $15 million plus to the budget for the purpose of remodeling and improving the existing hospital facilities that we have. Certainly these funds are needed.

In the hearings the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs repeatedly referred to the need for relacing several of the old cantonment type of hospitals which are still being used by the Veterans' Administration, most of which were given to them by the services at the end of the war. Mr. Higley said, and I quote:

> Not only are they difficult to operate but they are expensive and they are firetraps, and we have spent a lot of money trying to get away from fire hazards.

I happen to know from my own personal experience, having been a patient in one of those cantonment-type hospitals for 3 months in 1952, that Mr. Higley knows whereof he speaks. The Jackson (Miss.) Veterans' Hospital is one of those cantonment-type hospitals and, naturally, I feel very much interested in what may happen in the future.

As I understood your explanation of these additional funds a few moments ago, this money will not be used to initiate construction or planning for any of these replacement hospitals?

Mr. EVINS. There are no funds in this appropriation for construction of new veterans' hospitals. The $30 million recommended in this bill by the committee is for repair, alteration, and modernization of existing Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary facilities.

I should add that Administrator Higley testified that there are nine old can-

tonment-type hospitals throughout the Nation, of which the one in the gentleman's district is included, in need of replacement. It is planned to bring in a program for replacing these nine old firetrap hospitals at an early date. The committee has urged that the VA come forward with such recommendations at an early date. The work of our committee and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will cause the Administrator, I feel, to move a little more rapidly in this direction.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend this committee on its action with regard to the hospital and domiciliary facilities in adding $16,185,000 to that aspect of this appropriation bill. I think in doing so they acted not only wisely but of necessity.

I find in the report on page 15 that they found, as the gentleman who just spoke stated:

> The Administrator testified that the Veterans' Administration was currently making a survey of the hospital facilities to determine what hospitals should be replaced and which hospitals need extensive modernization. The results of the surveys are already startling.

To me that is very understandable, because I come from the State of Florida, in which we have an influx of over 100,000 people a year and approximately 200,000 veterans in the last 10 years. It is expected that our State will have the second largest influx of people of any State within the next 10 years. That is particularly of importance in my district, in that our hospital situation is as follows, which I think points up emphatically how important this appropriation is:

At the VA Center, Bay Pines, Fla., we have a facility with 599 beds. There are 594 veterans whose eligibility have been established or whose eligibility establishment is pending; 594 who are unable to get into this hospital facility. It is believed that the modernization program of this hospital will increase the operative capacity alone by some 50 percent.

Unlike the gentleman from the State of Georgia who just spoke whose hospital is in Dublin, we are in the situation where we have too small a hospital for too large a number of patients for the facility, whereas he has too large a hospital and too few veterans. It is not a question of transferring veteran patients because they come to the State of Florida on account of the excellent weather and climatic advantages to them, and which is needed for their health and which they can get only in Florida. Therefore, improved facilities are needed in Florida and the Bay Pines Hospital in my district is the largest facility with the largest waiting list.

I have hopes that some of this additional appropriation will be made available to this facility, it being high on the priority list for improvements in the amount of $1,273,900.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year as a member of this important Subcommittee on Independent Offices and I want to say at the outset that it has been an extreme and an interesting pleasure to associate myself with the members of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the others.

As the Members of the House know, the Independent Offices Subcommittee deals with the appropriations of many agencies of our Government. It was an extremely interesting privilege to listen to and discuss with the representatives of these agencies their needs and problems. There is much that might be said about this important bill and this important report of the subcommittee. I want to take a moment to allude to a reference in the report under the section relating to the Federal Power Commission about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] spoke earlier in the debate. He referred to the relationship of the appropriation for the Federal Power Commission to the International Joint Commission and to our United States representative from the Federal Power Commission on this international body. I am happy that the report makes reference to the need for continuing representation on the part of the United States from the Power Commission of a person who is not only interested and concerned but also one who will exercise real vigilance in the protection of the properties of the people of the United States along the international waters of the Great Lakes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wish the gentleman would turn to page 28 under the heading "Veterans' Administration" and refer to the $300,000 available to the President for special study of compensation and pension programs. I wonder if the gentleman does not believe that such studies should be by the legislative branch and not the executive, and if he does not think this is possibly subject to the charge of bypassing the legislative branch?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would be happy to yield to our distinguished chairman to respond to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. We had a budget request for this language. In years gone by all Chief Executives have done that. The gentleman asks whether it is legislation. The answer is, "Yes, it is."

Mr. PATMAN. I expect, of course, to make a point of order against it and I hope it is sustained.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Whatever recommendations are made by that committee will come to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Since January our committee has been making an investigation of compensation and pensions. We expect to continue. I think there is a lot of work that needs to be done on veterans' problems. The committee is investigating and expects to continue.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I commend the gentleman on the job he is doing in this field. I am confident that the results will be beneficial to all including the veteran.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee expired before I could ask him the same question. In his remarks he made a point of the fact that this is the first time in a number of years that the complete request which had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the VA had been granted as far as hospitalization and other features of the veterans' program were concerned. Yet last year I was on the Appropriations Committee and at that time it seemed to me that we had granted more funds than were requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget in the appropriation bill last year.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I respond to the gentleman by saying it is my understanding that the Congress and the committee reported and appropriated more money during each of the past 2 years than was requested by the Bureau of the Budget for veterans' hospitalization and medical-care programs. As to this year, the budget request, I believe, amounted to $4,452,000,000, an increase of some $257 million, and, in addition to that, the committee has increased the amount by some $10 million. Therefore, there is a substantial increase given this year over that approved by the budget and requested by the administration. And I repeat that increases were made on each of the past 2 years.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on housing?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I would like to inquire with reference to the appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, if there is any consideration given with reference to the bottleneck that has developed in a number of the offices and the great backlog of work. Was there any provision for additional offices?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has the answer to that question at his fingertips.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the gentleman that certainly he has a very urgent problem in his own area and the committee in an effort to recognize and get that problem behind us has increased that appropriation to the district offices so that they can process applications to the tune of $7 million more than they had last year. We think that will cut down that backlog to the point where it should be.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek enlightenment and make some comments

upon one item in the bill before us, that is the proposed appropriation for administrative expense of the Federal Housing Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I have read the report of the committee and it appears this item is recommended for some increase over the current appropriation, but that the amount proposed is less than that requested by FHA. I also note that the committee finds the administrative expense of FHA unduly high in comparison with similar costs incurred by the Veterans' Administration in processing veterans' home loans.

Now, I have received many complaints from my district, and particularly from the metropolitan area of Fresno, Calif., about the delays occurring in processing FHA insured loans. I personally know of instances in which valid, approved applications have been delayed up to 7 or 8 months in approval of reinsurance. My people are demanding that a district insurance office be established in Fresno to try to cut down these delays which are causing large and unnecessary losses and are depriving people of homes. I understand this backlog of uncompleted cases bottlenecked in FHA insuring offices is general throughout the country.

I have examined the transcript of hearings on these appropriations before the committee and I have been unable to find that this bottleneck in the FHA program was discussed before the committee, or that any facts and figures on the magnitude of the problem were sought from the FHA representatives before the committee.

I would like to ask the committee what its information is on this subject and whether or not the appropriation here recommended is sufficient to permit establishment of district insuring offices in areas where the volume of business and the existing backlogs indicate the urgent necessity of faster action.

I would further like to serve notice that I intend to ask the FHA for such an office in Fresno, Calif., and that I sincerely hope that the Administrator of FHA will take to heart the committee's suggestion that he find means of reducing administrative expense so that the appropriation allowed will permit establishment of such additional offices as may be needed to service these applications promptly and without continued hardship and inconvenience to the people.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. There are some 228 applicants for admission to the hospital at Fort Root, Ark. Is it the gentleman's opinion that this item is broad enough to cover replacement and occupational rehabilitation at that point?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] would like to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. The budget estimate for major repairs to these 172 institutions of the Veterans' Administration was $13,815,000. The committee, recognizing the need for that hospital in the gentleman's district and the need for hospitals in districts of the other Members, went above the budget to a total of $30 million. So there are funds in there. I understand the gentleman's project is high on the priority list. I hope the Veterans' Administration will get busy and put the institution in the shape it ought to be in.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss one more subject included in this bill and report and I refer to the civil-defense program. I have a suggested amendment which I shall offer for the purpose of making clear that the money in this bill is available for training and education purposes in the use of the monitoring and detection devices so essential to the radiological problems of today and the radioactive fallout. I shall discuss this matter at the time I offer the amendment when we reach that point in the bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to ask the gentleman if he has determined whether or not a specific situation in Michigan can be handled in the funds allowed for the VA in this bill. We have the Dearborn facility, in Dearborn, Mich., that has several hundred vacant beds at the present time. We are interested in trying to use these beds for psychiatric cases where we have a shortage of beds. I wonder if the survey found that this would be feasible and that there are sufficient funds to handle that situation.

Mr. OSTERTAG. It is my understanding that funds are available for this purpose and the survey is under way. I am confident the transfers can be made. The whole purpose of these studies and these surveys is to obtain a proper balance and utilization of the facilities in existence.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I assume the committee would look favorably on that, and in the event there were not sufficient funds, that they would be forthcoming.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I do not propose to answer for the committee or the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to express my convictions that have been developed as a result of my new experience of service on the Committee on Appropriations and specifically the Independent Offices Subcommittee. When I came here 2 years ago I marveled at the ability of those serving on the Committee on Appropriations and wondered how they developed the information and the knowledge that they possessed in relation to the departmental budgetary requests. In my experience this year I learned how they have developed that knowledge. It has been a distinct pleasure for me as a second-term Member to serve on this committee and to watch and learn as the gentleman from Texas, Chairman THOMAS, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] handled the budget requests for fiscal 1956.

Mr. Chairman, this is a committee that spends some $6 billion and it deals with some 16 agencies of our Government, agencies that reach in and touch practically every facet of life in the Nation. So, it is well that this Congress have men who are informed as to what these agencies need and what is sometimes more important, what they do not need. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the ranking minority Member from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] who have served on this committee with such great distinction over the years and who have been of great assistance to us, the new Members who now serve on that committee.

I want to congratulate my chairman [Mr. THOMAS] and I think I speak for all the members of this committee and, I believe I speak for all the Members of this House, when I say that he is a great chairman. How does one become a great chairman and a valuable member of this committee? By hard, painstaking work—taking home the agency justifications and sitting for hours studying the requests. That is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] have done and continue to do. The membership of this House can be proud of the service they have given and are giving to this Nation.

I am happy to be associated with them and with Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee; Mr. VURSELL, of Illinois; and Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York, all new members of this subcommittee who also have given outstanding service during the hearings of this committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have earlier spoken on the floor of the House of some of the benefits that will result from the use of additional funds for improvement of hospital and domiciliary facilities at veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation. I would take this opportunity to further point out some of the advantages to be received by this action, and, what is more important, some of the benefits in service to be directly received by worthy veterans in my area of the State of Florida at the VA center at Bay Pines.

Recommendations before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would, by improvement of present facilities and without extensive building additions, would provide better professional services to the patients now being treated at the Bay Pines facility and would result further in more effective and economical use of employees. Recommended improvement of the surgical facilities would increase operative capacity by nearly 50 percent and would add to the roentgenological service and permit treatment of postoperative cases without transfer to other facilities at further expense and

inconvenience to the veteran. This speedup and betterment of operative conditions is most important whereas many or more veterans are awaiting admittance to this 599-bed hospital as are under care. I see no better dollar investment for the Government than this increase in use of present facilities.

The amount of the additional and urgently needed improvements requested for Bay Pines is $1,273,900. Of the additional amount of $16,185,000 recommended in the appropriation bill presented today, this is relatively small when consideration is given to the ratio of resident veterans per bed available in Florida, which is 309 to 1, as compared to the national average of 185 to 1. This needed improvement in a vigorously growing area of our Nation is most imperative.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Civil Service Commission shall not impose a requirement or limitation of maximum age with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive service who are otherwise qualified: *Provided*, That no person who has reached his 70th birthday shall be appointed in the competitive civil service on other than a temporary basis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the language on page 4, line 6 to line 12 inclusive, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this point of order against certain provisions in title 1 relating to the Civil Service Commission because it contains legislation in an appropriation act. Under this legislative directive contained in the appropriation act you would prohibit the Civil Service Commission from imposing any requirement or limitation of maximum age whatsoever with respect to the appointment of persons in competitive Civil Service.

In making this point of order, I emphasize that I do not disagree with the Federal Government establishing a firm policy for the employment of older persons. I do, however, emphasize that our committee, which through past years has demonstrated that they have an interest in furthering the policy of employing our older citizens, be provided with any information which would indicate that such a policy was not being followed out in the Federal Government.

It is well recognized that the proportion of older persons in our population is increasing, and I fully agree with the House Appropriations Committee that the Federal Government as an employer should set an example in hiring older workers wherever they can be effectively employed.

Actually I believe our Federal service has a good record in employing older workers. After Public Law 455 was approved in 1952, the Civil Service Commission made a thorough review of existing age limits in the competitive service. Before this time, there was generally a maximum age limit of 62 years, with many lower limits set in specific cases. As a result of the Commission's review of Public Law 455, this general 62-year limit was abolished. Instead the Commission published a list of specific age limits for certain jobs after a careful review of the facts in each case. The Commission urged all Federal agencies to hire older workers for appropriate jobs and set up special regulations for hiring workers over the age of 70 for one year renewable appointments.

While I firmly believe that older workers should be encouraged to work in appropriate Federal jobs, I also believe that certain types of Government work require younger persons.

A good example is the job of aeronautical research pilot in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. These pilots make test flights under experimental conditions where quick reaction time is essential. The Commission has set an age limit of 33, not waived for veterans, for the lower grades in this occupation and a limit of 40 years for the higher grades. Certainly you would be doing no favor to an older man in letting him accept the risks of this highly dangerous occupation.

Federal law enforcement positions likewise require fairly young and aggressive men. I can think of two examples: First, the immigration patrol inspector who guards our borders in every kind of weather under the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice. In this case the Commission has set a maximum age limit of 31 for nonveterans and 35 years for veterans for entrance into these jobs. It seems to me that these are very reasonable limits for this difficult and sometimes dangerous work. Records going back over the years show the hazards to which this fine group of public servants is exposed. In the interest of the man himself, as well as in the interest of the Government, we should provide for realistic age limits for these types of jobs.

Second, I am thinking of jobs like the various types of criminal investigators in the Treasury Department—the T-men of the Secret Service, the Bureau of Narcotics, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Customs Service. These are arduous and hazardous law-enforcement jobs. The Government's interest requires that they be filled with men who are fit to withstand physical encounter with public enemies. For these jobs the Commission has set an age limit of 40 years, not waived for veterans. When we compare this with typical age limits for city and State police or patrol jobs, I believe this limit is entirely reasonable.

The need for young, active men in these law-enforcement types of jobs has already been recognized by the Congress when it approved a retirement age of 50 after 20 years of service.

Another type of Federal job requiring a definite age limit is that of correctional officer in the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice. We do not have to see any lurid movies to realize the type of situation these men are up against. Without arms of any kind they mingle freely among hundreds of hardened criminals. In this case the Civil Service Commission has approved a maximum age limit of 45 years for both veterans and nonveterans. This seems like a defensible age limit in view of the active and hazardous nature of the work.

Everybody recognizes that a man must serve an apprenticeship or 3 or 4 years before learning the work of a skilled trade. To the Government agency or to the industry involved, this means an investment of several thousand dollars in the individual apprentice. This expenditure cannot be justified unless the Government can expect that the trained journeyman will return that investment through long years of service. An agency which accepts a man of 60 for a 4-year apprenticeship cannot expect to receive an adequate return on its training funds.

Recognizing this, many unions themselves have set low age limits for apprentices in industry. For example, the National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, in preparing standards for candidates for electrical apprenticeship, established a maximum age limit of 24 years. When the Federal Government sets up extended apprenticeship programs, it should protect its investment by similar age limits.

In some professional occupations, the duties of positions at the entrance level are of a preparatory nature and involve intensive training over a period of 2 to 3 years before the employee can perform at the full professional level. Typically, junior scientific, professional, and administrative jobs are in this category. You are hiring someone not as an immediate producer as you would hire a typist, but rather someone whom you can carefully train for advancement to higher grade work over a period of years. I believe it is reasonable for the Civil Service Commission to set age limits for such jobs if it is convinced that an effective training program exists. In this way the Government's investment in training can be returned through long years of service.

These types of age limits apply to trainee jobs only, and do not keep older workers from getting appointments at higher grades in their professions. The Federal service has a long tradition of welcoming the entry of workers from State and local government, the universities, and private industry at jobs above the entrance level. This is a fine tradition which is not endangered by setting reasonable age limits for trainee jobs. Therefore it seems to me that entrance age limits for these types of jobs are desirable and necessary, and that we should not take away the discretion of the executive branch in this matter.

In the Veterans' Preference Act Congress has prohibited age restrictions for jobs. But there must be exceptions to even this, by necessity.

In conclusion, I do not automatically support every age limit set by the Commission under Public Law 455, but I do feel that the executive branch should continue to have the power to set age

limits where the nature of the work requires it. To deny this power is to weaken our Federal competitive service at a crucial time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say that our distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. REES] is usually right. This is legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman defer his point of order?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, I shall not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. In the opinion of the Chair, the language is legislation on an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergency supplies and equipment: For procurement of reserve stocks of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, $30 million.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OSTERTAG: Page 8, line 4, after "Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended," insert the following: "and for procurement of radiological instruments and detection devices by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator and for distribution of such instruments and devices to the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States, by loan or grant, for training and educational purposes, under such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall prescribe."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I should like to propound a question to the gentleman.

What is the purpose of this amendment, may I ask my colleague, who is a member of the committee?

Mr. OSTERTAG. The purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that these funds may be used by the Civil Defense Administrator in his discretion to expedite protection of the civilian population against the deadly peril of the radioactive fallout. Already they have the so-called detection and monitoring devices which require considerable training and education before they can be used. As I understand, the Civil Defense Administration has already on hand several thousand of these monitoring and detection devices. The purpose of the amendment is to authorize the distribution of such devices for detection and training purposes only.

Mr. THOMAS. I dislike to do what I am doing now. May I remind my colleague that there is pending a supplemental appropriation of $12 million to this agency. What is in the supplemental we do not know because it has not been submitted to the House. May I make this observation. If there is no objection to the language, and if we study it further, and it goes to the Senate, and the language then appears to be objectionable, is the gentleman willing to take it out in conference?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Exactly. I am merely trying to expedite the solution of a new problem that has developed here in connection with our civil defense activities in the utilization of these detection and monitoring devices, because education and training in connection with the use of them is very vital.

Mr. Chairman, as I previously stated, the Civil Defense Administration already has on hand certain radiological detection and monitoring devices, to determine the presence, intensity, and duration of fallout. The CDA expects to acquire more as they are tested and perfected. The Administration is now developing machinery through which these instruments can be placed in the hands of civil-defense leaders for education and training purposes, so that information and knowledge which may be essential to the Nation's survival can be disseminated by orderly processes throughout the population at top speed. This amendment will insure that the funds provided under this section may be used for this laudable purpose as the need arises and under such conditions as the Administrator deems necessary and wise.

Mr. THOMAS. We do not want to hurt anything, but still we do not want to do anything when we do not know exactly what we are doing, and frankly we do not know what we are doing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, we have no objection to it on this side. We feel that what the gentleman from New York is trying to do is correct. However, as the gentleman from Texas says, this has more in it than may be reviewed at the present time. If the understanding between us is as stated by the gentleman from Texas, we think that is the proper solution.

Mr. THOMAS. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, civilian defense has two purposes: First preservation of life; second, continuity of production.

The primary purpose for military expenditures is the preservation of the life and liberties of our citizens. Since the end of World War II—fiscal years 1946–55—$313,010,000,000 have been spent in the military field, but less than $244,610,000—fiscal year 1951 through fiscal year 1955—has been spent in the civilian-defense field.

Reevaluation of our problem of national defense must be made in view of scientific and technological advances since the end of World War II. Two principal developments should concern us: (a) Drastic reduction of the factor of space in relation to time; (b) increase in weapon power.

At the end of World War II, our fastest bomber-plane speed was 250 miles per hour. Our fastest fighter-plane speed was 400 miles per hour.

Today our jet bombers attain speeds in excess of 600 miles per hour. Speeds in excess of the speed of sound—760 miles per hour—are known to be possessed by fighter planes.

Transocean flight, with or without refueling, coupled with near or supersonic speed, changes many facets of offense and defense as practiced in World War II.

The increase in weapon power has been much greater than the change in the time and space factor. This increase has been so great that even the revealed degree of increase, challenges credulity.

The 2,000-ton TNT blockbuster has been replaced by atomic-hydrogen bombs which release TNT power in the range of millions of tons. Blockbusters have been replaced by city vaporizers.

Cities, such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, and Washington, D. C., are today vulnerable to complete paralysis and possibly to complete elimination as a residential and industrial factor in a future war, by the explosion of 1 or, in some instances, possibly 2 of these terrible atomic-hydrogen bombs.

The use, by an aggressor, of supersonic speed in delivery of these powerful weapons, makes previous concepts of national defense obsolete.

National defense against attack becomes so difficult therefore, that many people, believing it impossible, become apathetic or fatalistic.

Certainly, no one can, at this time, suggest a complete or pat solution. But a challenge for survival to our citizens and free institutions cannot be met with folded hands.

To surrender without a struggle would prove us unworthy of life and liberty.

Therefore, we must face up to this new and terrible challenge which science and industrial techniques have spawned. The cost in dollars or human effort, whatever it may be, will be less than the value of life or the penalties of slavery.

We must understand the problem before we can discuss possible solutions.

National defense in the atomic-hydrogen age requires a total effort on the part of all citizens to a degree never before contemplated. There can be no front line and protected rear area, as in the past. The citizen in an industrial area is as liable to be in a military target as the military enlistee on a military installation.

National defense, therefore, means total defense and will require total, or near total, participation if we are to survive.

Our military experts have listed 74 critical target areas in the United States for possible enemy attack. These target areas are our first priority civilian defense problems, although there are others of a secondary nature (approximately 154). These target areas in most instances are zones which transgress single city, county, and sometimes State lines. The concept of our civilian-defense law of 1950, which placed financial responsibility on local political subdivisions, and on voluntary participation of citizens, is now inadequate and obsolete.

The increase in weapon effect, which can jeopardize life in an area as large as 8,000 square miles, places responsibility undeniably on the Federal level.

To rely on voluntary participation of citizens is unrealistic, foolhardy, and can but endanger our chance of national, as well as individual, survival. No one de-

plores this necessity for further regimentation more than your speaker. I see no alternative when faced with the hazards of atomic-hydrogen attack.

If we willingly submit to police, fire, and sanitation laws in the interest of the common welfare, certainly it is not unreasonable to face the necessity for compulsory participation in civilian defense and compliance with such local and Federal laws deemed by our democratic lawmaking bodies to be necessary for personal and national survival.

The production of goods for civilian and military use in wartime must continue and, in fact, be accelerated, if civilians live, if war is to be waged and victory won.

In the atomic-hydrogen age of total war—including attack on civilian areas—this seems difficult, if not impossible. But if we are to survive, difficulties must be overcome and the seemingly impossible must be made possible.

When we contemplate solutions, we are appalled by the costs involved. But the cost of war is appalling also, and the cost in terms of lives, property, and liberty of a defeated and subjugated nation defies computation. We, therefore, must assume the cost, high though it may be, of survival.

I note herewith six basic principles of procedure toward the goal of a realistic civilian defense:

(a) Dispersal of key industries for vital civilian services and military production is imperative.

(b) Critical bottlenecks in transportation must be eliminated to prevent paralysis in the transportation of goods and people.

(c) Sensible evacuation plans, within available warning-time, must be rapidly consumated.

(d) A comprehensive program of shelter and care for evacuees must be established.

(e) A frank and complete educational program for every citizen on the whole subject of weapon effects and his individual duties and responsibilities, in case of attack.

(f) An integrated program of Federal and local legislation to insure participation and enforce compliance with master plans of civilian defense in each target area.

No attempt has been made to work out in detail the complex of problems which faces our Nation in this day when our survival is threatened. If the problem is faced honestly, I have no doubt that the ingenuity and productivity of our people will find the answers.

We must have leadership at the highest level, and a vigorous attack on the problem of those responsible for the preservation of our Nation.

Only the President can give that leadership. Only the President can give to our people the sense of urgency necessary to secure the support of public opinion. Only the President can break the log jam of public confusion and indifference on the part of an uninformed populace. Only the President can approve a realistic program of civilian defense.

The Congress has a responsibility too, which, I regret to say, has not been discharged. The national welfare and defense is part of the congressional area of responsibility. Particularly, in my opinion, is this responsibility resting on the Committees on Armed Services, Atomic Energy and Government Operations. This responsibility is peculiarly theirs because of their access to classified information on weapon effects and their legislative responsibility.

Two other important principles must be accepted, in my opinion, if we are to have a realistic plan of civilian defense, which will receive public approval and implementation.

The first principle is the acceptance, by the Federal Government, of the primary responsibility for direction and financing. Civilian defense is just as important as military defense in the interest of national survival in the atomic-hydrogen age. The expense of civilian defense must be borne as a Federal responsibility, the same as our military expense, because of this identity of purpose.

The second principle is the acceptance of the need for universal participation, on the part of all citizens, under the compulsion of legal requirement, through Federal and local law and ordinance.

Unless we face up to these realities of the hazards of the atomic-hydrogen age, we are living in a fool's paradise and we are gambling with our national survival.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed 12 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $169,325 for expenses of travel; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency; and the salary of a general counsel, but not in addition to staff otherwise authorized, which shall hereafter be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent; $4,300,000: *Provided*, That the clause under this head in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955," relating to the Administrator's general supervision and coordination responsibilities, is amended to read as follows: "and the Administrator's general supervision and coordination responsibilities under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 shall hereafter carry full authority, where applicable, to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency": *Provided further*, That necessary expenses of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 459), shall be compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $700,000: *Provided further*, That no funds available to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its constituent agencies shall be available for any advance, loan, contract for a capital grant, or contract for annual contributions, under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1452, 1453), under sections 314, 701, and 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 (Public Law 560, approved August 2, 1954), under section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 459), under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1749), or under sections 9 and 10 of the Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1409, 1410), unless any such proposed advance, loan, contract for a capital grant, or contract for annual contributions is approved by the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 20 of the bill at line 18 running through line 1, on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the proviso beginning on page 20 of H. R. 5240 at line 18 and running through line 1, on page 21, as follows: "*Provided*, That the clause under this head in the 'Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955,' relating to the Administrator's general supervision and coordination responsibilities, is amended to read as follows: 'and the Administrator's general supervision and coordination responsibilities under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947 shall hereafter carry full authority, where applicable, to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency,'" is legislation on an appropriation bill in that—

First. It changes existing law—see House Report No. 304, page 17—by amending permanent legislation enacted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, and by amending Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947.

Second. It imposes new duties on an administrative official.

The proposed language is ambiguous. The powers and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be changed, but it is not clear what the nature or extent of the change would be. There has been no study of this language, no hearings, and no statement is now before the Congress as to the purpose of the proposed proviso.

If the administration has changes to propose in the organization of the Housing Agency, the President may send up a reorganization plan or, more properly, suggest a bill dealing with the subject. To date he has not indicated that he intends to ask for any change.

If Members of Congress wish to sponsor changes in the organization of the Housing Agency or other departments or agencies, they should introduce legislation for appropriate reference to the Committee on Government Operations where the matter could be studied in an orderly fashion and acted upon after

hearings and proper consideration. Any recommendation that might result would then be laid before the House with a report and an adequate statement of its nature and purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard to make a brief statement. The point of order made by the gentleman from Michigan is valid. If he insists on it, we will have to admit that the point of order is good. May I point out to the gentleman from Michigan, however, that this language was carried in the bill last year and no point of order was made against it. May I tell my distinguished friend that what this language does is to really limit the language which was in the bill last year. Last year the language gave to the Administrator authority to virtually reorganize four agencies and to reallocate the functions of those agencies and to reallocate funds appropriated by the Congress. We think, perhaps, we went too far and gave him too much authority last year. What this language does this year is to rescind some of the authority which was given to him. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if they want to change it, the President can send up a reorganization plan or somebody can introduce a bill. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RAINS). The Chair is ready to rule. Obviously, the language against which the point of order is made is legislation upon an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the words *"Provided further"* on page 21 and continuing through the balance of that page down through and including line 12 on page 22, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $89,500 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $150 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $12,250,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Amend the item relating to National Science Foundation by deleting "$12,250,000" in line 17 of page 25 and substituting therefor "$15 million."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that the conflict in which we are now engaged will be won in the field of science. In that field, the Soviet is outstripping us. You only have to read the testimony at the public hearings on this bill to grasp the seriousness of the situation. Thanks to the scientists of the United States and to the tremendous job done by the National Science Foundation, we have made an advance in basic science that is unparalleled. Now when the Soviet is forging ahead, it is proposed that we drag our feet.

I was surprised to find that this distinguished committee, for which I have the greatest respect, placed the appropriation for the National Science Foundation at the same figure as last year, and over $7 million below the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

I am appealing to your commonsense in this matter. Whoever wins the war of science wins the cold war. To assure the kind of world we wish for ourselves and our children, the best investment we can make of American dollars is here. May I point out to you a few of the contributions that basic science has made, functioning through the National Science Foundation, in the year 1953, as given in Fortune magazine. One was the discovery of a vaccine for polio. Do you want to curtail that work? One was the discovery that has made one of the greatest advances in finding a remedy for cancer. Do you want to curtail that work? From the National Science Foundation have come many other contributions to medicine, to agriculture, to industry, to national strength and security.

At this time, when we are spending countless millions and billions of dollars in the purchase of weapons of arms and in the maintenance of Armed Forces, we are giving the National Science Foundation an appropriation of a little more than $12 million. In the race of science, the outcome of which will determine the kind of world we are to live in, we look the other way. We give our millions to the winds and what is left over of our pennies we give to the scientists who later will be asked to find some way of harnessing the winds. It is the economy of suicide.

I trust that the good commonsense of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this modest amendment of mine increasing by only $2½ million the National Science Foundation appropriation. Even with this addition the appropriation would be almost $5 million less than the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is in deep sympathy with the very fundamental question that our distinguished friend from Illinois has raised, but I think I can say with every degree of sincerity and accuracy that there is not a subcommittee in this House that is more favorable toward basic research than the group here today.

There are numerous instances in this bill where money is provided for basic research.

The National Science Foundation is only 3 or 4 years of age. They started out with a million and a half, are now up to $12¼ million. They want to go to $20 million. They have 178 employees. Their job is to do 2 things and 2 things only. They cannot operate a laboratory themselves; they have no authority to tell any agency of the Government what to do or what not to do. The only authority they have is to do two things: First, to hand out money to our great universities for scientific investigations and research programs—and we think that is a grand thing, for this Government is spending about $2.2 billion this year for scientific investigation and research in prototype development, and this is just a small part of it, every agency in the Government is doing it.

The second function of this organization is to hand out stipends to seven or eight hundred students, ranging from $1,400 to $3,400, to take postgraduate doctorial degrees in basic research in our great universities. That is fine, but we do not think the agency ought to go as fast as it is going.

There are 159 universities in the program, and some of them have 3, 4 and up to a dozen contracts. If time permitted I could read you more than 125 contracts in over 150 institutions dealing with biology alone this year.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be defeated.

We have let this institution grow probably much faster than it should have. We should not let them go heels over head and break their own neck doing some of the foolish things they may do if we do not give them just a little supervision.

I hope this amendment is defeated. We have given them more money in the pending bill than they can wisely spend and digest for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $500 for the purchase of newspapers; not to exceed $125,000 for expenses of travel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $4,875,000.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona: On page 26, line 12, strike out "$125,000" and insert "$138,360."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and the amend-

ment which will follow, deals with the Securities and Exchange Commission. The committee saw fit to increase the appropriation to the Securities and Exchange Commission $125,000 over the apropriation for the last fiscal year. Practically all of this money which will be appropriated is to be used to procure personnel in the field offices.

The importance of the Securities and Exchange Commission has been pointed up in the last few months more than I find it necessary or desirable to point it up right now. Suffice it to say that we have in the past few months in this country had a rampant bull stock market. We have had various investigations by a committee of the other body, which, more than anything else, pointed up the fact that if it had not been for this particular agency there may have been a situation arise which could have gotten out of hand and might have been injurious to the country. The work of this agency in preserving the sanity of investors is of incalculable aid to our country and its economy.

The information which I have received is that the employees to be hired through this increased appropriation mainly will go to the field offices. The Denver office and the San Francisco office will be given most of these employees. The territory covered by these offices comprise most of the western half of the United States.

There have been tremendous developments in the field of uranium and other metals and materials in that part of the country and an attendant development in the sale and offer for sale of stocks and bonds by such industries. It becomes absolutely necessary then for these field employees to get out in the country and to find out exactly what makes these various stocks tick; in other words, to find out whether the public will probably get value received for the dollars invested and whether the prospectuses and the materials submitted therewith are accurate. They cannot make such determinations by sitting in their offices.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does something which the committee has failed to do, perhaps through inadvertence. The bill provides that the travel expenses of the SEC will be only $125,000 per year. The appropriation bill for the last fiscal year provided the same amount, $125,000. Due to the fact that these additional employees will be in the field offices and must travel, it seems to me that we should raise the limitations on travel by the amount which I have suggested, that is, by the amount of $13,360.

I am informed that practically all of the travel performed by employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission is by employees of the field offices, not by people from Washington. So this money will be used to perform what I consider to be a very necessary part of the vital functions of this Commission.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman propose to increase the total amount of the appropriation, or is this simply an increase in the permissive amount which may be spent for travel?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If my amendment is adopted, naturally I expect the total amount to be increased. I have another amendment which I shall offer which does increase the total amount that will coincide with the amendments I have offered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to have 3 minutes on my other amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right with me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to increase the travel allowance by $13,000. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman has in mind. He is trying to take care of the problems in his own district, and I commend him for that. I think he is certainly within his rights, and I admire him for it. But, after all, there is not an agency of this Government that does not travel at least 25 percent more than is absolutely necessary. I do not think anybody will disagree with that. You get on an airplane or a train, and you will find a big percentage of the people on the train are Government employees. I wonder if the gentleman could explain, or does he know, how this additional $13,000 would be allocated. It is not needed. The Denver office is set up for the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the committee has directed them not to put on any more employees in the District of Columbia office but to put them in the field where they are needed. The big offices are in San Francisco, Chicago, and New York, and now Denver has a great office. It is an office in which there is activity in uranium, but they can cut out just a few little, unnecessary trips out of Chicago and New York and some of the other big offices and certainly get the job done in our distinguished friend's district. This money is not necessary, and I hope the amendment is disapproved. I have the highest regard for our friend, and I know what he is aiming at, but I think we will get this job done without this increase in money, and we will help you to take care of your immediate problem, which is a very sizable one, we know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Arizona: On page 26, line 14, strike out "$4,875,000" and insert "$4,955,000."

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment involving the Securities and Exchange Commission, and I will be very brief on this one because I think that the matter is a rather obvious one.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, like many other administrative bodies, makes quasi-judicial decisions. It prints these decisions as opinions. The opinions of the Securities and Exchange Commission have not been printed and bound and compiled since 1949. It becomes very difficult, not only for the members of the Commission and its field officers but for the average attorney practicing law to determine anything as to the judge-made law under which the Securities and Exchange Commission is operating.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of us were not here when these administrative bodies were created. A lot of us might have done a little bit differently, if we had been here, about creating them, but we did create them. They are part of the Federal Government. I think this particular Commission is doing a very fine job. The fact that we did create these commissions and endowed them with quasi judicial powers certainly impels one to believe that we also have the duty of making certain that the decisions arrived at by these boards and administrative tribunals are made available to those people in the United States who must read them, so that research may be conducted by the practitioner of law and the accountant and the other persons interested in this field. Presently it is impossible to do a scientific job of legal research on matters involving interpretations of the securities acts.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of making an announcement?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I desire to announce to the membership of the committee that the congressional leaders who have been at the White House are on their way back here. The Premier of Italy will arrive shortly, and I trust all of us will remain here to hear him and to pay him the respect that is due him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, our friend seeks to increase this appropriation by, if I understood him correctly, $80,000. The committee has already gone $125,000 above the amount the Commission had last year. What the gentleman seeks to do with this $80,000 is to enable the Commission to compile in one large volume all of these opinions that have already been printed and which can be purchased from the Printing Office. The money is there, and it is $125,000 above what they had last year. If they would rather spend the extra money in compiling this one large volume instead of putting on extra employees, they have that discretion.

This amendment ought to be voted down, because there is already more than $80,000 above what they had last year in the bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true, however, that the appropriation for this Commission is $122,000 below the budget estimate?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Still it is $125,000 more than they had last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations for the Selective Service System may be used for the destruction of records accumulated under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which are hereby authorized to be destroyed by the Director of Selective Service after compliance with the procedures for the destruction of records prescribed pursuant to the Records Disposal Act of 1943, as amended (44 U. S. C. 366-380): *Provided*, That no records may be transferred to any other agency without the approval of the Director of Selective Service.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the first 7 words in line 18, page 27, "which are hereby authorized to be destroyed" is legislation on an appropriation bill, because it authorizes the Director to destroy records.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the specific language to which the gentleman makes his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] desire to be heard on this point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we ask for the ruling of the Chair. We doubt that this is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard very briefly on that? Apparently the Chair feels this is legislation, but this follows the Records Disposal Act of 1943. Does it become legislation if it is a repetition of a statute?

The CHAIRMAN. Why is it necessary to have it if it is already in the law? The Chair thinks it is clearly legislation and sustains the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. How far did that go, Mr. Chairman? Did it go down to the end of that line?

The CHAIRMAN. The language is "which are hereby authorized to be destroyed." That is the language to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made his point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

General operating expenses: For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; purchase of 31 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $3,300 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $2,731,000 for expenses of travel of employees; $155 million, of which (a) $15,150,000 shall be available for such expenses as are necessary for the loan guaranty program, and (b) $300,000 shall be available as the President may direct for a special study of the compensation and pensions program: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 20 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language starting at the end of line 10, page 28, reading "$300,000 shall be available as the President may direct for a special study of the compensation and pensions program."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for my action is this. The President has a way, under the Constitution, of communicating with Congress, which he uses frequently. I do not think he should bypass Congress. I know that is not his real intention and not his purpose in this instance. But the result of this would be to bypass Congress. I think any recommendation the Executive has should be submitted to the legislative branch, to representatives of the people who are prepared to make an investigation and study. I understand the Committee on Veterans' Affairs under Chairman TEAGUE, is now conducting an investigation along this line, and I am sure that they will make a fair examination and study and make a comprehensive report. I do not believe the Executive should engage in that type of activity.

I have known over the years for points of order to be made in this way, and then when the bill goes to conference the other body insists on putting in the language, it does put it in, and then when the language comes back to this body it is not subject to a point of order. Therefore, it goes on through. I hope the chairman will not permit this language to go in the bill. I hope he remains adamant. In the event that he feels constrained to yield, I hope he will at least give the House an opportunity to have a direct vote on it before agreeing to put it back in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in order to complete the point of order, I ask unanimous consent that on page 28, line 10, the words "and (b)" be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the situation which exists here. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding. There is nothing new in this. The preceding President constantly carried on investigations of this nature. I do not recall any time in the last 8 years or in the 12 years preceding it that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] raised any objection. The investigations carried on by the Bureau of the Budget are exactly what is intended here. While I think the chairman is plainly correct in his ruling, nevertheless this could have been worded as simply a limitation upon the amount of money, because it is being done each year.

The point I want to make, and this is the important point, is that there seems to be a feeling on the floor that if an investigation is made of the compensation and pensions program this necessarily means to reduce compensation and pensions or to deprive veterans of compensation or pensions. This is not the fact. In the District of Columbia area a limited investigation carried on at the request of this subcommittee by the General Accounting Office proved a large number of veterans were not receiving the amount of money to which they were entitled due to arithmetical errors at the time the compensation was computed. There are also people who were getting compensation to which they were not entitled, although they might have been entitled in previous years. I think that was a very good inclusion, and it will probably have to be worked out through the Congress or through the Bureau of the Budget or through the Office of the President.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I will state to the gentleman that I have often criticised this method during the Democratic administration as well as during this administration. I think it is clearly wrong. I think the legislative body should resist any encroachment by the executive, just as the executive should resist any encroachment by the legislative.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to points of order and amendments at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4720. An act to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances.

## DESIGNATION OF COMMITTEE OF ESCORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort our distinguished guest into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN; the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD; and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. RODINO.

The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

## RECESS

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess the following occurred:

## VISIT OF THE HONORABLE MARIO SCELBA, PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY

The Doorkeeper announced the Honorable Mario Scelba, Prime Minister of Italy.

Mr. Scelba, escorted by the Committee of Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, I deem it a high privilege and a great honor to present to you the representative of a great and free people, and a friendly people, the Prime Minister of Italy. [Applause, the Members rising.]

## ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MARIO SCELBA, PRIME MINISTER OF ITALY

(The address delivered by the Prime Minister of Italy was interpreted as follows by Mr. A. José De Seabra, of the State Department:)

Mr. SCELBA. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House of Representatives, it is, indeed, an honor for me to come before the House of Representatives of your great Republic. Let me thank the Speaker for his greeting and his words. But my thanks go on behalf of my country toward the distinguished men of this House. The decisions taken here in these recent years have brought a notable contribution to our democracy and to our moral and material recovery.

I must confess I am moved as I stand in this place where so much has been said of Italy and so much has been done for Italy.

The American taxpayer has shouldered considerable burdens. For your political wisdom, your generosity, and your experience of history have urged you to identify the cause of freedom and welfare of European peoples with the interests of your country.

Our recovery is today an accomplished fact. We are now tackling the structural problems which are nature's legacy to our country. Their solution is our aim, but also the means essential if we are to consolidate democracy. Sacrifice and hard work will be required of us. They have always been the lot of our people, though this has not always been acknowledged. But history and our sense of responsibility point our course. For we know full well what fate would befall the civilized nations and, foremost among them, our country, if Italy lost her liberty. We know it full well and we can visualize it better than anybody else. From this knowledge spring our determination and our resolve to safeguard democracy and our freedom. [Applause.]

But we know that in safeguarding our freedom we safeguard the freedom of others. [Applause.] The fact that our friends show concern, and at times unjustified alarm, about our future proves how interdependent we are and how the weakness of one of us is a source of weakness, economic or military, for all the community.

Our interests, therefore, coincide. Let us unite and cooperate ever more closely. [Applause.] That is the very foundation of all our foreign policy for which stand the Atlantic alliance and the integration of Europe. Our community must be not only military but political and economic.

Good news has come to us from Europe. After our ratification of WEU, the first on the Continent, the European ideal is slowly materializing, Europe is in the making. Let us work without undue haste but without delay in order that century-old nationalisms be merged and integrated. [Applause.]

European political unity and economic unity, through creation of a single market with free movement of men and goods will strengthen the Atlantic system in its eastern reaches and will relieve America of its responsibilities and obligations in the democratic community. In so doing they will consolidate the security of all free peoples and will make for prosperity and peace.

I said the other day and wish to repeat that friendship between the United States and Italy is a constructive element in the achievement of our communiity aims. And this community is in turn one more link in the solid chain of our friendly relations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the Prime Minister will be glad to stand in the well of the House and greet the Members.

The Prime Minister of Italy stood in the well of the House and received Members of the House of Representatives.

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.

## PRIME MINISTER SCELBA, OF ITALY

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to join in the reception for Prime Minister Mario Scelba, of Italy, by the House this afternoon. I welcome him not only personally but in behalf of the many citizens of Italian descent who live in my district in San Francisco.

The present Government of Italy and its people certainly deserve recognition by the United States and the rest of the free world for the part they have played in resisting the encroachment of Communist totalitarianism, despite the real danger that Italy faces by virtue of its nearness to the areas already swallowed up as satellites. In spite of the ever-present threat, the people of Italy have come through nobly in defense of their freedom and have made a great contribution to holding back the tide which threatens Western Europe. It is my firm belief that they will continue to remain strong on the side of democracy and the current visit by Prime Minister Scelba should certainly lend encouragement to them in their courageous effort.

My faith and hope in the future of democracy in Italy rests on my own observation of the many contributions to the American tradition made by Italian immigrants and their descendants in America, and particularly by those who make up such an active and important part of the population of San Francisco. They have brought to us the best of Italy's remarkable culture and have succeeded in blending it with our way of life so as to add luster to both. Our San Francisco Americans of Italian descent have provided leadership to the city in almost every phase of civic affairs, and are in large measure responsible for the unique position San Francisco enjoys as a cosmopolitan center of culture and life in America. We have real cause to be proud of their outstanding achievements just as they have cause to be proud of the way in which their cousins in Italy have met the test of Communist infiltration and open defiance of the democratic regime.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I welcome the visit by Prime Minister Scelba. I only regret that his crowded schedule does not permit him to visit San Francisco where he would be greeted with open arms and the warm regard of those San Franciscans who trace their heritage back to his homeland.

## TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on

the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT No. 305)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE
(By HARRY F. BYRD),
ROBERT S. KERR,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
EDWARD MARTIN,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The first section of the House bill authorized the bill to be cited as the "Revenue Act of 1955." The Senate amendment authorized the bill to be cited as the "Tax Rate Extension Act of 1955." The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Sections 4 and 5 of the House bill provided for a credit against the individual income tax in an amount equal to $20 multiplied by the number of exemptions allowed as deductions in computing taxable income. The credit applied to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955. The Senate amendment struck out sections 4 and 5 of the House bill. The House recedes.

Amendment to the title: The Senate amendment to the title of the bill conformed the title to the amendments made by the Senate to the text of the bill. The House recedes.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at the end of the debate and before the vote on the pending conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 4259 passed the House it provided for a 1-year extension of the 52 percent corporate tax rate and of the Korean increases in excise tax rates. This means that the corporate normal tax, which was scheduled to drop from 30 percent to 25 percent on this April 1, will not do so under the bill until next April 1. In the case of the excises, it means that the rates on distilled spirits, gasoline, automobiles and parts, and cigarettes will be continued at their present levels until April 1, 1956.

In addition, as the Members no doubt well recall, the bill would have provided for a $20 credit against tax for taxpayers and for each of their exemptions. The Senate deleted this $20 tax credit. The House conferees receded and concurred in the Senate amendment deleting this provision.

I supported the $20 credit in the House. In conference, I used every effort to get this credit restored to the bill. Failing in this, I offered a compromise whereby each taxpayer would have been given a $10 credit for himself, his spouse, and for each of his exemptions. This compromise failed.

I had 10 other compromise suggestions which I was prepared to offer. The Senate conferees, with one exception, opposed a tax credit in any form. I might say that the House Democratic conferees supported me fully in my efforts to retain the $20 credit and in trying to work out a compromise. When I realized that there was no possibility whatever for the House Democratic conferees to prevail, I very reluctantly agreed to the Senate amendment striking the tax credit from the bill.

I did this because it is necessary that the excise tax rates be extended by this Friday, April 1. Otherwise, even if the rates should lapse and are reimposed in a short time, there would be a considerable administrative burden on both the taxpayers and the Treasury Department, because of the tax and refunds on floor stocks. Of course, if the excise tax rates were not extended at all, there would be a loss of revenue in a full year of operation, $1,080,000,000. In the case of the corporate rate, the one-year extension will produce, in a full year of operation, $1,750,000,000, making the total $2,830,000,000.

No particular problems would be involved if the present corporate tax rate should not be extended by April 1.

For my part, I am as strong as ever in my belief that the Congress should give high priority to individual income tax relief, particularly for those persons in the lower income brackets. However, I do believe that under the circumstances, we must extend these taxes, and that we must act promptly to do so on account of the excise taxes.

Because of the deletion of the $20 credit provision, the Senate also had to change the title of the bill and the name of the act.

I urge that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use the 10 minutes, and I have no requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Democratic leadership on finally coming around and doing the job which we should have done weeks ago. When President Eisenhower recommended the extension of the present excise tax and corporation income-tax rates, there was almost universal agreement that these two extensions would have to be provided. We are finally getting the job done 1 day before the deadline.

The income-tax reduction proposed by my friends on the other side of the aisle was unrealistic at best. They admitted that such a tax cut to take effect some 10 months in the future might well have to be reversed. Insofar as it held out any real promise of tax relief to hard-pressed American taxpayers, it was an illusory hope. I do not believe that the American people ever expected that it would become law, nor do I believe that the Democratic leadership ever believed sincerely that it would.

The Republican tax reduction record is clear. We provided over $7 billion in tax relief last year. We have always stood for tax reduction when the fiscal security of the Nation permits. When the time is ripe for a further tax cut, the Republican Party will propose one. It will be a reduction that will benefit all of the American people.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it was early in January that the President recommended to the Congress the extension of the excise taxes and corporation income tax rates which would otherwise be subject to automatic termination this April 1. We all thought then that the President's recommendation would be carried out without any delay. Because of the existing deficit and continued defense needs, everybody without regard to political affiliation agreed that these two extensions must be enacted.

But you all remember what happened—instead of doing the job which everybody knew had to be done, the Democratic leadership made a political football of this $20 reduction matter. They went ahead recklessly and without any regard for the financial stability of the Nation and proposed an income tax reduction which would have added over $2 billion to the national deficit. That unsound and irresponsible scheme was immediately pointed out by the Republicans and now has finally been defeated.

The Republican Party has no apology to make for its tax program in this session of Congress or in any other session. The record is clear. In all their years in office, the Democrats never did anything but raise taxes, increase the deficit, and create inflation. This is a matter of legislative history. On the other hand, every Republican Congress in the last 20 years has enacted a substantial tax reduction program. When we talk about increasing personal exemptions let me say that the only increase in personal exemptions to be enacted in the past 20

years was enacted by a Republican Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in reducing income taxes just as soon as our fiscal situation permits. We cannot balance the budget by granting exemptions carelessly and without study and without careful consideration. Income taxes are personal taxes and if we are to judge the future by the past, reduction of these personal taxes will not come except by efforts of the Republicans who have always given careful consideration to tax reductions. This legislation as passed by the Senate is in effect what the Republicans of this House tried to pass when this legislation was considered on the floor of this House a short time ago. We are now accepting the work of the Senate which is exactly what we Republicans tried to do on the floor a short time ago.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the adoption of the ill-advised compromise that is effected by the conference report on H. R. 4259. By my conscience and convictions I am bound to vote against the adoption of the conference report and shall do so.

The $20 tax reduction was, in my opinion, all too modest in amount. Its true merit lies in the fact that it represents an honest attempt by the Democratic Members of the House to give long overdue tax relief to the taxpayers who need it most—the low-income families of America.

It is not necessary for me to document the well-established fact that the so-called tax relief granted by the Republican 83d Congress was tax relief for the big corporations and for the wealthy. Over 65 percent of the individual taxpayers in America have incomes under $5,000. To this group went a mere 38 percent of the immediate relief and a totally inadequate 18 percent of the long-run relief granted by the Republican tax relief program. The balance of this Republican tax reduction—62 percent of the immediate relief and 82 percent of the long-run relief—went to individuals with incomes above $5,000 and to corporations.

With the adoption of this conference report, the Republican Party will have reaffirmed its traditional tax policy of denying tax relief to low-income taxpayers and granting tax relief to our more well-to-do taxpayers. In the 83d Congress, the Republican Party gave tax relief to those persons who receive unearned income from stock dividends. They claimed that it was not wrong to grant such preferential tax relief. In fact, they boasted that such tax relief was not only proper but long overdue. Let us examine the record to see who benefitted from this tax reduction on income from stock dividends. The number of stockholders in America is about 4 million persons, out of a total of 72 million taxpayers. Of that total number of stockholders, 400,000 people or 10 percent receive 80 percent of the dividend income. The Republicans represented that specialized tax reduction as tax equity and tax justice. Yet, when the Democratic majority in the 84th Congress undertakes to give every American citizen a tax cut of $20 for himself and each of his dependents, the Members of the House and the House leadership are denounced for fiscal irresponsibility.

These statistics clearly demonstrate the justice and equity provided in the Democratic-sponsored $20 tax credit. This modest relief was essential to balance the Republican tax give-away of the 83d Congress.

The practical benefit that low-income families would realize from the tax relief contained in the House-passed version of H. R. 4259 was made clear to me recently by two visitors who came to my office. Each of these individuals was the head of a typical American family. They informed me that this tax credit would more than solve the wage earner's family shoe bill for the year.

I assure the Members of the House that the people of Michigan know what is being taken away from them with the compromise which is embodied in this conference report. The rank-and-file taxpayers of Virginia and Georgia may not need the $20 tax credit. The citizens of Virginia and Georgia may not know what it means. The people of Michigan do know what it means and they do want it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I refused to sign the conference report and I refuse to vote for its adoption.

In addition to the elimination of the $20 tax credit, I am also very much concerned over the extension of the excise tax rates which is provided for in H. R. 4259. At the beginning of the House-Senate conference on this legislation, I served notice on the Senate conferees that I was willing to sit at the conference table with them until April 1, 1955 when the automatic reductions in the excise taxes affected by this bill would have gone into effect. Then the Congress could have retroactively extended the 52 percent corporate rate.

No one has a more consistent record of opposing the imposition of excise taxes than I do. I opposed the rate extension last year and I oppose the extension this year. Excise taxes, with their regressive tax impact, should be reduced or repealed, not increased.

The automobile industry at Detroit, with the thousands of jobs it provides for American workers, is being adversely affected by the continued high excise-tax rates applicable to automotive vehicles. The Congress cannot permit the present high level of excise-tax rates to continue without seriously harming American consumers, industry, and labor.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Congress should reject this conference report. The House should insist that tax relief be granted first to low-income taxpayers. We should let the excise taxes be reduced on April 1, 1955, as provided under present law. After that, we could retroactively extend the 52 percent normal and surtax rate on corporations. Only in that way, Mr. Speaker, can we provide tax equity and justice for the American people. It was the Republican 83d Congress which last year extended the life of the so-called Korean excise taxes for 1 year, specifically to terminate on March 31, 1955. It is because of President Eisenhower's recommendation that these reprehensible excise taxes, so burdensome to the consumer and so unfair to the producers is now to be extended for still another year. As an insult to the intelligent American voter, the Republicans in the last campaign claimed credit not only for overall tax relief in the 1954 bill, but claimed credit for an automatic excise cut which they nullified and extended for another year.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, originally, I voted for the so-called $20 clause because I felt it represented a method to cure some of the inequalities which were incorporated in the Revenue Act of 1954 as it referred to low-income groups. That act allocated only 23 percent of the tax relief to individuals earning under $5,000.

Since the Senate refused to adopt the reasoning of the House of Representatives, and after hearing the speech of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I became assured that all compromises reflecting such reasoning had been urged and rejected with reluctance and considerable misgivings, I am forced to change my position and will vote in favor of the conference report so as to save the other tax-raising provisions of the bill which will expire on April 1, 1955.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable JERE COOPER, that the need to reduce income taxes for low-income families is of highest priority.

Along with many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, I am not satisfied with this measure which does not include the $20 per person tax credit on which we previously voted in this House. With the rising cost of living, with the rising cost of local government, the time for tax relief for the small taxpayer is, indeed, long overdue.

Conversation and the promise of lowering the cost of Government is meaningless to the average taxpayer unless these economies are reflected in the smaller taxes which he must pay. The most direct form of tax relief is in the reduction of income taxes. Although this conference report does not include the $20 per person tax credit which I previously supported, I feel that it is my duty to support this measure. To do otherwise would be to reduce corporation income taxes and excise taxes which the measure contains. These corporation and excise taxes should not be reduced under any circumstances until income taxes for the average man are made more tolerable.

Since the Government, through these corporation and excise taxes, will raise almost $3 billion, it is my sincere hope that Congress, in this session, may pass a measure to increase personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $700 for each dependent. The present $600 allowance for the cost of supporting a dependent is unrealistic. This allowance should be raised annually until it becomes commensurate with the cost of

providing for a dependent. A dependency exemption should be what it purports to be—an allowance for sums expended for the maintenance and support of a lawful dependent.

Only through an increase of exemption allowance will we arrive at a fair method of taxation. An increase in the dependency exemption serves to equalize the position of the head of the family with other wage earners in our competitive society.

I will support the conference report only because I hope that this Congress will take the necessary steps to increase dependency exemptions during this session in the interest of tax justice for the family.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I favored H. R. 4259 as it was originally passed by the House and am now in favor of the provisions of the bill authorizing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

It is a disappointment to me that the conferees' report discloses that the Senate would not agree with the provisions in the said bill providing for a $20 credit against an individual's income tax for each personal exemption. In my opinion the greatest need for tax relief in this country is to individuals on fixed wages and fixed incomes. The only method under present tax law in which tax relief can be given to such persons, equitably, is through an increase in the individual and personal income tax exemptions.

I have no quarrel with tax relief to dividend holders or to businesses where such tax relief can be authorized. However, to my mind the first priority on tax relief is and has been for some time an increase to the average person on a fixed income.

I am voting to support the conferees' report not because of any change in view with respect to the necessity of an increase in individual and dependency income tax exemption, but because, in my opinion, the economy of the country would greatly suffer if the legislation provided by H. R. 4259 with respect to the 1 year extension of existing corporate normal tax rates, and of certain existing excise tax rates, was delayed. In my opinion an increase in the individual and personal dependency income-tax exemption still retains a No. 1 priority insofar as tax relief is concerned.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote reluctantly and regretfully for the conference report because I have no alternative. I voted in the 83d Congress and again in this Congress to give some tax relief to those who need it most. I cannot understand the philosophy of those who always slip the gravy to those who have the most and cry out in agony when someone wants to let a little drip on the bread of those who have the least. The little relief for the little people we sought to provide has been snatched away in conference. What is left is a tax bill which if we do not pass will result in the loss of almost $2 billion in revenue. Unfortunately, there is a time limit. In the present condition of our budget, and with the enormous demands upon us, we are compelled to settle for what has come out of conference before the expiration date of some of those taxes. It is just that the Federal Treasury cannot stand at this critical time the foregoing of $2 billion in badly needed revenue.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, some New Deal orators have been exhorting the public with the usual extravagant political claims of being the party of the "little man" in tax-reduction measures.

Let us look at the record. It will speak for itself and it will show that under New Deal philosophies the so-called little fellow has had to pay higher taxes. It has been the Republican Party which has cut taxes for the lower-income groups. Since the first income-tax law was passed by a Democratic Congress in 1913, there have been 15 income-tax increases. Democratic Congresses voted all but one of these increases.

The New Dealers put low-income people and wage earners on the taxroll. In 1932 there were 1,900,000 taxable Federal returns. In 1952 there were 46,800,000 such returns. Republicans did the cutting 7 out of the 10 times that income taxes have been reduced since 1913.

In 1954 the Republican Congress reduced taxes by a total of $7.4 billion—the largest cut in any 1 year in history. Some excise taxes were reduced 50 percent. The Republican Congress reduced taxes on electric light bulbs, stoves, refrigerators, electric toasters, telephones, cosmetics, telegraph bills, ladies' purses, pharmaceutical supplies, theater and amusement admission tax, and many other excise taxes. This cut benefited all.

Sixty-two cents out of each dollar in the tax reduction went to individuals. Approximately 25 cents of this 62 cents going to taxpayers with incomes under $5,000.

The New Dealers have been endeavoring to play politics with tax legislation claiming that they want to increase income-tax exemptions thereby lowering individual income taxes. Again I say: "Let's look at the record." The following chart shows the exemptions from 1931 to 1954 as passed by the Congress:

*Republican: Republican controlled Congress—Democratic: Democrat controlled Congress*

| | Republican, 1925-31 | Democrat, 1932-39 | Democrat, 1940 | Democrat, 1941 | Democrat, 1942 | Democrat, 1944 | Republican, 1948 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Single | $1,500 | $1,000 | $800 | $750 | $500 | $500 | $600 |
| Married | 3,500 | 2,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,200 | 1,000 | 1,200 |
| Dependent | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 350 | 500 | 600 |

As we listen to various speakers, political and otherwise, we should keep in mind that the record speaks for itself and the statement set forth in this article is the record.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote against the adoption of this conference report—not because of any objection to extension of the 52 percent corporation income-tax rate or the excise-tax rates therein, but simply as my personal protest against failure to include in the bill any income-tax relief for the small individual income taxpayer.

When the revised Internal Revenue Code was before the House last year I felt very strongly that the individual low-income taxpayer was entitled to relief, particularly in view of the tax reductions written into the law to the advantage of big-business interests and wealthy stockholders. When the fight to include a reduction in taxes for the little man failed last year, I determined to do everything I could to push for such relief in this session of Congress. I strongly supported the successful Democratic move to include a $20-per-person tax reduction for individuals when H. R. 4259 was voted on in the House on February 25 of this year. To me it is extremely unfair and unfortunate that no agreement was reached between the conferees for the House and the other body to include at least some measure of tax reduction for individual taxpayers in this conference report. I cannot vote for a report which does not give the low-income groups in this country the relief to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that I do not oppose at this point extension of tax rates to which H. R. 4259 has now been limited. My vote against the report is purely a protest against failure to do justice to the little man. It is, further, a protest against acceptance by the Congress of the trickle-down theory of tax relief held by this administration, under which they want to confine tax reductions to Big Business in the hope that in their goodness and mercy they will permit some of their added income to trickle down to the small-wage earner. That economic fallacy has been exploded long ago. The House was on the right track in February when we voted the $20-per-person tax reduction. I suggest that we should soon get back on that track by forcing a reduced tax rate for the low-income groups in this country. By that method we give direct relief where it is most needed and, at the same time, promote economic growth by the only sure means available—increased consumer purchasing power. On those grounds I urge the rejection of this conference report.

I believe, also, Mr. Speaker, that we Members of the House are entitled to feel put upon in not having this conference report brought back to us for final action until we are under the gun, so to speak, as to expiration of the excise taxes and the extension of the present corporate income-tax rate. When we are asked to act on March 30 on a matter which must be decided by April 1, there seems justifiable reason to believe that the democratic processes are being slighted in favor of tactics more suitable to other forms of government. Perhaps the motive in delaying this legislation was not what it seems, but when

we are faced now with only two choices—letting the present taxes expire or pass this bill—I think a protest is justified.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot bring myself to agree to the conference report on H. R. 4259, now before us for decision.

To do so will cruelly deny modest tax relief designed to benefit the needy family in the lower income brackets, while at the same time the "fat-cat" Republican Revenue Act of 1954 will continue to drain off billions in tax benefits predominately to large business, dividend recipients, and wealthy individuals.

It is arrant fiscal irresponsibility, we are lectured from high administration places, to give modest tax relief to lower income families—to give a direct tax saving of $20 each to the father and mother and for each dependent child, so that the relief will be more effectively felt at the lower income levels where the family burden presses the heaviest.

But—so goes the lecture from the same high administration sources—it is an act of high and ennobled statesmanship, contributing to the welfare and stability of every humble home and fireside, to give unbounded tax relief to big corporations, coupon clippers, and wealthy individuals as was done last year in the Revenue Act of 1954.

I and other Members on my side of the aisle took the floor many times last year and this to protest the one-sided character of that 1954 act, particularly as to its dividend credit tax bonanza and its distorted and swollen depreciation tax allowances to corporation.

The dividend-credit provision of that 1954 act—the special tax reduction for coupon clippers—will cost $362 million a year. Eighty percent of that relief will go to the six-tenths of 1 percent of American families who own four-fifths of all publicly held stock. Ninety-two percent of American families own no stock and get no benefit. Less than 4 percent of all taxpayers—those with incomes over $10,000—receive 76 percent of all dividend income. And eight-tenths of 1 percent of all American families—those with incomes over $25,000—get 55 percent of all dividend income.

I ask, is it a token of fiscal responsibility that special tax relief be accorded a favored limited group of dividend recipients—the unearned income class—but even most modest relief be denied the mass of taxpayers who work and toil for earned income?

The special depreciation allowances granted by last year's tax bill—thinly disguised special tax credits for increased corporate dividends or favored capital gains benefits to stockholders on corporate reinvestment of tax free earnings—will continue to cost billions in reduced Federal revenues for a generation. Expert students of intricate tax maneuvers and business finance estimate that by the year 1960 the United States Treasury would be losing, at present levels of gross national product, about $3 billion per year as a result of these new depreciation provisions if current tax rates on business remain the same. The same sources estimate that by 1955 the tax loss would rise to more than $5 billion per year, and it would continue to rise thereafter. I commend to the attention of the Members the revealing study of Depreciation Under the New Tax Law, by Robert Eisner, published in the Harvard Business Review for January 1955, and reprinted in the RECORD of March 11 at page 2708.

But when the 1954 act was under consideration and even as of recent date, we were told in solemn assurance by the Secretary of the Treasury, and other administration fiscal pundits who now lecture us on fiscal irresponsibility, that these swollen depreciation tax benefits will really cost the Federal Government nothing. They say that if you view their tax effect on one piece of new machinery—and please limit your myopic view to only one added machine by the taxpaying corporation in this dynamic business economy of ours—then the Government will later get back the taxes it lost in the earlier years because no more depreciation tax allowances can be taken after the full cost of that single machine has been written off for tax purposes.

"Baloney," as a forthright statesman, dear to my memory, might have responded. The shallow assurance that the increased depreciation tax allowance "all washes out in the end"—to quote the study above referred to—"not only is misleading, it is to all practical purposes flatly erroneous." It mistakes the effect on a single piece of property for the cumulative tax effect, typical of American corporations, of increasing investment in new property additions each year in keeping with the economic growth of our system. Assume that gross additions of property are made at a constant rate each year by one of the big corporations in a heavy capital industry, if the properties last 33 years depreciation tax allowances under the generous new methods of last year will exceed tax write-off under the old method in each of the first 27 years under one of the new methods and in every one of the first 33 years under the other new method authorized last year. The tax benefit does not "wash out in the end"; it can pile billions upon billions in reduced corporation taxes each continuing year for the next generation.

"When do we get back those billions?" I inquire after due heed to recent public sermonizing on fiscal responsibility. When I tried last year to find out from the Secretary of the Treasury, I ran into a stumbling block of refusal to give the information at first, then official stall, and finally airy assurance to the effect that "it all washes out in the end."

Not even the Wall Street Journal accepts the glib assurance of the Treasury that the new depreciation tax allowances "all wash out in the end." To quote from the lead editorial appraisal in the issue of March 28, 1955:

> As shown here a few weeks ago, the depreciation change can produce large cumulative effects over the years. On any single piece of property the effect is minor. It merely postpones taxable income a few years by concentrating the depreciation in the early part of the life of the property. But as new facilities are built year by year, the relative weight of the early, heavy depreciation rates will keep growing, and Federal revenues will reflect this.

Yes, $362 million a year of special tax benefits directly to stock dividend recipients—coupon clippers—and billions more per year in corporate tax benefits through tax-free depreciation allowances to be kept in company tills, distributed to stockholders, or reinvested with consequent increased stock values able to be realized upon at favored capital gains rate of taxation. In the eyes of administration lecturers, that must be the acme of fiscal responsibility.

Relief for the wealthy, we are told, will stimulate investment and promote confidence. It will sustain that delicate maiden, whose confidence we must so tenderly nourish, the stock market boom. Relief for the needy, this administration tells us, must be spurned as phony and base political trickery. For the latter—for the needy—the weight of the taxload on their burdened backs will help spur their daily toil and assure heightened awareness of the precious price of citizenship.

Some other observers, perhaps lacking in self-righteous zeal for the current brand of fiscal responsibility, detect in this strutting fiscal conscience only the old hard-panned "trickle down" theory again restored to its place of public eminence after years of brooding silence. I doubt that in our modern economy, sustained as it must be by mass purchasing power and ever-broadening distribution of the products of farm and factory, the "trickle down" will be adequate or timely in rate of flow to promote the truly dynamic expanding economy that lies within our reach.

I urge disagreement to the conference report. I respect the views reluctantly reported by the majority members of the committee of conference. I know their sincerity, their deep conviction, and their persistant effort to gain acceptance of House action in passing the $20 tax credit. Only under adamant threat of Presidential veto, on the eve of expiration of current higher rates of corporate and excise taxes, did they bow to Executive fiat.

But I am still mindful that our Founding Fathers wrote in the Constitution that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives;" and to the Congress the Constitution gave the power to levy and collect taxes. Too often of late has this House—its elected Members—forsworn its rightful prerogative. Let us assert it now, confident in the human justice and economic justice of our prior action, lest by failure to do so we embolden further the disciples of the McKinley era in their new onslaught of power and privilege. If we disagree to the conference report, then this House itself lifts the awesome responsibility from the individual shoulders of the able chairman of the conference committee and his fellow conferees. I doubt that the administration, despite its blustering threats, would rashly jeopardize by veto the true fiscal responsibility and fairness of our Government. The pages of history are studded with examples where human liberty and justice were won only by like defiance of entrenched power.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 387, nays 8, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—387

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Davis, Ga. | Hope |
| Abernethy | Davis, Tenn. | Horan |
| Adair | Davis, Wis. | Hosmer |
| Addonizio | Dawson, Utah | Huddleston |
| Albert | Deane | Hull |
| Alexander | Delaney | Hyde |
| Alger | Dempsey | Ikard |
| Allen, Calif. | Denton | Jackson |
| Allen, Ill. | Derounian | James |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Devereux | Jarman |
| | Dies | Jenkins |
| Andresen, August H. | Diggs | Jennings |
| | Dixon | Jensen |
| Andrews | Dodd | Johansen |
| Anfuso | Dollinger | Johnson, Calif. |
| Arends | Dondero | Johnson, Wis. |
| Ashley | Donohue | Jonas |
| Ashmore | Dorn, N. Y. | Jones, Ala. |
| Aspinall | Dorn, S. C. | Jones, Mo. |
| Auchincloss | Dowdy | Jones, N. C. |
| Avery | Durham | Judd |
| Ayres | Edmondson | Karsten |
| Bailey | Elliott | Kean |
| Baker | Ellsworth | Kearney |
| Baldwin | Engle | Kearns |
| Barrett | Evins | Keating |
| Bass, N. H. | Fallon | Kee |
| Bass, Tenn. | Fascell | Kelly, N. Y. |
| Bates | Feighan | Keogh |
| Baumhart | Fenton | Kilburn |
| Beamer | Fernandez | Kilday |
| Becker | Fine | Kilgore |
| Belcher | Fino | King, Calif. |
| Bennett, Fla. | Fisher | King, Pa. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Flood | Kirwan |
| Bentley | Flynt | Klein |
| Berry | Fogarty | Kluczynski |
| Betts | Forand | Knox |
| Blitch | Ford | Krueger |
| Boggs | Forrester | Laird |
| Boland | Fountain | Landrum |
| Bolling | Frazier | Lane |
| Bolton, Frances P. | Frelinghuysen | Lanham |
| | Friedel | Lankford |
| Bonner | Fulton | Latham |
| Bosch | Gamble | LeCompte |
| Bow | Garmatz | Lesinski |
| Boykin | Gary | Lipscomb |
| Boyle | Gathings | Long |
| Bray | Gavin | Lovre |
| Brooks, La. | Gentry | McCarthy |
| Brooks, Tex. | George | McConnell |
| Brown, Ga. | Gordon | McCormack |
| Brownson | Granahan | McCulloch |
| Broyhill | Grant | McDonough |
| Buchanan | Gray | McGregor |
| Budge | Green, Oreg. | McIntire |
| Burdick | Green, Pa. | McMillan |
| Burleson | Gregory | McVey |
| Burnside | Griffiths | Macdonald |
| Bush | Gross | Machrowicz |
| Byrd | Gubser | Mack, Ill. |
| Byrne, Pa. | Gwinn | Mack, Wash. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Hagen | Madden |
| Cannon | Hale | Magnuson |
| Carlyle | Haley | Mahon |
| Carnahan | Halleck | Mailliard |
| Carrigg | Hand | Marshall |
| Cederberg | Harden | Martin |
| Chatham | Hardy | Mason |
| Chelf | Harris | Matthews |
| Chenoweth | Harrison, Va. | Meader |
| Chiperfield | Harvey | Merrow |
| Church | Hays, Ark. | Miller, Calif. |
| Clark | Hayworth | Miller, Md. |
| Clevenger | Hébert | Miller, Nebr. |
| Cole | Henderson | Miller, N. Y. |
| Colmer | Herlong | Mills |
| Coon | Heselton | Minshall |
| Cooper | Hess | Mollohan |
| Corbett | Hiestand | Morano |
| Cramer | Hillings | Morgan |
| Cretella | Hinshaw | Moss |
| Crumpacker | Hoeven | Moulder |
| Cunningham | Hoffman, Ill. | Multer |
| Curtis, Mass. | Hoffman, Mich. | Mumma |
| Curtis, Mo. | Holmes | Murray, Ill. |
| Dague | Holt | Murray, Tenn. |
| Davidson | Holtzman | Natcher |
| Nicholson | Robsion, Ky. | Thompson, N. J. |
| Norblad | Rodino | Thompson, Tex. |
| Norrell | Rogers, Colo. | Thomson, Wyo. |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Rogers, Fla. | Thornberry |
| O'Brien, N. Y. | Rogers, Mass. | Tollefson |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Rogers, Tex. | Trimble |
| O'Hara, Minn. | Rooney | Tuck |
| O'Konski | Rutherford | Tumulty |
| O'Neill | St. George | Utt |
| Ostertag | Saylor | Vanik |
| Patman | Schenck | Van Pelt |
| Patterson | Schwengel | Van Zandt |
| Pelly | Scott | Velde |
| Perkins | Scrivner | Vinson |
| Pfost | Scudder | Vorys |
| Philbin | Seely-Brown | Vursell |
| Phillips | Sheehan | Wainwright |
| Pilcher | Short | Walter |
| Pillion | Shuford | Watts |
| Poage | Sieminski | Westland |
| Poff | Sikes | Wharton |
| Polk | Siler | Whitten |
| Powell | Simpson, Ill. | Wickersham |
| Preston | Simpson, Pa. | Widnall |
| Price | Sisk | Wigglesworth |
| Priest | Smith, Kans. | Williams, Miss. |
| Quigley | Smith, Miss. | Williams, N. J. |
| Rabaut | Smith, Va. | Williams, N. Y. |
| Radwan | Smith, Wis. | Wilson, Calif. |
| Rains | Spence | Wilson, Ind. |
| Ray | Springer | Winstead |
| Reece, Tenn. | Steed | Withrow |
| Reed, N. Y. | Sullivan | Wolcott |
| Rees, Kans. | Taber | Wolverton |
| Reuss | Talle | Wright |
| Rhodes, Ariz. | Taylor | Yates |
| Richards | Teague, Calif. | Young |
| Riehlman | Teague, Tex. | Younger |
| Riley | Thomas | Zablocki |
| Rivers | Thompson, La. | Zelenko |
| Roberts | Thompson, Mich. | |
| Robeson, Va. | | |

NAYS—8

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Blatnik | Holifield | Roosevelt |
| Chudoff | Metcalf | Shelley |
| Dingell | Rhodes, Pa. | |

NOT VOTING—39

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barden | Dolliver | Passman |
| Bell | Donovan | Prouty |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Doyle | Reed, Ill. |
| | Eberharter | Sadlak |
| Bowler | Fjare | Scherer |
| Brown, Ohio | Harrison, Nebr. | Selden |
| Buckley | Hays, Ohio | Sheppard |
| Canfield | Hill | Staggers |
| Celler | Kelley, Pa. | Udall |
| Chase | Knutson | Weaver |
| Christopher | McDowell | Wier |
| Cooley | Morrison | Willis |
| Coudert | Nelson | |
| Dawson, Ill. | Osmers | |

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Fjare.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 154, Rept. No. 311), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1955, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1955, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters—

"(1) relating to employee health, welfare, and pension plans;

"(2) relating to the question of Federal aid to school construction; and

"(3) relating to education and labor generally.

"*Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

"For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

"The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

Amend the title so as to read: "To authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction."

## ANALYSIS AND REEVALUATION OF PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 198, Rept. No. 312), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 256, providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## CONSTRUCTION AND CONVERSION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 199, Rept. No. 313), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4393) to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## AMEND SECTION 401 (E) (2) OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 200, Rept. No. 314), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5240, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the remainder of the bill had been considered as read and open to amendments and points of order at any time. Are there any further points of order?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill against the following language appearing on page 28, lines 15 through 19:

*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that language is subject to a point of order. It is a limitation. It permits the spending of $1 instead of the previous amount of $1.50. This has been contemplated by the Veterans' Administration in setting up its budget. This has been in for 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in line 15 the words "no part of any appropriation" are used. That goes beyond this appropriation bill. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill against the language beginning in line 3 on page 31 and extending through line 14 of that page, as follows:

*Provided*, That hereafter no part of any appropriation to the Veterans' Administration shall be available for outpatient dental services and treatment, or related dental appliances with respect to a service-connected dental disability which is not compensable in degree unless such condition or disability is shown to have been in existence at time of discharge and application for treatment is made within 1 year after discharge: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to adjunct outpatient dental services or appliances for any dental condition associated with and held to be aggravating disability from such other service-incurred or service-aggravated injury or disease.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week and also on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to answer the question asked by my colleague.

After the disposition of this bill today there are a few matters which will be taken up by unanimous consent, three reports from the Committee on House Administration and a resolution from the Committee on Rules authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to have the ordinary powers of subpena, and so forth. That will be all.

While we will meet tomorrow, there will be no business.

Then we will adjourn over until Monday. That is when the official adjournment resolution takes effect. I may say for the benefit of the Members and for whatever guidance it may be to them that I intend to go home tomorrow night myself.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 37, after line 25, insert a new section to be designated as section 108, as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any officers and employees who allocate positions in the classified civil service with a requirement of maximum age for such positions."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on the ground that it is legislation and placing a duty upon the agency to determine the age of each applicant.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is negative restriction directed solely to funds sought to be appropriated by this bill. It is not legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. RAINS). The Chair is ready to rule. It appears to the Chair that this is a proper limitation. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is directed to the purpose of correcting one of the most glaring evils in the Federal Government today, and that is the restriction of employment of those applying for jobs on the basis of their age. Many of you have read the article which was recently in Collier's magazine by the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor,

under the title "After 45, Are You Too Old to Work?" And under it, it says, "Yes; the figure is 45. Shocking as it is, people in the prime of life are denied jobs because of their age. The Secretary urges action now to help them."

Mr. Chairman, 45 is a relatively young age, and yet the Civil Service Commission is establishing age limitations much lower than 45. I read from the New York Times of September 25, 1954:

UNITED STATES JOB AGE OF 35 SHARPLY PROTESTED

One hundred stenographers and typists are wanted by the Federal Government, but they must be "under 35 years of age." The jobs are for Washington and abroad, a spokesman at the New York State Employment Office, where the notice is posted, said yesterday.

The pay is $2,950 to $3,795 a year, with cost of living allowance and transportation overseas. Asked what agency of the Government was recruiting young workers only, the spokesman said it was "off the record."

The age stipulation aroused bitter comment from one applicant who was reminded by an employment interviewer that she was over the age specified. She recounted the obstacles in private industry for those over 35 and said she was maintaining herself on unemployment insurance which is nearing its end.

"And now it's the Government that wants young women only," she said. "They don't think we are too old to pay our taxes that support the Government and the employment service."

Mr. Chairman, this is a woman who wants to work and who is living on unemployment compensation. Because she happens to be over 35 she is barred because of this arbitrary ruling of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The Committee on this side will accept the amendment, with the understanding that after we have an opportunity to analyze it and go into conference, if it becomes apparent, which it is not now because we have not had a chance to study it, we will reserve the right to disapprove it in conference if it develops that the amendment is bad.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is excellent, and with the same understanding we accept it.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. Certainly, if we are to make progress in the elimination of the bias against hiring older workers in private industry, the Federal Government must set a good example. I am grateful to the Committee for accepting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 28, after line 14, insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation in this bill shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this seeks to meet the question raised on the point of order which was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] regarding that proviso. I offer this brief explanation of it. This has been in the law for several years. Originally when the amount was written into the bill, it was $2.50 per month, later this was reduced to $1.50. The Veterans' Administration was to pay $1.50 per month per student to the college or school where the student was studying merely to report that he was there. Upon that basis, the subsistance check for the month was sent to him. After consulting with the Veterans' Administration and with the schools, it was decided 3 years ago that $1 was adequate.

I am willing that they should have, first, to underwrite the monthly report which we require them to make, which is more often than they have to make on their own students. This budget was set up by the Veterans' Administration in contemplation of the fact that the amount would be a dollar. I am simply renewing the provision which has been in earlier bills.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas), there were—ayes, 67; noes, 35.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Members to know what this amendment is and what has happened back through the years. My point of order against this rider provision was successful but while I was called to the telephone the provision was placed in the bill by limitation. My amendment will strike the language and policy will revert to that in Public Law 550, 82d Congress.

A few years ago we passed Public Law 550, and it was necessary that we provide for some payment to the colleges of our country for making reports on the veterans who were in school.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs made a very careful study. The colleges demanded at least $2.50. We finally gave them $1.50. Without study and without investigation this Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has changed it to $1. It was written as legislation on an appropriation bill. That is the reason I made a point of order against the legislation, and I expect to ask for a rollcall on this amendment when the bill is passed.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 34, line 3, insert immediately after the word "which" the following: "$1,000,000 shall be available for surveys and preparation of plans and specifications for a general hospital in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., and."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

What do you mean by "metropolitan"? What does that term mean, "metropolitan area"? Does that mean the city of Washington?

Mr. BROYHILL. Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I asked the gentleman to yield.

Mr. BROYHILL. Metropolitan Washington is defined by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There has already been debate, the Chair states to the gentleman from Texas. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the distinguished Chairman that I was on my feet long before the gentleman from Virginia was recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman raise his voice. The Chair's attention was diverted for a moment. The point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, the term "metropolitan area of Washington" has been defined by the Civil Service Commission as including all the city of Washington, the District of Columbia, the counties of Arlington and Fairfax in Virginia, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, Va., and the counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery in Maryland.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman have any particular area in mind where this hospital will be put?

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes, I do; but at the moment all the Representatives in the House from the metropolitan area are together.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is self-explanatory. It does not appropriate any additional funds whatsoever; it merely earmarks $1 million of the $30 million included in the bill for plans and specifications to build a hospital in the metropolitan area of Washington.

This hospital was authorized back in 1945, 10 years ago; in fact, at that time, they authorized the construction of a 750-bed hospital. Of all the hospitals which have been authorized throughout the country at that time and since that time, every hospital has either been constructed or have had funds appropriated and are under construction except this one. This is the only hospital in the entire country for which funds have not been appropriated, but which has been authorized. The ratio of veterans needing hospitalization to beds throughout the entire country was 149 to 1 in 1949.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. After I finish the burden of my remarks I will, if time remains.

In the metropolitan area the ratio of veterans to hospital beds in 1949 was 409 to 1, but even after constructing the 750-bed hospital the ratio of veterans to hospital beds would far exceed the national average. That is so because Washington, D. C., is a metropolitan area that extends into the suburbs, and the population of the metropolitan Washington area is 1,800,000. If we take the veterans' needs into consideration—while I have no precise figures, we know that the ratio of veterans per bed in the metropolitan Washington area far exceeds any other area of the country, at least by 2 or 3 to 1.

The entire appropriation of $15,800,000 has been requested in times past. The hospital was recommended by the Veterans' Administration to the Bureau of the Budget and by the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress. We asked for it on the floor last year. It was opposed by the Appropriations Committee because they felt there were not sufficient doctors, but it was indicated that if conditions changed this year we would possibly get more favorable cooperation. This $15,800,000 was requested by the Veterans' Administration of the Bureau of the Budget, but the Bureau of the Budget failed to recommend it to the committee.

We are not today asking for the $15,800,000. We are merely asking that $1 million of the funds which are appropriated here for replacement of hospital facilities be earmarked so that we can start the preparation of plans and specifications. We must get a hospital constructed here eventually.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. When this plan was originally brought forward and the hospital authorized, did the Government obtain what is known as the Nevis tract?

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Government still have title to that property?

Mr. BROYHILL. The Government has title to it but since then they have rescinded that order and have authorized construction of the hospital at Soldiers' Home in the District of Columbia and have reduced the size of the hospital from 750 to 500 beds.

Mr. BAILEY. That is on the present site of Soldiers' Home?

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes. All of the veterans' hospitals in the country and all of the veterans of the country will benefit by the construction of this hospital in the Nation's Capital. Mr. Higley, of the Veterans' Administration, stated that they planned to make this hospital a national training center for nurses, a national training center for the administration of hospitals and a national research center for all the research that is being done all over the country. All of that will be coordinated here in Washington, D. C., as other facilities are coordinated in Washington, D. C.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to my distinguished friend's motion. I am just a little bit surprised that our friends on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs did not make a point of order. Of course, I was on my feet trying to make a point of order. It is legislation on an appropriation bill but I do not object to it on that basis.

Mr. Chairman, we are putting the Veterans' Administration behind the 8-ball here. There are 15 or 20 hospitals that were authorized which have been cut out from time to time. It may be that the Mount Alto Hospital in the District of Columbia has outlived its usefulness; it is quite an old hospital. But if we are going to do this at least 30 or 40 other Members here might want to do likewise. So we better let this thing come in through regular channels. I can assure the gentleman from my own point of view that if the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration come in with a request for funds and they make a good case as to need for this hospital, I will go along with them. But, as the matter now stands, the Bureau of the Budget has not made an estimate and as far as I know the Veterans' Administration has not requested it in this year's request for funds.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be defeated until it is put in shape and has come through regular channels. If the Veterans' Administration recommends it to the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Budget brings it to the House, we can then consider it. I imagine the need also exists in 40 or 50 other localities. We only have 172 veterans' hospitals. Some of them are no more than 50 to 60 percent full as far as regular medical and surgical beds are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto, and on the paragraph, close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I object. I do not want to be frozen out. I want a couple of minutes time here.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 18 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there are 8 or 9 Members standing, which would allow 2 minutes apiece. Let the debate go on for 5, 6, or 7 minutes. I see that a good many Members want to speak.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 71, noes 30.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the committee will give favorable consideration to this amendment. Of all the areas in the United States, the Nation's Capital and nearby Maryland and Virginia have been the most neglected in the matter of adequate hospital facilities for the veterans of the area. The only hospital available for the veterans in this area is Mount Alto Hospital, which is woefully inadequate. I believe the building itself must be nearly 50 years old. It was taken over by lease by the Government for veterans' purposes in 1919. Certainly since that time the population of this area has practically tripled, and yet we still have only the same facilities that we had for veterans in 1919.

Moreover, in the last Congress the gentleman from Virginia and myself urged upon the Congress the adoption of an amendment which would accomplish this purpose, and we were assured by the committee that it would be done in this Congress.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urgently request the committee at this time to honor this gentleman's agreement which was given to us in the last Congress and adopt this amendment for merely allocating—no new money; we are not trying to put new money into the bill—merely allocating funds, not for the construction of a hospital but merely for the planning of a veterans' hospital for the District of Columbia and the Maryland and Virginia metropolitan area.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, repeatedly the Veterans' Administration has told me that they have asked for adequate facilities for a diagnostic center here in Washington. Anyone who visits Mount Alto Hospital knows that they receive excellent care. We also know that that hospital is a national scandal today. Why the Members of the House, the Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget and everybody connected with veterans' affairs do not fight for these facilities and see that they go through, I do not know. Of course, I feel that it should be located in Washington. Anyway, this area should be cared for. I think there is more money than is actually needed in the appropriation for the hospitals and domiciliary care. We have a site already here. I beg that this be approved.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. On pages 1236 and 1237, there is testimony from Mr. Higley, the chief of the real-estate division, to the effect that this overall program would cost $175 million. He stated that next year, 1957, they anticipated a request of $40 million for this purpose to present to the Congress and an overall program including nine cantonment-type hospitals. I understand that Mount Alto is to be included.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But, this goes on year after year and nothing is done and the scandal continues.

Bill No. 5240 provides an increase of $10,756,000 over the total amount requested in the President's budget for the Veterans' Administration in the 1956 fiscal year. The report on the bill shows that $16,185,000 was added for the purpose of accelerating a program for replacement of old and cantonment-type hospitals and acutely needed rehabilitation and modernization work at others. At the same time, however, the bill reduces the amount requested for general operating expenses by $5,300,000. In recognizing the continuing high-level volume of loan guaranty activities, the report specifies that a $1 million increase is provided for that program. This means that the reduction to be applied to other administrative operations is actually $6,300,000. The report states that $3 million of the reduction should be applied to the Department of Insurance and the balance to administrative expenses.

While the report—page 3—shows a proposed reduction of 1,043 employees from the number requested by the Veterans' Administration for all activities, it must be recognized that the budget estimate as submitted provided for a decrease of 1,479 employees under the general operating expenses appropriation for fiscal year 1956 as compared to 1955. It is noteworthy that there was a reduction of 3,507 in this group from 36,342 in 1954 to 32,835 in 1955. The number of insurance policies in force as of January 1, 1955, was 6,476,651 compared to 6,696,532 in force on January 1, 1954. This is a reduction of approximately 3 percent but the actual workload has increased since 5,330,978 policyholders were making payments of premiums direct to the Veterans' Administration on January 1, 1955, as compared to 5,090,113 on January 1, 1954. The budget for the Department of Insurance for fiscal year 1956 requests 6,821 employees against an estimated total of 7,544 for the current year. This is a decrease of nearly 9 percent. There are 740,076 veterans in training or in school as of February 28, 1955, and the average for the current fiscal year is estimated at 582,900. Based on a realistic projection of the volume of this program into the 1956 fiscal year, there is good reason to believe that an average number of 593,000 veterans will be in school or in training in the 1956 fiscal year whereas the budget request, not anticipating such volume when it was submitted some months ago, estimates an average number of 516,000 veterans in this program in 1956.

In addition to the reductions in our general operating expenses for personnel, attention is called to the fact that over $560,000 for so-called employee fringe benefits provided in recent legislation will be absorbed in the 1956 fiscal year. The major portion of this amount is for the Government's share of the cost of insurance for employees.

Reorganization of the Veterans' Administration about 1½ years ago had as a primary purpose the reduction of operating costs so long as service to veterans should not be impaired. In view of the reductions in personnel already effected, the further reductions which will be required by the decrease in the appropriation presents a serious question as to the ability of the Veterans' Administration to economize to such further extent without impairing service to veterans. It is not contended that all economies must be related to numbers of employees, but any significant decrease such as that under discussion must be related primarily to employment.

The Veterans' Administration desires to perform its functions with the lowest possible cost consistent with adequate service to veterans and has effectively demonstrated its intention in this respect not only during the past 2 years, but in its reduced budget request for the 1956 fiscal year. The total amount requested under the general operating expenses appropriation for the 1956 fiscal year was $160,300,000, as compared to an appropriation of $167,672,300 for the 1955 fiscal year. It is sincerely believed that the budget request for the 1956 fiscal year is conservative not only in the loan guaranty program as recognized by the House report, but also in the vocational rehabilitation and education program and consonantly in other functions which are related to and perform supplementary services for these programs.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The purpose of it is to provide adequate veterans' hospital care or planning for that care for one of the most thickly populated and most rapidly growing areas in the country. To give you an idea, the estimated veterans' population of Maryland in 1945 was 90,000. In 1949, only 5 years later, it was 263,000, almost triple the population and bear in mind that the population, particularly in the metropolitan area, is growing every day and is made up to a large extent of younger married couples, most of whom are veterans. The estimated veterans' hospital beds were increased slightly over one-fourth in that same period.

The area affected by this matter, the districts represented by Mr. HYDE and myself, are among the most rapidly growing counties in the State of Maryland. There is a crying need for this hospital facility and I urge everyone to vote for the amendment.

May I point out that there is no request for additional money, but this is simply to earmark money already in the bill. It is my understanding 4 VA hospitals, including 1 for this area, were approved at the same time. Three of those hospital have been built, but the one approved for this area has not been built. Each year the cry has been "wait until next year and you will get it then." But I feel now is the time and we cannot wait any longer and must start our planning for this badly needed facility for the veterans immediately. For these reasons, I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to get recognition for some time here. I want to take this time to say that I have just received a telegram from the Louisiana Municipal Association protesting the rider that was placed on the bill requiring prior approval of the two committees; one in the House and one in the Senate. It is my understanding that this has been stricken out and I should appreciate it if someone will tell me whether that is so.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, that was stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much and I ask unanimous consent to insert this telegram at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The telegram follows:

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Urge your efforts to have rider removed from independent offices appropriation bill requiring prior approval of House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees of housing and urban renewal projects using Federal money.

LOUISIANA MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
*538 Reymond Building.*
ANNA JANE WARRINER,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have clarified this point concerning this amendment and I shall address my remarks to any member of the committee who is present and can answer the question.

The question is, this money that is earmarked, will that come out of the $30 million that is allocated for rehabilitation of other veterans' hospitals?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The answer to the question is "Yes."

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I think that is something that we should consider very seriously. I hate to be in opposition to my colleagues from Maryland, but we have a very serious problem here. I would go along with appropriating additional funds for this study, but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that there is a necessity for additional hospital facilities here in the metropolitan area. However, I do not think it would be a wise move to take the little money that is now allocated for the rehabilitation of existing hospitals and devote that money to study and planning for one more hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to point out what I think is perhaps an error in the information that has been given to the committee. The statement has been made that perhaps no area in the United States needs facilities for its veterans more than the Washington area. I would not deny anyone the privilege of asking for veterans' facilities, but may I point out that in the State of Florida, with 436,000 veterans, we have 1,350 general medical beds and 116 beds for NP patients. We have over 872 NP patients that have to go hundreds and

hundreds of miles out of Florida to get attention. It would be just as logical to ask the veterans in Washington to go to Chicago or Boston or Philadelphia or some other area 500, 600, or 700 miles from the metropolitan center of this great country of ours.

We have a good hospital at Coral Gables, and we have another facility at Pass-a-Grille, and we have one at Lake City. I believe as the result of this bill there will be improvements made at Coral Gables. We desperately need now an NP hospital in Gainesville. In the United States as a whole there is an NP hospital bed for every 450 veterans, but in Florida there is only 1 NP hospital bed for every 3,600 veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe an objective study will show that the need of the State of Florida is greater than that of any other State in the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has just completed a very careful study of the veterans' facilities throughout the entire United States. We have sent each Member a copy of that survey. I had hoped this amendment would probably come up next year. There is no reason why it should not be placed in the bill this year. There is some controversy between civil defense and the Veterans' Administration as to where to place this hospital, but this is not building money, it is planning money, and there is no question that the needs in this area are probably greater than in any other place in the United States. The present hospital is an old girls' school, and certainly should be replaced as soon as possible.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. This point is not clear in my mind. If we allow the allocation of these funds requested by the gentleman from Virginia, will this endanger the possibility of other hospitals getting funds in this particular appropriation bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, it will take this money from the repair and renovation of other hospitals. There is no question about it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman consider that to be legislation that should be passed even though it may take it away from other hospitals? Does the gentleman believe this is good legislation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. When this legislation first started downtown there was practically no money in the bill for renovation and repair. When the Bureau of the Budget learned that we were doing a very careful study, they put some money in there, and then more money was added later, so it is the case of one against the other. I would personally like to see the amendment adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, while I am not opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, may I point out that there are other areas in the United States that are just as critical as the one for which he pleads. In an area representing over 1 million people, the one general medical hospital is in an old building that was once a hotel. Why, the oxygen has to be stored in the basement, an enforced violation of recognized hospital administration, where the doors are so narrow you cannot get a gurney through them. There is not an elevator in the place to handle sick people. That is the condition that we are up against in Oakland, Calif.

I do not mind the gentleman getting his $1 million to make surveys, but let us not use all this money for surveys and studies—there are plenty of studies in the files of the Veterans' Administration. Let us quit making studies and get action. Let us use some of this money for rehabilitation work in those hospitals that can be modernized, let us get on the way of obtaining an adequate and decent program for veterans' hospitals long needed and long overdue. I commend to you the report of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] which is now on your desks. I am sure you will find it a shocking one and one that indicates we have violated our responsibility to our sick and disabled veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. I would like, if I may take this time, to explain why I raised the point of order against the provision beginning on line 3 of page 31 with the word *"Provided,"* and continuing through line 14, inclusive.

May I say that a bill has been passed through the Veterans' Affairs Committee dealing with this subject, which will be a permanent law. Of course, as you know, a rider that goes through on an appropriation bill is temporary. Everyone I know of who is concerned with this legislation is satisfied with H. R. 5100. We have used a great deal of time and study in the preparation of this bill. We had the American Dental Association and the Veterans' Administration, as well as many other people, appear before the Veterans' Affairs Committee to testify. After hearing all sides and wishing to write a bill that would be satisfactory and at the same time take care of the situation, H. R. 5100 is the result of that study.

This bill is much the same as the one introduced last year by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. It makes permanent the legislation we are seeking to pass. It costs very little, if any, more money and it is a great saving over what was being spent for this same purpose in 1951. The best I can figure it is a saving of in the neighborhood of $75 million. We found that a great deal of money used at that time had been wasted.

The rider that was struck from the bill by my point of order as presently written and passed last year contains the same provisions as the appropriation committee made previously, namely, that it does not provide for any exemptions for the Spanish-American War group nor for trainees under Public Law 16.

H. R. 5100 which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported unanimously last Tuesday is accepted by the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration since it contains all of the conditions which they believe would be permanent law and would not have to be appropriated each year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this is the predicament which the House finds itself in on this amendment. There is no question but that a hospital for veterans should be provided in the area of the District of Columbia. There is no question but Mount Alto is an old hospital. It is inefficient in its operation and it is not possible to take a patient in that hospital from the operating room back to his bed in a ward without having to go through an outdoor corridor. The problem is—where should a new hospital be put and when should it be built? It is my understanding that this is the next hospital on the list to be built among the general hospitals. Now that is one side. The other side of the question is that we do not have the figures as to how much it should cost or where it should be built. I think the House generally is favorable toward the intent of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia. Let me put it this way. If the amendment carries, the money will be well spent. The work will be carried on about as it is planned. If the amendment does not carry, then the gentleman should have an understanding and we should have an understanding that the Veterans' Administration be urged to give immediate attention to the needs of Mount Alto Hospital and to determine where a replacement should be placed. The credit should go to the gentlemen from Virginia and the gentlemen from Maryland who have so effectively brought this to our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am in great sympathy with the gentlemen from Virginia and Maryland, but I am going to ask the House to be practical. There is $30 million in the bill to start renovating and remodeling hospitals that are firetraps. Since the new program started in 1944 through 1955 we have built 61 hospitals. There remain 111 that were built prior to World War II.

Let us not deplete this fund by taking out a million or a million and a half for plans for a new hospital. If they come in here next year with that budget estimate, I will attempt to persuade the members of this committee that as far as I am concerned we should vote for the appropriation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman, but if this amendment is

adopted, $1 million is taken away from other hospitals.

Mr. THOMAS. It will take a million dollars. There are 111 of these old hospitals which badly need this $30 million, plus a hundred million dollars more.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that Walter Reed Hospital, right here in the metropolitan area, needs an awful lot of rehabilitation right now.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us not disturb this money. If it comes in here next year we will supply the money. There is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5240) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Phillips amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 28, after line 14, insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation in this bill shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas) there were—ayes 69, noes 65.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 227, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—154

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alger | Gentry | Miller, Md. |
| Allen, Calif. | George | Miller, Nebr. |
| Allen, Ill. | Gross | Miller, N. Y. |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Gubser | Minshall |
| | Gwinn | Nicholson |
| Andresen, August H. | Hale | Norblad |
| | Halleck | Norrell |
| Arends | Hand | Ostertag |
| Auchincloss | Harden | Phillips |
| Baker | Harvey | Pillion |
| Bass, N. H. | Hébert | Priest |
| Bates | Heselton | Ray |
| Baumhart | Hess | Reece, Tenn. |
| Beamer | Hiestand | Reed, N. Y. |
| Becker | Hill | Rees, Kans. |
| Belcher | Hillings | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Bentley | Hoeven | Riehlman |
| Berry | Hoffman, Mich. | Robeson, Va. |
| Betts | Holmes | Sadlak |
| Boland | Holt | St. George |
| Bolton, Frances P. | Hope | Scott |
| | Horan | Scrivner |
| Bosch | Hosmer | Scudder |
| Bow | Hull | Sheehan |
| Brownson | Hyde | Short |
| Broyhill | Jackson | Simpson, Ill. |
| Budge | James | Simpson, Pa. |
| Bush | Jenkins | Smith, Kans. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jensen | Smith, Va. |
| Cederberg | Johansen | Springer |
| Chenoweth | Johnson, Calif. | Taber |
| Clevenger | Jonas | Talle |
| Cole | Jones, N. C. | Taylor |
| Colmer | Kean | Teague, Calif. |
| Coon | Kearns | Thomas |
| Cooper | Keating | Thompson, Mich. |
| Cramer | Kilburn | |
| Curtis, Mo. | King, Pa. | Utt |
| Dague | Krueger | Van Pelt |
| Davis, Tenn. | Laird | Velde |
| Davis, Wis. | Latham | Vursell |
| Dawson, Utah | LeCompte | Wainwright |
| Derounian | Lipscomb | Westland |
| Devereux | Lovre | Wharton |
| Dondero | McConnell | Wigglesworth |
| Ellsworth | McCulloch | Williams, N. Y. |
| Evins | McDonough | Wilson, Calif. |
| Fjare | McGregor | Wilson, Ind. |
| Ford | McIntire | Wolcott |
| Frelinghuysen | Mailliard | Yates |
| Gamble | Marshall | Young |
| Gathings | Martin | Younger |
| Gavin | Meader | |

NAYS—227

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Burdick | Dowdy |
| Abernethy | Burleson | Durham |
| Adair | Burnside | Edmondson |
| Addonizio | Byrd | Elliott |
| Albert | Byrne, Pa. | Engle |
| Alexander | Cannon | Fallon |
| Andrews | Carlyle | Fascell |
| Anfuso | Carnahan | Feighan |
| Ashley | Carrigg | Fenton |
| Ashmore | Celler | Fernandez |
| Aspinall | Chatham | Fino |
| Avery | Chelf | Fisher |
| Ayres | Chudoff | Flood |
| Bailey | Church | Flynt |
| Baldwin | Clark | Fogarty |
| Barrett | Corbett | Forand |
| Bass, Tenn. | Cretella | Forrester |
| Bennett, Fla. | Crumpacker | Fountain |
| Bennett, Mich. | Cunningham | Frazier |
| Blatnik | Curtis, Mass. | Friedel |
| Blitch | Davidson | Fulton |
| Boggs | Davis, Ga. | Garmatz |
| Bolling | Delaney | Gary |
| Bonner | Denton | Gordon |
| Boykin | Dies | Granahan |
| Boyle | Diggs | Grant |
| Bray | Dingell | Gray |
| Brooks, La. | Dodd | Green, Oreg. |
| Brooks, Tex. | Donohue | Green, Pa. |
| Brown, Ga. | Dorn, N. Y. | Gregory |
| Buchanan | Dorn, S. C. | Griffiths |
| Hagen | Matthews | Rogers, Mass. |
| Haley | Merrow | Rogers, Tex. |
| Hardy | Metcalf | Rooney |
| Harris | Miller, Calif. | Roosevelt |
| Harrison, Va. | Mills | Rutherford |
| Hays, Ark. | Mollohan | Saylor |
| Hayworth | Morano | Schenck |
| Henderson | Morgan | Seely-Brown |
| Herlong | Moss | Shelley |
| Holifield | Moulder | Shuford |
| Huddleston | Multer | Sieminski |
| Ikard | Murray, Ill. | Sikes |
| Jarman | Murray, Tenn. | Sisk |
| Jennings | Natcher | Smith, Miss. |
| Johnson, Wis. | O'Brien, N. Y. | Spence |
| Jones, Ala. | O'Hara, Ill. | Staggers |
| Jones. Mo. | O'Hara, Minn. | Steed |
| Karsten | O'Konski | Sullivan |
| Kee | O'Neill | Teague, Tex. |
| Kelley, Pa. | Patman | Thompson, La. |
| Kelly, N. Y. | Patterson | Thompson, N. J. |
| Keogh | Pelly | Thompson, Tex. |
| Kilday | Perkins | Thomson, Wyo. |
| Kilgore | Pfost | Thornberry |
| King, Calif. | Philbin | Tollefson |
| Kirwan | Pilcher | Trimble |
| Kluczynski | Poage | Tuck |
| Knox | Poff | Tumulty |
| Knutson | Polk | Udall |
| Landrum | Powell | Vanik |
| Lane | Preston | Van Zandt |
| Lanham | Price | Vinson |
| Lankford | Quigley | Vorys |
| Lesinski | Rabaut | Walter |
| Long | Radwan | Watts |
| McCarthy | Rains | Whitten |
| McCormack | Reuss | Wickersham |
| McMillan | Rhodes, Pa. | Widnall |
| Macdonald | Richards | Williams, Miss. |
| Machrowicz | Riley | Williams, N. J. |
| Mack, Ill. | Roberts | Winstead |
| Mack, Wash. | Robsion, Ky. | Wolverton |
| Madden | Rodino | Wright |
| Magnuson | Rogers, Colo. | Zablocki |
| Mahon | Rogers, Fla. | |

NOT VOTING—53

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barden | Dolliver | Nelson |
| Bell | Donovan | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Bolton, Oliver P. | Doyle | Osmers |
| | Eberharter | Passman |
| Bowler | Fine | Prouty |
| Brown, Ohio | Harrison, Nebr. | Reed, Ill. |
| Buckley | Hays, Ohio | Rivers |
| Canfield | Hinshaw | Scherer |
| Chase | Hoffman, Ill. | Schwengel |
| Chiperfield | Holtzman | Selden |
| Christopher | Judd | Sheppard |
| Cooley | Kearney | Siler |
| Coudert | Klein | Smith, Wis. |
| Dawson, Ill. | McVey | Weaver |
| Deane | Mason | Wier |
| Dempsey | McDowell | Willis |
| Dixon | Morrison | Withrow |
| Dollinger | Mumma | Zelenko |

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Seldon with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Wier with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Dixon.
Mr. Christopher with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Siler.

Mr. BARRETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FENTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KNOX changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STAGGERS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CORRECTION OF SECTION NUMBERS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers and provisos and parts of the bill which were eliminated, and those partly eliminated from the bill on points of order, and to correct such other typographical errors as may appear.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## INVESTIGATION AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 154) to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1955, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. And the gentleman has consulted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and it is agreeable that the resolution come up in this way?

Mr. O'NEILL. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof insert the following: "That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1955, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters—

"(1) relating to employee health, welfare, and pension plans;

"(2) relating to the question of Federal aid to school construction; and

"(3) relating to education and labor generally.

*"Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

"For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress as such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

"The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SALE OF WATER TO McCORMICK, S. C.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4436) relating to the sale of water from the Clark Hill Reservoir to the city of McCormick, S. C.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand this is just a local matter that has been approved by the full committee.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. That is right.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman the bill has a unanimous report from the Committee on Public Works. The dry weather, and so forth, has made it almost impossible for this small town to get any water. They are going to pay the Government for the water and instead of its costing anything it will bring money into the Treasury.

Mr. MARTIN. That is a relief.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Chief of Engineers is hereby authorized to contract with the city of McCormick, S. C., upon such terms and for such period not to exceed fifty years as he may deem reasonable for the sale of not to exceed six hundred acre-feet of water annually from the Clark Hill Reservoir, and is authorized to grant to the city of McCormick at no cost easement over Government lands at Clark Hill for the sole purpose of constructing necessary pipeline and pumping station, and the project for Clark Hill Dam authorized by the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved December 22, 1944, is hereby modified accordingly: *Provided*, That all moneys received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That nothing in this Act shall affect water rights under State law.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "sale" and insert "use of storage space in the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing said city a regulated water supply in an amount."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "from the Clark Hill Reservoir."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Relating to the use of storage space in

the Clark Hill Reservoir for the purpose of providing the city of McCormick, S. C., a regulated water supply."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of this bill I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], this bill is of an urgent nature. The city of McCormick was in a desperate situation last summer and fall regarding its city water supply. Last year was the third dry year in that area of the country. The McCormick city reservoir dried up and the city had to go to great extremes to get water. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts and to the House that we have had some winter rain but the rainfall is still insufficient and McCormick is looking to the dry hot summer months with apprehension. The town recently voted a bond issue by an overwhelming majority to finance a pipeline to nearby Clarks Hill Reservoir where a pump station would be installed and by this manner McCormick would be assured of a regular supply of water. Clarks Hill is a Government power project and reservoir under the control of our Army Corps of Engineers. The reservoir covers many thousands of acres. McCormick under this bill is only asking permission of the Congress to use a minute portion of this vast store of water. The Corps of Engineers has approved the bill. In fact, they helped to write it. I appeared with them before the Public Works Committee of the House this morning—only a few hours ago. Mr. Speaker, the splendid acting committee chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], and the entire membership endorsed and favorably reported this bill. Likewise the committee staff realizing the urgency of this bill, graciously consented to forego all other business to prepare and type this favorable report and to place it on the Speaker's desk a few moments ago. In the meantime I discussed this bill with the distinguished Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN], the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the distinguished and able minority leadership of the House, the gentleman from Massachuetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the distinguished minority leader of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Gentlemen of the House, it is refreshing to me and to many of the Members with whom I have talked today that a municipality instead of asking for money from the Federal Government is only requesting that they be permitted to pay into the Federal Treasury money for use of abundant water already in the Clarks Hill Reservoir. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the people of McCormick will be grateful to you if this bill could pass today thus giving them the time necessary to lay the pipe and install the pump station before the long, dry, hot days of the coming summer. This House by such action today can help avert a possible disaster to that fine South Carolina community.

---

## INCREASING CERTAIN PAYS AND ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4720) to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 5, strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections."

Page 3, line 12, strike out "service.'" and insert "service."

Page 3, after line 12, insert:

"'(f) Any officer serving on active duty in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral shall, in addition to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled by the provisions of this act, be entitled to an additional increment of basic pay in an amount of $100 per month. Any officer serving on active duty in the grade of general or admiral shall, in addition to the pay and allowances to which he is entitled by the provisions of this act, be entitled to an additional increment of basic pay in an amount of $200 per month. The additional increments provided by this subsection shall not be considered a part of the active duty pay or of the monthly basic pay of these grades for the purpose of the computation of retired pay.'."

Page 7, after line 10, insert:

"(13) Section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act is amended by adding at the end of such subsection the following: 'In lieu of transportation of baggage and household effects, a member of a uniformed service who transports a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States for use as a residence and who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage and household effects, under this section, shall under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned be entitled to a reasonable allowance, not to exceed 20 cents per mile, or to the dislocation allowance authorized in this section, whichever he shall elect.'."

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(13)" and insert "(14)."

Page 7, line 22, strike out "(14)" and insert "(15)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman to explain the two amendments inserted by the Senate. I have no objection to them, but I would like to have the gentleman explain them.

Mr. KILDAY. I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is the military pay bill we passed here a few weeks ago by a vote of 399 to 1.

A time limitation is involved, because unless the bill gets to the White House by tomorrow it will delay the effective date for a full month.

Only two amendments were placed in the bill in the Senate. I would like to point out initially that we dealt with 296 basic pay scales in this bill. The Senate has changed only 2.

There is one other amendment that I would also explain, but the practical proposition is that I doubt if we could accomplish much in conference when the other body has agreed to such a proportion of the provisions contained in the House bill.

The first amendment that was adopted in the Senate will amount to a total increase of $158,400 per year. It provides for an additional allowance of $100 per month for lieutenant generals and their equivalents and additional pay of $200 per month for full generals or four-star generals or their equivalents. There are 76 officers of the grade of lieutenant general or equivalent and there are a total of 26 officers in the grade of general or equivalent, and, as I have said, the total additional cost is $158,400 per year. The other amendment has to do with the transportation of members of the Armed Forces of all ranks and grade. At the present time, of course, they are entitled to their transportation and to the transportation of baggage and household effects, but those who have trailers and move themselves with the trailer, and also their baggage and household effects in the trailer, do not get any credit for that. The Senate has added a provision which, under regulations to be adopted by the Department, provides that a person who moves a trailer to be used as his residence and transports his baggage will in lieu of the cost of transportation of his baggage and household effects be granted mileage not exceeding 20 cents per mile. He will, however, not be entitled then to receive the dislocation allowance which we provided in the House bill. This matter was pending in a separate bill in the House introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN]. The Senate has included that provision and, I believe, Mr. Speaker, under proper safeguards against any abuse.

I think the Senate has taken such a tremendously large proportion of our bill there is no point in going to conference, and that we should at this time concur in the Senate amendments.

If there is to be delay in the military personnel receiving their increased pay, I do not want the responsibility to be on the Congress; so I hope we can conclude it this afternoon.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. As I understand the last Senate amendment, it provides in regard to the trailer situation that where a serviceman and his wife live in a trailer and travel from one post to another they will be compensated. I have always been impressed with the justice of their case, and I am very glad,

listening to the remarks of my friend from Texas, to join in his request to concur in the Senate amendment which brings this relief to a worthy class of persons who are in the service.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In view of the fact that this is the 30th day of March, should the House concur in the Senate amendments and the bill be sent to the White House, it means that the pay increase will take effect on May 1; is that right?

Mr. KILDAY. It depends on when the President signs the bill. If the President signs it tomorrow, it will become effective April 1.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the House concur in the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PAMPHLET THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Concurrrent Resolution 85 with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "hundred", insert "5."

Page 1, line 10, after "thousand", insert "250."

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "24,750" and insert "30,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas explain the amendments?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment simply adds 2,500 copies of this document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 98) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 22 of the 84th Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000 including expenditure for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EMPLOYMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL MESSENGERS, OFFICE OF POSTMASTER

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 195) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective April 1, 1955, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of two additional messengers, Office of the Postmaster, at the basic salary of $1,940 per annum each.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SESQUICENTENNIAL OF MOUNT VERNON, KNOX COUNTY, OHIO

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 201) which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas July 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1955, will be celebrated as the Sesquicentennial of Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio; and

Whereas Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio, is the birthplace of Daniel Decatur Emmett, the composer of the song Dixie; and

Whereas the house in which Daniel Decatur Emmett was born will be dedicated as a museum during the sesquicentennial celebration; and

Whereas Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio, was also the birthplace of Columbus Delano, the man who nominated Abraham Lincoln for President; and

Whereas Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio, was chosen by the Government some 6 years ago as the typical American town: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives extends its felicitations to Mount Vernon, Knox County, Ohio, on the celebration of its sesquicentennial, and expresses its appreciation for the splendid services the citizens of Mount Vernon have rendered to this Nation during the past 150 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EVERY KNOCK A BOOST

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not always easy to judge the effectiveness of a program such as that of the United States Information Agency, but the increasing venom of Communist attacks on the Agency would seem to indicate the arch-propagandists of Moscow and Peiping are, at least, beginning to smart.

A recent issue of International Life, a monthly scientific-political journal published in the U. S. S. R., devotes a long article to what it titles "Factory of Lies: The United States Information Agency."

The writer, and he, of course, speaks for the men of the Kremlin, depicts the United States Information Agency as an instrument of aggressive United States policy which "systematically falsifies the statements of the Soviet Government" and "poisons the atmosphere" with "lies and distortions" disguising the true objectives of the war-mongering, atom-rattling United States.

The article—and remember this is the Soviet government speaking—asserts that the United States propaganda is ineffective, but it admits that it must be reckoned with and resolutely opposes as a not unimportant obstacle in the defense of peace. I see this as a sort of back-handed compliment to the United States Information Agency, no matter what the intent of the writer. Every knock a boost from this source.

Policies and operations of the United States Information Agency are analyzed in detail with, of course, the most fantastic interpretations. The writer would seem to have done considerable research in preparing his masterpiece. Actually, of course, the operations of the United States Information Agency are so open he did not have to dig too deeply. We do not work behind curtains of any kind.

I spoke of this article as a backhanded compliment. The United States Information Agency could make a collection of this type of bouquets. The Chinese Communist professor who wrote that the Voice of America—the Agency's international broadcasting service—was "10 times more dangerous than the A-bomb, because the bomb damages only a limited area, while the Voice corrupts every person who listens," was indirectly paying tribute to the effectiveness of this operation. Again, the Soviet writer, who declared that the Voice had become synonymous with lying to "millions of Soviet people," was, inadvertently, I am sure, admitting that the Voice, despite Communist jamming efforts, is penetrating the curtain to what is, to them, an alarming extent.

The jamming operation is, itself, another of these tributes in reverse. The Communists spend as much on their efforts to prevent their people hearing the Voice as the United States Information Agency does on the entire Voice operation. Equally indicative are the punishments invoked for the crime of listening. The punishments vary. In some Communist areas it is not a crime to listen, but repeating what has been heard, if reported, is a one-way ticket to Siberia, if not to the gallows. Reports of the conviction of persons guilty of these crimes fill Communist newspapers. For example, Reuters, London, in a radioteletype to the United States, February last, reported that the people's court at Cheb, Czechoslovakia, had sentenced Jaroslav Maloun, a technician and member of the agricultural cooperative at Nebancie, to 14 months' imprisonment for agitation against the Republic by listening to foreign propaganda radio stations. He was found guilty of helping several farmers to listen in his apartment during 1952, 1953, and 1954. Reuters quotes Straz Miru, a Czech Communist paper published in Karlove Vary. Chinese Communist newspapers recently reported death sentences passed out to two unfortunate individuals whose only crime was that they had listened. Listening was enough. In their case, repeating what they had heard was not mentioned.

But the people, even the Chinese, do listen. A Chinese refugee recently told the Agency's Hong Kong post that "many in China risk their lives to listen secretly to the Voice of America, hoping for news outside the Bamboo Curtain."

All refugees and defectors report that they, and their friends, listened to the Voice.

But, again, we do not need this testimony. The Communists themselves constantly lament not only that their unhappy people listen to the Voice, but that they are guilty of paying too much attention to other United States so-called propaganda. Nowa Kultura, a Polish publication, declared recently:

> These people—
>
> The Poles—
>
> listen not only to the Polish radio but also to Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America * * * those who listen to these barking stations cannot help hearing about the alleged superiority of western art.

This same article denounced the Poles equally venomously for reading western books.

> Let us not suffer from delusion—
>
> It said—
>
> the books of Koestler, Orwell, Waugh, and Camus are read, circulated and even sought after in Poland. They are read not only by the open enemies of our country, but also by those whom we have failed to convince.

Alas, poor Poland and those unhappy Poles who have not been convinced that the misery inflicted by their Communist masters is not good for them. But there are still those who yearn for freedom and dream of the day when the Communist yoke will be removed and the air of Poland freed of the Communist reek. To keep hope alive in these people is one task of the United States Information Agency. It is an important task. The day will come when we, the free world, will need these people.

The Communists blame the United States Information Agency, and its programs, for practically anything that goes wrong under the Communist rule. Trybuna Ludu, another Polish Communist publication, recently declared that the United States Information Agency, and the Voice, are responsible for the failure of the hay crop in Blotniki. Village farmers, Trybuna Ludu told its readers, who have listened to the Voice have lost confidence in the Communist regime and, simultaneously, their efficiency as farmers. They do not exert their best efforts to save their crops. They do not take the proper steps to insure a good crop. They actually doubt the stability of the Communist government and these doubts have their source in the hostile propaganda disseminated by the Voice of America.

In my opinion, this criticism of the United States Information Agency is that Agency's best measure of the effectiveness of its programs. These are Communists, telling us themselves, that the United States Information Agency is doing the job it was assigned, that it is telling all peoples throughout the world the truth about the United States and the truth about communism. It is winning the battle for freedom in the minds and hearts of men.

## TENURE OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposed joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States by providing for a compulsory sabbatical leave for United States Representatives and United States Senators. The resolution provides that after the adoption of the amendment Representatives and Senators cannot serve more than 12 consecutive years at a time. In other words, at the end of 6 consecutive full terms a Representative must retire for 2 years, a Senator at the end of 2 consecutive full terms must retire for 2 years.

The constitutions of many charitable corporations in the United States have been changed over the past few years to require a compulsory sabbatical leave for their board members. The philosophy behind these proposals and the manner in which experience has shown that philosophy is carried out is well worth considering in establishing the procedures of our national legislative bodies.

There are two sides to the coin. First. Many persons serving on boards of charitable institutions or filling other positions of public nature have found it quite difficult to gracefully retire from that position so that others may assume some of the burdens of this civic responsibility. The compulsory sabbatical leave technique provides a graceful way for them to terminate their service. Many people will not think that this philosophy has any bearing on Representatives or Senators. However, I know many of my colleagues recognize this as a very beneficial suggestion which could be happily applied to their own situation. Indeed there are very few Congressmen who come down to Washington with the thought in mind beyond serving a few terms; certainly there would be very few who would state that they would want or anticipate serving as many as six terms. They simply get caught in a fascinating rut.

Second. On the other hand, it has been observed that certain persons, and very fine persons, who serve on charitable boards for an extended period of time begin to look upon the particular institution as something of their own and something in which they have a vested interest. It is difficult to gracefully suggest to these persons that they have done a fine job, but wouldn't it be good for them to retire so that someone new could come in. The enforced sabbatical leave provides the technique whereby this problem is met. The same situation exists as to members of the national legislative body. In fact, due to the power that an incumbent national legislator has to get himself reelected it is exceedingly difficult to get a person to step aside even when grace is thrown to the winds, and he is specifically approached on the subject of retiring.

There is raised from time to time the argument that you lose some good men by requiring this break in service. However, experience has shown that if the man is really good and truly wanted, he is back on the board again after his sabbatical leave. So I am certain it would be with our national legislators. Any man who was making a career of being a legislator could certainly continue to make a career of it; in fact, probably be a better legislator for the fact that he could step out for a 2-year stint every 12 years to regain his perspective. Actually he can serve 3 sets of terms or 36 years, if he is wanted, or 48 years. Any man whom the people of a district really wanted would certainly go back into the Congress regardless of who had taken his place for the 2 years leave of absence.

Many additional gains to be derived from the adoption of this procedure can be seen as it is more closely analyzed. The fact that the representative theory of our Republican system would be strengthened is one, with Congress meeting 9 and 10 months out of every 12 and the constant load being placed upon the shoulders of the representative, many representatives become more residents of Washington, D. C., than of their districts. Yet if a person is to be a true representative he must be a part of the community he is representing. The sabbatical-leave technique will encourage this.

Further, much of the criticism directed against the seniority system of committee assignments and committee chairmanship is well founded. But those who are sincerely concerned about the legitimacy of the criticism always come

up with the realization that almost any other system would be worse. Furthermore, there is justification in the belief that the longer a man serves on a committee or upon a particular assignment the more valuable he is and the more he understands the work to be done. The sabbatical leave device should assist greatly in correcting some of the more obvious bad results of the seniority system and yet retain most of the good features. In other words, with the sabbatical leave procedure the seniority system, of course, would remain. I doubt if anyone could change it even if he wanted to. However, the 2-year break would insure quite a bit of new flexibility and certainly a real turnover in committee chairmanships. With the increase in Congressmen's salaries, which seems justified if indeed we are going to make of a representative a full time job, the wisdom of which I question, the power of an incumbent Congressman to get reelected is accentuated even though he becomes in effect a nonresident of his district. It will become increasingly important to have a device which will keep representation in Washington close to the people. This device will help to do it.

Perhaps some point will be raised that a Senator dropping out for 2 years compulsory sabbatical leave is in the position of waiting 6 years, before he runs for reelection again. Actually there are relatively few Senators who have served more than two terms, furthermore there is nothing that would prevent them from running for office in the House if they want to stay in legislative work. The experience, I am sure, would be broadening. Also the possibility of running for the other senatorial seat from the State suggests beneficial rather than detrimental results in the attitude of incumbants toward their jobs.

Finally, I think a change in procedure of this nature has some real chance of being adopted by the Congress. Perhaps not by the present Congress because the idea has just been presented, but as the matter is studied and thought over. The sabbatical leave would apply to the terms of no present Congressman—it would only start to apply to all equally from the date of enactment. In other words, a Congressman with 20-years consecutive service could look forward to 12 more years consecutive service just as one with 10 or 2 years service. Very few Congressmen, no matter how long they have served, would say that they expect or anticipate serving 12 more years. I again suggest that most Congressmen would look upon this procedure as one which would solve their own personal problem. It would provide a graceful way of getting out, even for those who though willing to stay feel it is just a question of time before they are retired ignominiously by the people at the polls.

## PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings which took place during the recess of the House today be printed in the RECORD at that point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## A SERVICE—BOTH CHRISTIAN AND PATRIOTIC

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by me before the District of Columbia Credit Union League at their annual meeting, March 12, 1955, at the Statler Hotel here in Washington.

It is as follows:

A SERVICE—BOTH CHRISTIAN AND PATRIOTIC

(Address by Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, March 12, 1955, District of Columbia Credit Union League annual meeting)

President Fuller, officers and members of the District of Columbia credit unions and their guests, it is certainly a happy privilege for me to have the honor and the opportunity of addressing you, or attempting to, upon this occasion. I have appeared before your group before, and I have the feeling that I am appearing before a good, genuine patriotic group of the finest type of Americans in the country—people who are interested in their country and their fellow man.

To a lot of people in this country, a credit union is next in importance to the church. It is my belief that you are continuing to carry on the crusade which our Saviour commenced when he drove the money changers out of the temple. You are carrying on that crusade. You are doing a great work. You are helping poor people. You are helping people who are in the low-income groups. You are helping people who happen to have misfortunes with which they are unable to deal individually with and as a family. You are doing a tremendous lot of good; you are making our country stronger by helping the people who built our country in time of peace and who saw it in time of war. I am proud of the credit unions.

EARLY INTEREST IN LEGISLATION FOR CREDIT UNION MOVEMENT

In 1934, Senator Morris Shepherd from the city and the district which I have the honor to represent (he was formerly a Member of the House from the district I now represent) interested me in credit unions and he told me he would like to have a monument of his service in the form of some constructive endeavor like credit unions that would go down in history; that he wanted to do something for credit union movement, and I told him: "Well, Senator, you have a bill and I will support your bill—I'll not introduce one in the House. I want it to be your bill and we'll get it through and hope to make it the law of the land." He succeeded in getting it through the Senate and I did my very best and was successful in getting it through the House. I shall never forget June 16, 1934—it looked like Congress was going to adjourn and this bill, although it had passed both Houses, had not been signed by either the Speaker of the House or the Vice President. So, Mr. Bergengren (many of you know him) and I got together and we commenced running from one end of the Capitol to the other to get it down to the President and get it through and signed to become a law. Fortunately, the House was stymied and about 11:30 that night, I think the RECORD will show—the Senate and the House adjourned until Monday morning. That gave us time, and on the 18th day of June—I'm sure you'll find—it was presented to the President of the United States, although he probably didn't sign it for a few days. But that was the beginning of the Federal Credit Union movement in the United States. We organized the first credit union under that law in Texarkana, Tex., and we named it the Morris Shepherd Credit Union and it is still a very successful credit union there, I'm proud to say.

IMPORTANCE OF ORGANIZED EFFORT

The years I've been in Congress, I have realized and have been made aware of, the people in the movement and associations and organizations that are trying to do something to further this genuine constructive interest of the people and the Nation. I count among those constructive groups the credit unions.

I understand that you have 159 organizations here in the District of Columbia. I congratulate you on having so many. I understand that all of these unions are not members of the District league. I hope you join. You're engaged in a great crusade.

In order to work effectively, and to the greatest extent, you must associate yourselves with others who are going in the same direction, and work shoulder to shoulder with them. Your enemies are united. They are working shoulder to shoulder against you. Not 84 percent organized but 100 percent. Every credit union that's eligible to join, should join the District of Columbia League, and it should be the same way in every State in the United States. You should join—you should identify yourself with this good constructive cause which is a real crusade.

Now you can't expand like you have in recent years and not step on somebody's toes. As you are helpful to others you're depriving some greedy person of an opportunity so he feels you're doing him wrong and depriving him of a profitable pursuit. Now you're helping a lot of people. I know that in doing good some of us are called do-gooders. Well I'm perfectly willing to be called a do-gooder, and I know you're perfectly willing to be called a do-gooder. You're proud of it—it's a good name. I don't object to it at all.

TRICKLE-DOWN MOVEMENT

Back in 1932, our country was really at a low point, and the right kind of a leader for a good or a bad cause could have tipped our country over to a foreign ideology. Fortunately it didn't happen. But we were at a loss to know exactly what to do. There were so many unemployed—so many bread lines—so many persons losing their homes. They didn't know where to turn—where to look; they had no place to go. Although they were able and anxious and willing to work they could not find employment. With that situation in mind, the administration in power at that time started the first trickle-down movement in the United States. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was proposed. For whom? For credit unions? No; for poor unemployed people? No; for people losing their homes? No. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was organized to help the banks, the railroads, and the insurance companies only. That was the original trickle-down movement. The trickle-down theory: Pour money in the top in the hope it would trickle down; percolate down to the masses. A lot of people thought it would happen. Well it didn't happen, so many of the trickle-downers were pleased and some of the more liberal trickle-downers were disappointed. And we've had them ever since; we have them today. As between a trickle-downer and a do-gooder, I'm certainly glad to be identified with the do-gooders rather than the trickle-downers.

SAFEGUARDS IN OUR ELECTION SYSTEM

The Congress is composed of as many fine men and women as you will find in any group in America. I have had the privilege of serving with more than 2,500 Members of the House of Representatives during the 26 years that I've had the privilege of serving

the United States Congress and I know that the people only elect good people as Members of the United States Congress. That is the rule—it is a general rule. After all a candidate for Congress and a Member of Congress is in a goldfish bowl. Everything he does or says is well known to the people he has the honor of representing. If he's a good Member, the people know it and they return him. If he is not a good Member, he is defeated. That's the way it should be. I'm in favor of the House continuing as a 2-year body. There's good reason for that. The House, the 435 Members, are elected every 2 years. The executive branch of the Government—4 years. The Senator's terms are 6 years. The judiciary—a lifetime job. That's the way it should be.

Our forefathers, the Founding Fathers, had a reason for writing in their Constitution that the Members of the House should be elected every 2 years. Two years is long enough for a poor Congress, in fact too long. If it is a good Congress, it can be reelected. The Founding Fathers wrote into our Constitution that only in the House could certain bills be introduced and considered first—bills involving collection of taxes, revenue measures. That gives the Members of the House charge of the purse strings of the Nation. The people have charge of the purse strings of the Nation by the privilege of electing or not electing the House every 2 years so the people do have complete charge. And if there is a dangerous trend—it can be changed in 2 years' time. So personally I'm opposed to any change in the 2-year term. It should remain that way.

Now I know that Members of Congress have not been paid the salaries they should have been paid. You know Members are very reluctant to vote an increase of their own salaries. But under the Constitution and laws that's the only way it can be done. This year they did, and I'm glad they did, because I don't want it to be a rich man's club. I want the Congress to be composed of people who have a measure of security to the extent they can have courage, and can be forthright in their convictions and expressions, and they can only occupy that position of security if they have adequate salaries. It's in the interest of the poorest people in this country that they have free and independent Representatives in the United States Congress. They don't want them to be subject to any temptation that might cause them to change their convictions and vote against the interest of the general welfare of all the people. It must be that way.

### CONGRESS IS ALERT TO THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE

The Members should go a step further and they should equip themselves with administrative assistants and economists, if necessary, so they will be able to keep up with the work that's going on in Congress. Why, we have 10,000 bills introduced every Congress. The Member of Congress, with one ear to his constituents, listens to what the people say too. After all, he is elected by the people and as one Member said: "What does it profit a Member of Congress to save the whole country and lose his own seat?" So, they're going to listen to the people back home. And they're going to keep at their duties; they should do that. They're trying to keep up with things the best they can. But they can't do it, it's impossible to do it. I can give you an illustration:

Last year there was a bill—H. R. 8300—a tax bill—to revise the tax laws of the country. Rewritten, the members of our party, the Democratic Party, didn't even see the bill until it was introduced and ready to come on the floor. We were assured it had been carefully gone over by the Treasury Department—it contained changes in our laws we should have we were told. Well, Members of Congress were helpless, 900 pages—changes—fundamental changes—basic changes—in the internal revenue laws of our country. Do you think any 1 Member could get into 900 pages and do anything with it in a few days time without knowing anything about the laws he was dealing with? Why, of course he could. He needed an administrative assistant, economist, people to help him. But he didn't have them. So what was the result? That bill went through; we voted blindly, at least those who voted for it did—I didn't vote for it. Voted blindly, and what has been the result? We have already discovered 75 major errors in that law just up to now. Why, without knowing it, they repealed the penalties on narcotics peddlers; the drug addicts repealed it. It was not known until the first of this year. They were all excited about it and they had to get a law reestablished placing a penalty on the transportation of narcotics. That's just a sample.

### ATTITUDE OF SOME BANKS TO CREDIT UNIONS

So now your problem with credit unions is keeping your Members of Congress advised about the truth concerning the work the credit unions are doing. There's a good business undertaking that should be supported by the Members of Congress. The banks, some of them, have taken the shortsighted view and are opposing the credit unions. I can't understand that. It is the larger banks, I'm sure, that do not come in contact with the credit unions. The credit unions are compelled by law to have a contact with a bank. They've got to do business with a bank. They keep their deposits in a bank. They get loans from a bank. They are good customers of banks. But some banks, not all of them, do not look favorably upon your making loans at a low rate of interest. You see, in bankers you can find all kinds of people. Most of them are the very best people, but sometimes there are exceptions. They do not view favorably your making loans at such a low rate of interest; they don't like that. I think the bankers are wrong. Now, the bankers, if they insist on making an issue of credit unions (and some of them continue to try to destroy you), it is possible we will have to make other arrangements about having someone else with whom you can deal, or have a setup of your own that will not require you to go through banks.

### HOLDING COMPANIES

The other day in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, of which I am a member, we had the chairman of the Federal legislative committee of the great American Bankers' Association appearing as a witness before our committee against a holding-company bill. You know the banks are built for the local community. They should serve the local community. They've been given great rights and privileges and opportunities to make money on the theory that it is necessary to serve the local community.

But these holding companies have grown up—and they're buying banks all over the country—across the State lines and everywhere. And they have dummy directors. We're trying to stop it. The American Bankers Association was there appearing against this bill we were trying to get through. I asked their chairman: "How many members are on your committee, the Federal legislative committee?" He answered, 13. I said: "Who else is a member of the committee besides yourself?" He didn't know one—he couldn't name one single one. He had been given that statement. He had read it; he had presented it, and he couldn't name one other member of that committee that was representing the American Bankers Association. But in that statement he had a provision against credit unions, against Federal savings and loans and against other thrift institutions, claiming they had unfair advantage over banks. I asked how did he get this unfair advantage when a banker is able to manufacture money. Bankers are the biggest manufacturers in the Nation. Not something you can eat and wear—but money. They are manufacturers of money. They manufacture from $6 to $10 to every $1 they have. And I asked him (and he couldn't answer, naturally, he couldn't) how he could consider the credit unions could hurt him as a competitor when a credit union merely makes loans of the actual money they have—when the banks could increase it 6 and 10 times to 1 and make a loan.

### GOLD AS A MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE

When we used gold, or rather when the people of Europe used gold as a medium of exchange almost exclusively, they had goldsmiths, and the goldsmith would have a safe like a bank has today, and he could keep the gold safely. People would carry the gold to him, deposit it just like they deposit it today in a bank, and he would write out a receipt for the gold. The person would take the receipt: he wouldn't come back and get the gold—he wouldn't need it. But he would use the receipt to trade. He'd buy something with it and the person who received it would buy something else and it would travel just like money travels today. They even passed a law in Amsterdam one time that if anybody started the rumor the goldsmith didn't actually have the gold to meet these receipts, he would suffer the death penalty. They didn't want any idle rumors floating around that the goldsmith didn't have the gold to cover every receipt. It happened they had a run on a goldsmith and he didn't have the gold and they hanged the goldsmith! Now that's how the reserve system started—just like we have here in the United States today.

It was finally determined that if the goldsmith had one dollar of gold, he could extend loans equal to ten times that much safely, and get interest on it, with the knowledge that people normally never came back for the gold anyway. One dollar to ten will take care of it and will be sufficient reserve. So we adopted that system here in the United States and today banks (depending on the type of bank) can make loans equal to from six to ten dollars for every dollar they have in reserve. That's manufacturing money. Now banks can do that and I defend them for it. I say it's all right if they do it for the purpose it was intended when they were granted the charters for making loans to local people, to help extend business and commerce, and to make it possible for people to get money when they need it when misfortune overtakes them. That's perfectly all right for the banks to do that. But when they go out of the banking business and become just government bond holders and commercial bookkeepers, and sell out to some foreign banks, and have only dummy directors locally, they're getting away from their charter. They should not be supported by the United States Government and allowed to pursue those privileges that are given to a local bank for that purpose. The Congress, if the members of Congress get the truth, are going to vote right. It's the best jury I have ever known.

### CONGRESS MUST BE INFORMED

Before I came to Congress I tried a lot of cases in Texas before the courts. I was prosecuting attorney, district attorney over an area of Texas. I went from county to county to try capital cases. I've tried lots of cases before juries. Juries are fair. Seldom do you ever find a jury that turns out to be unfair; very, very seldom. One out of a hundred, something like that; then probably just one on that jury. The jurors are fair. Members of Congress are fair. If you get the truth to them in the right way they will do exactly the right thing—the majority

of them will. The exceptions will not have any weight. That's the reason we should have majority rule in this country. We don't want minority rule. In other words every person who is absent will be against it and a minority will control. That's just one of the instances.

We don't want minority representation in government, we want it exactly as it is. Majority rule, and whenever you get the truth to the Members of Congress, a majority will do whatever is right under the circumstances. Your problem is meeting this awful vicious propaganda that is going throughout the length and breadth of this great country of ours, and particularly to the desks of the Members of the United States Congress—propaganda that is not in your favor—its against you. You've got to meet that some way. Those of you from States where you have Members of the House and Senate should contact those Members and let them know how you feel about this. Those of you from a State, and most of you are, and have relatives back home, get in touch with them and tell them what a great thing the credit unions are. Tell them to write their Members of Congress to take care of the credit unions and make sure they are not unfairly treated. In doing that we'll have tremendous support in the United States Congress.

OPPOSITION FROM FASCIST-MINDED GROUPS

As to ideologies that have been going around all over the country, in discussions remember this: The first thing that the Fascists do is to destroy credit unions, labor unions, and farm cooperatives. I am not saying every person in the United States who favors the destruction of credit unions, labor unions, and farm cooperatives is a Fascist. I do not make that charge. But I do make the charge that every Fascist in this country and every Fascist-minded person in this country is in favor of destroying those three groups, including the credit unions. Back in the days of Hitler and Mussolini the people were taught to hate communism and socialism, which was all right. But they overlooked one thing: they didn't mention fascism and dictatorships, and they caused people to hate communism and socialism to the extent that the people quickly embraced fascism when the time came for Mussolini and Hitler to proclaim Fascist countries. Fascism and communism are the same at the top—each is a dictatorship. There is no difference between them. Both Communists and Fascists are against credit unions, labor unions, and farm cooperatives. They are both for the destruction of your organizations. Right here in America today we have been fighting back at communism, which is a fine thing. I'm opposed to communism, you're opposed to communism; we don't want communism. We want democracy. We want a democracy in a republic like we have today. It has proven to be the best and finest government on the face of the earth. While we are fighting back at communism that is coming from the left, let us not overlook an equally devastating, destructive enemy in the form of fascism that is attempting to approach us from the right. One is just as bad as the other; I'm afraid there's a lot of sentiment in our Nation today for real, old-time fascism. They're not willing to admit it, but there are lots of earmarks.

SUMMARIZATION

Now then, my friends, I have talked to you as long as I should talk. I'll just summarize this way: When I came here 26 years ago, or a little better, I felt like certain things should be done. Credit unions of course fit right into the plans I had. I have been trying to inform myself on ways and methods of being the most effective representative just for the plain people of the country, and in doing that I have realized that a lot of fine, able Members of Congress have had great advantages, more advantages than I have had, graduates of the finest universities in the United States and in the world. I have to work a little bit harder every day, and I have during these 26 years, to try to make up for that and to try to learn the things that would help me to be just a good representative for just the plain people of the country, the people I represent, down there in the first district of Texas, because I believe that will help all the people. When you help plain people, the average people, in our land to enjoy equality of opportunity, that helps everybody. Some will get more than others; certainly they will, because they will work harder for it and they have trained their minds. They are more discreet and they are more diplomatic and more tactful. They know how to do the constructive thing at the right time better than some of us. They have trained themselves that way, and they will always get a little bit more than some of the rest of us. That's all right; I don't object at all. But let's give every person an equal chance—equality of opportunity, and give every family an opportunity to have a breadwinner with a good job; in other words, we want full employment.

Now, another act that I am so proud of—as a Member of the United States Congress I was the original author in the House of Representatives of what is now known as the full employment bill, 1946. That's when the bill went through. That's one of the greatest acts upon the statute books, and I was certainly glad to have my name placed upon the original bill that was presented in the House of Representatives which resulted in passage of the enactment of the full employment bill. During this time, these 26 years, we've had some awfully hard times. But remember this, my friends, as the people get the truth and as the United States Congress gets the truth, this country is free and will remain free and will work in the interest of just the plain folks of the country. I congratulate you on the fine job you are doing.

## ARE EFFORTS BEING MADE TO REMAKE AMERICA? HOW STRONG ARE THE GROUPS ATTEMPTING TO CARRY OUR COUNTRY BACK TO ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Marquis Childs, a famous columnist, recently wrote an article, Bigness Not So Bad After All, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald and other prominent newspapers throughout the Nation. In this article, a very important subject is discussed. The Committee on Intergovernmental Relations happens to be the basis for this particular article.

Recently, in a Midwestern State, a member of the State senate offered a resolution memorializing Congress to submit an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which would do the following:

First. Allow 12 States to initiate an amendment to the United States Constitution and when adopted by three-fourths of the States it would be a part of the United States Constitution without any action on the part of Congress.

Second. It was stated that the resolution was furnished to this Senator by the chairman of the Committee on Intergovernmental Relations and that it was endorsed by former President Herbert Hoover.

It has long been argued that if the power to tax inheritances, gifts, and estates was left up to the States, the States would be in competition with one another and a fair rate would be charged; of course, the idea being to relieve the Federal Government of such a power. The truth is one State is already spending enormous sums of money distributing expensive brochures showing how easy it is to become a resident of that State and receive many tax advantages that people in other States do not receive. It is also suggested that a person can retain his present residence and establish residence in this State and upon death his property will be dealt with under the laws of the latter State in a way that his descendants will receive many generous tax advantages. Therefore, instead of States competing with one another and making the rates high, they will compete with one another and have no rates at all against the extremely wealthy.

This is an important subject now since there are already $40-billion worth of tax-exempt bonds issued principally by States, counties, cities and political subdivisions. Half of these bonds are held by individuals. These individuals and others who receive income from these bonds do not pay any tax of any kind whatsoever to the Federal or State Governments on such income. The question is how long will it be before a large part of the big wealth of the country will own tax-exempt bonds and pay no taxes whatsoever and the remainder will be domiciled in a State that has induced them to take up residence with the promise and understanding that their estates will not be taxed upon death. These are serious questions, and I believe should receive more consideration.

I am inserting herewith the article by Mr. Childs. The following excerpts are particularly interesting:

First: In March of 1953 President Eisenhower recommended a commission on intergovernmental relations to study the tangled relationships between Federal, State and local governments and recommended changes which would eliminate overlapping and duplication.

Second: There is a paid staff of 30, complete with information director, and the expectation is that if they do not get a second renewal, another similar commission will be appointed.

Third: The holders of this philosophy certainly think of themselves as the most loyal and patriotic of Americans, and the most strongly opposed to communism, yet they favor measures to weaken the national Government and its popular support, measures that the Communists would probably be glad to see carried out in the United States.

Fourth: Angry critics have recently charged that commission reports are being used to spread propaganda justifying the dismantling of the Federal Government.

BIGNESS NOT SO BAD AFTER ALL

(By Marquis Childs)

One of the characteristics of this Capital is the way in which, regardless of the party in power, bureaus, commissions, and agencies blossom like the flowers in the spring and take root as hardy perennials. If you dial the number Executive 3-3262, a polite voice answers Intergovernmental Relations.

The specialty of the Eisenhower administration is to make at least one commission

grow where none grew before and that helps to explain intergovernmental relations.

In March of 1953 President Eisenhower recommended a commission on intergovernmental relations to study the tangled relationships between Federal, State, and local governments and recommend changes which would eliminate overlapping and duplication. The commission as approved by Congress was to report by March 1, 1955, and go out of business.

It was heavily loaded with Republicans and Southern Democrats who would like to cut the Federal Government back at least to the era of the Founding Fathers with the Chief Executive filling the genial role of a limited monarch.

Because their report was not completed Congress extended the life of the commission until the end of June. There is a paid staff of 30, complete with information director, and the expectation is that if they do not get a second renewal, another similar commission will be appointed.

Several of the commission members are defeated or retired officeholders, among them former Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon, and former Gov. Dan Thornton, of Colorado. Others, such as Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Val Peterson, Director of Civil Defense, are preoccupied with exacting full-time jobs. Governors John S. Battle, of Virginia, and Allan Shivers, of Texas, are members, as are Senators Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, and Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota.

What apparently most members of the Commission do not know is that one of their number has written a book which is an objective, careful analysis of the whole problem they are studying. Prof. William Anderson, of the University of Minnesota, whose The Nations and the States, Rivals or Partners? has just been published by the University of Minnesota Press, is a long-time authority in the field. Suggesting that a lot of the outcry about centralization comes from those opposed to all Government activity, the author says of this philosophy:

"It pictures big government and centralism, socialism, the welfare state, and dictatorship, and it revives the discredited shibboleth of States rights. It professes loyalty to the Constitution by the people, but seems to forget that the adoption of that Constitution by the people with its provisions for a strong National Government, was one of the greatest acts of constructive republican centralization the world has ever witnessed.

"The holders of this philosophy certainly think of themselves as the most loyal and patriotic of Americans, and the most strongly opposed to communism, yet they favor measures to weaken the National Government and its popular support, measures that the Communists would probably be glad to see carried out in the United States."

Professor Anderson reached his conclusions after a long-time study of the role of the Federal Government and the States. He has found that the grants-in-aid from Washington to the States, so frequently attacked, have not measurably increased Federal control over State governments. While it has had some equalizing effect, as between States with low per capita income and those with high per capita income, this is uneven and insignificant.

Professor Anderson's fellow members of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations will object that this is merely his own viewpoint, and that is true. But it is also true that no other Commission member has given such long and careful thought to every aspect of the problem.

Angry critics have recently charged that Commission reports are being used to spread propaganda justifying the dismantling of the Federal Government. That cry came in the wake of the Hoover Commission report on Federal lending agencies. There is a nice question as to whether these reports are made in a spirit of objectivity or whether they are colored by political bias. If the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations wants to get a careful, thorough, documented study, they can buy Professor Anderson's book for $3.75. And perhaps after they read it they will decide that they can shut up shop.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 4 I was absent on account of official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## POSTAL PAY RAISES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most decisive actions of the current session of Congress was to vote down the postal pay-raise bill recently presented to the House under suspension of the rules.

It was evident from this vote that a large majority of the House disapproved the method by which this ill-fated measure was brought to the floor and strongly believed that the provisions of the bill were inadequate and otherwise unsatisfactory.

It is to be hoped that a suitable bill will soon be presented. Such legislation is overdue and amply justified in order equitably to adjust the pay scales of our faithful postal workers who have no remedy to rectify current unfair pay scales and the impending threats of harmful administrative changes in postal organization and personnel except that which may be afforded by the prompt action of Congress.

How and when will this action be taken? The other body has passed a measure that is apparently agreeable to most employees and to the general public. This House cannot and should not lag behind in adopting such a bill. The arguments for it are strong and obvious, while the arguments against it are labored and obtuse. A brief survey of current pay scales in relation to 1939 index figures will plainly disclose the merits of this proposed legislation. It shows beyond question that general postal pay scales are substantially below comparative levels in private industry which have been reached as a result of regular periodic increases not as yet extended to postal workers.

And there are other factors which strongly urge immediate corrective action in favor of all postal personnel. It would be grossly unfair to discriminate through classification features or in any other way against any group of these loyal Government workers. There is no possible justification, whether for alleged efficiency reasons or pretended economy, for writing provisions into a postal pay bill that may result in downgrading, salary cuts, unsound job eliminations, or uncertain, precarious status for any postal worker.

Congress has a direct responsibility to the public for applying fair standards and satisfactory working conditions for postal workers and other employees of the Government. To delay further in this task will merely make a bad situation worse.

I hope and urge that the House will not fall behind in discharging this responsibility and that a suitable postal pay increase measure will soon be presented for our consideration.

I am convinced that public opinion favors such action and that if given the opportunity the House will work its will regarding postal pay legislation so as to do substantial justice to all our postal employees.

## THE ARAMAIC BIBLE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the Members' attention to a matter that I believe to be of great interest. On last Friday the world's oldest known New Testament in Aramaic, the language which Jesus and His disciples spoke, was carried to the White House, where it was viewed by the President, and to the Library of Congress, where it is hoped that it will rest permanently as one of the greatest contributions to our cultural and religious heritage. An organization has been formed, the Aramaic Bible Foundation, for the purpose of acquiring the Yonan Codex, one of the world's most modern precious religious documents, to present as a gift to the Library of Congress and to reproduce facsimile copies of the Codex for distribution to qualified theological and other educational institutions and to scholars.

The foundation hopes to bring this invaluable document to the attention of our people in its appeal for interest in and study of the sayings of Jesus. I am glad to bring this to the attention of the House and to advise the House that the Library of Congress has arranged for an informal showing of the document in the Whitall Pavilion at the Library on Thursday, tomorrow, between the hours of 11 and 4, before it is placed under glass in the special display arranged by the Library of Congress. Members of

the Congress and the press are invited to attend this privileged last private showing of this inspiring document.

## CONSTRUCTION ON THE NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill authorizing the immediate construction by the United States Army Corps of Engineers of certain works of improvement on the Niagara River for power purposes. It is my fervent hope and earnest belief that the bill which I propose will serve to break a disastrous stalemate which has imposed a stranglehold on this essential project for 5 years, and which threatens otherwise to continue indefinitely into the future. Permit me to review briefly the recent history of power development proposals on the Niagara River.

In February 1950 the United States and Canada, recognizing the need for enhancing the beauty of Niagara Falls, one of the scenic wonders of the world, and for achieving the ultimate power potential from this, the world's most ideal power-development center, enacted a treaty in their mutual interest. It provided, in substance, for the equal sharing by each nation of increased quantities of waters of the Niagara for power purposes, and the simultaneous construction of devices to insure the preservation and enhancement of the beauty of the falls despite this increased diversion for power. Since it was anticipated that the two countries would not necessarily complete their respective power-development projects simultaneously, and since the increased power to be afforded was and is urgently needed on both sides of the border for industrial development and national security, the treaty provided that the country completing its project first could use the share of water allotted to the other until the latter was in a position to use its share. Now let us examine what has happened in the 5 long years that have elapsed since the ratification of the treaty.

The Canadians have virtually completed their works of development for power purposes and are now in a position to utilize not only their share of the treaty waters but ours as well. On this side of the border, the United States Army Corps of Engineers has completed the project designed to beautify the falls in anticipation of the additional drawoff for power purposes. What has been accomplished to develop works for the development of power in this country? Gentlemen, not a spade of earth has been turned. And it is the shocking truth that the realization of the benefits of this power would be 4 or 5 years away if the project were started today.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the value of the power to be generated on the American side under the 1950 treaty is over $60 million annually. Over $300 million worth of this liquid gold has been lost since the treaty was ratified. We are faced with the inevitable prospect of seeing another $300 million worth lost in the next 4 or 5 years if the power facilities were started today. Accustomed as this Nation is to thinking in terms of big figures, those are still enormous amounts. Furthermore, at a time when we are starved for additional power, and faced with an ever-increasing need to meet the threat of world communism with all the industrial might at our command, you cannot put a price on this lost potential. It is priceless.

What has brought about this sad state of affairs? An area of disagreement, of stalemate, between the various interests concerned with the development of the project—an area of disagreement which appears small indeed when compared with the enormous losses which have resulted. In brief, there are those who say that the development of power on the American side should be by governmental agency, preferably the established Power Authority of the State of New York, and that certain preferences should be established with respect to the disposition of the power thus developed. These proponents would authorize the construction of independent transmission facilities, in addition to existing private facilities, if necessary, to meet these preferences.

There are others, occupying a sort of middle ground, who would also authorize development of the facilities by the State of New York but who would not place strict limitations on the disposition of the power developed, proposing rather an equitable disposition for the benefit of the people as a whole, to the extent economically feasible through existing private transmission facilities. Finally there are those who insist that the additional facilities should be developed, and the power transmitted through existing and expanded private transmission facilities by existing private interests. All three proposals make adequate provision for users in other States within economic transmission distance of Niagara Falls.

Mr. Speaker, I have no magic formula for resolving the relatively small area of disagreement. I wish that I did. I am admittedly a Johnnie-Come-Lately to this arena where my colleagues and others have contested so inconclusively these past 5 years. But as a Representative from Buffalo, the large population center and heartland of the Niagara frontier, I can no longer stand idly by and see another 5 years or more sacrificed on the altar of obstinacy. Those who have championed one side or another of this dispute in the past are actually handicapped by their prior, fixed positions in attempting to bring about a solution to this problem which inevitably must be resolved. Someone must untie the Gordian knot.

I can, I believe, make one important contribution. I am extremely impatient with the status quo. I want to hasten the inevitable.

It is my proposal that the United States Army Corps of Engineers be authorized to embark immediately upon a program for the construction of power facilities at Niagara Falls. My bill will be specifically confined to authorization of construction of the facilities and will contain no commitments whatsoever on ultimate ownership and operation of the facilities, or disposition of the generated power—the matters now in dispute. The bill will urge the divergent interests to embark immediately upon discussions with a view to utilizing all or any part of the construction period for the purpose of resolving their differences and coming up with a workable solution.

What will the bill accomplish? It will save for us the 4 or 5 year construction period. So that when the differences are resolved, as they inevitably must be, the project will be completed, and not just beginning. The time required for construction should be more than enough for reasonable men, and the fact of completion will be a spur for reasonable men to act.

I have suggested the United States Army Corps of Engineers as the agency to build the project because this, the greatest construction agency in the world, has since the earliest history of our Nation been universally recognized as nonpartisan.

The builders of the Panama Canal, the atomic-bomb projects, and the beautification works at Niagara Falls, who are even now commissioned to construct the St. Lawrence Seaway, are certainly in a position to construct this power project to the satisfaction of all concerned.

I wish to emphasize that this proposal is therefore in no way prejudicial to the present position of any interests. Just as all three of the proposals heretofore forwarded provide that the developers of power shall reimburse the United States for the cost of works already constructed to enhance the beauty of the falls, the agency ultimately selected to operate the power facilities can acquire ownership by reimbursement of the cost of construction.

Mr. Speaker, those who oppose immediate construction of the project, pending resolution of differences, say in effect, "Settle it my way now, or do not develop the power at all." This at a time when all possible power is urgently needed to turn the wheels of American industry and to provide more comforts in American homes. In view of the world situation, that attitude is a luxury that we cannot afford.

While we dawdle, our friendly neighbors to the north can consume our share of this power. Recognizing our historically close and friendly ties, that is a generosity which we also cannot afford. The Canadians have solved their problems. Certainly we cannot afford to be less efficient in solving ours.

Gentlemen, I urge your wholehearted support of my bill.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4259. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 465. An act for the relief of Ernest Ludwig Bamford and Mrs. Nadine Bamford; and

S. 632. An act for the relief of Jan R. Cwiklinski.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACDONALD on the subject of amending section 1B of the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. ASHMORE and to include an editorial.

Mr. POWELL and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD, and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $220.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KELLY of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK.

Mrs. KEE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETELLA (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. PHILBIN) and to include a letter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania).

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SISK (at the request of Mr. SHELLEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH and to include an article.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to extend his remarks and include a statement made before the Committee on Education and Labor.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 31, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

615. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

616. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947 (ch. 433, 61 Stat. 715), as amended, to increase the number of professional and scientific positions authorized for the Department of Defense"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 154. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 198. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 256. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 312). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 199. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4393, a bill to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 313). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 200. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2225, a bill to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4436. A bill relating to the sale of water from the Clark Hill Reservoir to the city of McCormick, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 98. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment (Rept. No. 316). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 195. Resolution authorizing the employment of two additional messengers, Office of the Postmaster of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 317). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 5326. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5327. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding a new title thereto providing additional authority for insurance of loans made for the construction of urgently needed housing for military personnel of the armed services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 68 the age beyond which deductions will not be made from benefits on account of outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5329. A bill to appropriate funds to carry out the authorized project for the improvement of Bayou Signette Waterway, La., as previously authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 5330. A bill to amend section 394 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5331. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 23-percent depletion rate for bauxite if from deposits in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 5332. A bill to authorize remedial works and measures to prevent the silting of Sandy Slough in Lincoln County, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5333. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FJARE:

H. R. 5334. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 5335. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5336. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses) so as to remove the limitation based on 3 percent of adjusted gross income, the maximum limitations, and (where the taxpayer or his spouse is 65 years of age or over) the limitation on amounts paid for medicine and drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 5337. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5338. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as applied to residential housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 5339. A bill to amend section 1 (b) of the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5340. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 5341. A bill to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for the transaction of business in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5342. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 5343. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5344. A bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5345. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5346. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5347. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5348. A bill to protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5349. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5350. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5351. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5352. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age for women and provide insurance benefits for certain additional widows and parents, and to amend the public assistance provisions of such act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5353. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5354. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 5355. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5356. A bill to provide for a Director of Dairy Services in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 5357. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 5358. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 5359. A bill to repeal title III of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5360. A bill to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5361. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5362. A bill to authorize the construction of certain public works for flood control and other purposes on the Purgatoire River in Colorado; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 5363. A bill to provide for protection of public property near the shores of the United States from damage by waves and currents; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5364. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5365. A bill relating to the imposition of a tax on the importation of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 5366. A bill creating a Federal Commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5367. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to authorize the determination of tax on distilled spirits when they are withdrawn from internal revenue bonded warehouse without regard to the date of original entry for deposit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5368. A bill to amend paragraph 1004 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the importation of certain yarns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5369. A bill to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5370. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5371. A bill to restore to retired enlisted men of the armed services allowances for quarters, subsistence, and clothing as provided by the act of 1885, establishing retirement for enlisted men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5372. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5373. A bill making an appropriation for the prosecution of the Delaware River channel-deepening project, as heretofore authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 5374. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5375. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A. National Memorial, Inc., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5376. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 5377. A bill to authorize the immediate construction of certain works of improvement on the Niagara River for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5378. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1888, entitled "Aid to State or Territorial Homes" (title 24, sec. 134, U. S. C., as amended); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5379. A bill to permit producers to donate surplus wheat to religious organizations, without payment of marketing penalty, where such donation will divert the wheat from normal trade channels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5380. A bill to extend the authority of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (by request):

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to improve the relations of the United States with Western Germany and Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. J. Res. 273. Joint resolution to establish a Commission for the Celebration of the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Theodore Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. J. Res. 274. Joint resolution paying honor and tribute to the memory of Robert E. Lee, and dedicating the Lee Mansion in the Arlington National Cemetery as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 275. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. Res. 197. Resolution to provide for the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORBLAD: House joint resolution 11 of the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate funds to the United States Geological Survey to carry out the traditional practice of 100 percent matching of all State offerings for the purpose of continuing the program of cooperative investigation of water resources; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, senate joint resolution 7 of the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, endorsing the action taken by the President and the Congress in their advocacy of the Formosa resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, senate joint resolution 4 of the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon

petitioning the Congress of the United States to recognize that the permanent maintenance and operation of the Columbia River development facilities are a Federal responsibility and that moneys for their operation and maintenance should become a continuing part of Federal appropriations, to be allocated to the State agencies responsible for such operation and maintenance through the Fish and Wildlife Service and further petitions the Congress to establish a permanent means of financing the maintenance and operation of these facilities by appropriate legislation making the costs of such operation and maintenance charge against funds received by the United States and its agencies in payment for electrical energy generated at Federal hydroelectric powerplants in the Columbia River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, senate joint resolution 6 of the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon memorializing the Congress of the United States not to pass H. R. 1, or any legislation which would similarly add to and change the existing trade-agreements legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legisuature of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that there be established a permanent means of financing the Columbia River development facilities, etc.; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that the McCarran Act be amended to insure that Alaskans are afforded the rights and responsibilities which are due loyal American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that legislation be enacted abolishing fish traps from the waters of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5381. A bill for the relief of Westfeldt Brothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5382. A bill for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 5383. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty W. Webster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Br. Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5384. A bill for the relief of Donn Kim Ringdahl (Kim Young Yon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 5385. A bill for the relief of Frank T. McCormick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 5386. A bill for the relief of Bui Thi Nhat (Rosa Minh); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5387. A bill for the relief of Marija Barsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5388. A bill for the relief of Bartolo Alcantar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5390. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Azniv Y. Hasserdjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of the University of Louisville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 202. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 2699, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

181. Mr. CANFIELD presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Passaic urging the Members of Congress of the United States to adopt legislation granting to the Post Office Department employees a 10 percent increase in salary; which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Administration's Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able statement made by the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell, in testifying before the subcommittee of the Public Works Committee on S. 1160, known as the administration highway bill.

The statement made by Comptroller General Campbell is accurate, is fundamental, and, coming from such a high authority, deserves the fullest consideration of the Senate.

I desire to compliment the Comptroller General on the very splendid presentation he has made on this legislation.

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

STATEMENT OF MR. JOSEPH CAMPBELL, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, ON S. 1160, 84TH CONGRESS, BEFORE THE PUBLIC ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 28, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the General Accounting Office appreciates the subcommittee's invitation to appear before you and give you our views with respect to S. 1160, 84th Congress, which would create a Federal Highway Corporation for financing the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways.

In the opinion of the General Accounting Office, one of the most important aspects of the legislation is the proposed method of financing the highway construction. The bill would create a new Government corporation to be known as the Federal Highway Corporation. The Corporation would be authorized to issue obligations not to exceed $21 billion. These obligations would be sold to the general public and, in addition, could be purchased by the United States from fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which is under the authority and control of the United States.

We feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable because the result would be that the borrowing would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States. While the issuance of the Corporation's bonds would be with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the obligations would be repaid from the permanent appropriation established by section 105(c), the obligations would specifically state that they are not obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States. However, the legislation provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the Corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriation for that year and, in addition, the Corporation would be authorized to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time. Both of these provisions coupled with the permanent appropriation would apparently be to assure the investors of ability to meet obligations, and tend to have the effect of a Government guaranty of the highway obligations, at least in the minds of the investing public. As a practical matter, the obligations would be moral and equitable obligations of the United States, since they would be issued by a corporation entirely owned by the Government. While the obligations would specifically provide that they are not guaranteed by the Government, it is highly improbable that the Congress could allow such obligations to go in default when one considers that credit standing of the Federal Government would be involved.

In addition, the Corporation's activities would not be self-sustaining. It would have no substantial revenues, and funds for paying off the obligations would come from the general fund of the Treasury. The funds available would be measured by future anticipated increases in collections of taxes on gasoline and special fuels.

The fact that the bill provides for a permanent appropriation measured by gasoline taxes does not, in our opinion, establish revenues for the Corporation in any normal use of the term. The gasoline taxes are revenues of the Treasury and go into the general fund of the Treasury. The appropriation provided would come out of the general fund of the Treasury exactly as most of the appropriations made by Congress.

The total amount of borrowings by the Corporation would amount to the very substantial sum of $21 billion and, in our opinion, would be borrowings of the United States Government, irrespective of the terminology applied. It seems only right that such obligations should be considered, classified, and disclosed as a part of the total borrowings of the Government, that is, the public debt.

It is our opinion that the Government should not enter into financing arrangements which might have the effect of obscuring the financial facts of the Government's debt position. We believe that the highway program—since it in reality is nonrevenue producing—should be financed by appropriations made by the Congress. If, to provide these funds, it is necessary to borrow from the general public, we believe that the borrowings should be handled under the existing authority of the Secretary of the

Treasury under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. This is a normal function of the Treasury Department and in carrying out his assigned fiscal and debt management responsibilities we do not feel that the effectiveness of the Secretary of the Treasury should be weakened by authorizing other Government agencies to borrow directly from the investing public. Also, under the procedure we recommend any borrowings necessary to fund the appropriations approved by the Congress would automatically be treated and disclosed as a part of the public debt of the Federal Government. In making this recommendation we recognize that a borrowing operation of this magnitude may require changes in the existing statutory public-debt ceiling.

Also, if the direct appropriation method is used to finance the highway construction, the Congress would be in a position to make an annual review of the progress and changing needs of the road program because money to carry it out would have to be specifically appropriated by the Congress each year. In addition to reviewing the actual needs of the program, the Congress could also consider whether, from an overall picture of revenues and expenditures of the Government, the full amount authorized for highway construction should be spent in a particular year.

In the event a Federal Highway Corporation is created, the Congress would, to some degree, lose its control over the program. The Corporation would submit annual budgets to Congress under the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, but only funds for administrative and operating expenses would be approved by the Congress. The program funds would continue to be available unless the Congress took affirmative action to limit the program expenditures.

I think most of you are aware of the position of the General Accounting Office with respect to Government corporations. We are opposed to the creation of new Government corporations, unless for the most compelling reasons or overriding public necessity. The corporate form of Government activity is objectionable because, for the most part, it is free from the normal safeguards set up by the Congress to maintain adequate control over the conduct of public business and the expenditure of public funds.

Based on the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, the new Corporation would have very little duties, outside of the issuance and management of its obligations. Administrative functions would be exercised by existing agencies. The Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads would act as Executive Director of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury would designate the treasurer of the Corporation to be established within the Treasury Department and authorized to utilize such Treasury Department personnel as the Board found necessary to properly perform its financial responsibilities.

Consequently the principal reason for the creation of a new Federal corporation seems to be that it would provide an identifiable agency outside of the Treasury empowered to borrow from the public on obligations issued in its name. If the necessary funds are obtained by direct appropriation as we recommend, the need for a new Government corporation would disappear. Any public borrowings necessary to fund appropriations would be obtained by the Secretary of the Treasury under existing borrowing authority.

On the question of indefinite appropriations such as would be established by S. 1160, we feel that the Congress should not as a general proposition authorize such appropriations. When collections are made available for expenditure on a permanent annual basis congressional control of the expenditures and the activities financed thereby are greatly weakened. In 1934 Congress considered this question and passed the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act. This act eliminated numerous permanent appropriations then in effect and provided that such appropriations be subject to annual consideration by the Congress. However, since 1934 many permanent appropriations have been authorized. A good example is the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. Appropriations by the Congress during 1954 totaled $17 million. Total funds available for expenditure during the year amounted to $59.5 million. Permanent indefinite appropriations provided $36.5 million of the difference, or about 60 percent of the total. These permanent indefinite appropriations are obtained from taxes on firearms, shells and cartridges, fishing equipment, sales of migratory-bird hunting stamps, and income received from mineral leases, timber sales, grazing fees, etc.

The feature of the bill S. 1160 which may raise questions of legality is the financing method proposed.

Article 1, section 8, clause 1, of the Constitution gives Congress power to lay and collect excise taxes provided they are uniform throughout the United States. The Federal gasoline tax meets this requirement. There is, however, a constitutional limitation on the taxing power of the Congress. That power may be exercised only "* * * to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

The question is then whether the revenue from the gasoline tax, or an equivalent amount, properly may be appropriated in advance for use in meeting the obligations of the Federal Highway Corporation. The only constitutional restriction on the duration of appropriations is that found in clause 12, section 8, article 1, which declares that no appropriation of money to raise and support armies shall be for a longer term than 2 years. As we have indicated, the Congress has frequently made so-called permanent appropriations. The following are current examples involving tax revenues: Appropriation of amounts equal to social-security taxes; appropriation of amounts equal to revenues derived under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; appropriation of an amount equal to 30 percent of gross customs-duty collections for use by the Secretary of Agriculture; appropriations for conservation of wildlife; appropriations to the governments of the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

The case of *Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *United States* (301 U. S. 308), involved a similar appropriation to the Philippine Government of future revenue from a processing tax on coconut oil produced in the Philippine Islands, and the Supreme Court held that an otherwise valid tax might be bound to a valid appropriation of the tax revenues. The Court said that if the Congress chose to adopt the quantum of receipts from the particular tax as the measure of the appropriation, it saw no valid basis for challenging its power to do so.

Another question is the propriety of the purpose for which the tax revenues are to be used. We do not think the legality of Federal appropriations for an interstate highway system can be questioned. It might be argued that the appropriated funds here involved are not to be used for the payment of debts of the United States, since the bonds are not legal obligations of the United States but merely of the Federal Highway Corporation. In the Cincinnati Soap case mentioned, the Supreme Court had this to say as to what constitutes debts of the United States within the meaning of the constitutional provision:

"It is conceded and indeed it cannot be questioned that the debts are not limited to those which are evidenced by some written obligation or to those which are otherwise of a strictly legal character. The term 'debts' includes those debts or claims which rest upon a merely equitable or honorary obligation, and which would not be recoverable in a court of law if existing against an individual. The Nation, speaking broadly, owes a 'debt' to an individual when his claim grows out of general principles of right and justice; when, in other words, it is based upon considerations of a moral or merely honorary nature, such as are binding on the conscience or the honor of an individual, although the debt could obtain no recognition in a court of law" (301 U. S. 308, 315).

Thus, even though the bond obligations would not be legal obligations of the United States, strictly speaking, and would not come within the Federal debt limitation, there is no doubt that they properly may be considered as debts of the United States within the constitutional taxing authority granted to Congress.

We think a future Congress would be free to reduce or repeal the Federal gasoline tax, which would automatically reduce or cut off the only important source of funds for meeting the bond obligations and would preclude or curtail the issuance of further bonds. As we have indicated, however, we think it would be unrealistic to assume that the Congress would permit bonds already purchased to be defaulted.

In the event the subcommittee is to favorably act on S. 1160, we recommend that several provisions of the bill be considered for amendment.

1. Consideration should be given as to whether the powers of the Corporation are too broad. We would recommend that the legislation be more restrictive as to the functions and duties the Corporation is to perform. Also, consideration should be given to limiting the life of the Corporation to a definite date.

2. Section 105 (d) is contrary to many of the existing statutory restrictions on the investment of trust funds. For example, the unemployment trust fund can only be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States. If the purpose of section 105 (d) is to permit investment of these and other trust moneys in bonds of the Federal Highway Corporation, existing statutory restrictions on the investment of trust funds should be declared inapplicable to avoid any possible conflict.

3. Section 208 dealing with right-of-way acquisitions should be clarified as to the source of funds for payment of the property acquired. The section provides that the Federal Government will pay 95 percent of the appraised value, or the actual cost, whichever is lower, but the section is silent as to who pays the additional 5 percent. It is assumed that the 5 percent will be paid by the State. We think the section should so provide and also make it clear as to whether the State advances the 5 percent to the Federal Government prior to the payment for the property, or whether the Federal Government may pay 100 percent and then be reimbursed by the State for the 5 percent.

## Federal Regulation of Natural Gas Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, continuing my efforts to fight for the consumer interest in connection with the proposals

to amend the Natural Gas Act, on March 25, 1955, I testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with respect to the vital concern of Cleveland and Northern Ohio in the outcome of the proposals which are before Congress. Over 95 percent of the residents of my district are consumers of natural gas which is distributed by a distributing company serving northeastern Ohio, including the northern Ohio cities of Akron, Canton, and Youngstown. This distributing company derives negligible quantities of its gas from the Ohio and West Virginia fields. The overwhelming quantities come from Texas, Oklahoma, and the Southwest.

During the past several weeks, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been hearing considerable testimony in support of various bills to release the so-called independent producers of natural gas from the regulation of the Federal Power Commission. The proponents of this legislation argue that it is necessary to protect the public interest in view of the so-called confusion allegedly brought about by the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips Petroleum case. The testimony in support of this legislation has largely consisted of experts provided by the oil and natural gas industries. It is possible that their great plea supported by $1,500,000 "educational fund" may be directed to the public interest, but it would be indeed unusual. The gas consuming public of America better awaken quickly in this tremendous drive to destroy effective Federal regulations and control. We may discover that the gas consumer's protection will be completely legislated away.

We in Cleveland are as vitally concerned as consumers as perhaps any other group in America. For example, the local distributing company—the East Ohio Gas Co.—has had its natural gas sales per domestic consumer rise from 85,743 cubic feet in 1945 to 195,893 cubic feet per domestic consumer in 1954. And domestic sales have increased in the area of our local distributing company, which is the northern Ohio area, from 46,674,457,000 cubic feet in 1945 to 131,175,084,000 cubic feet in domestic sales in 1954. For this same period, industrial sales have climbed from 30,126,754,000 cubic feet in 1945 to 59,554,879,000 cubic feet in 1954. The total consumption therefore of our northern Ohio gas served principally by this one local distributing company has risen from 76,801,211,000 cubic feet in 1945 to 190,729,963,000 cubic feet in 1954. In analyzing these figures, we find that gas consumption has increased almost 300 percent in domestic sales and almost 200 percent in industrial sales within a 10-year period. Putting it another way, our space heat consumers have increased from 120,709 in 1945 to 539,109, or roughly an increase of almost 350 percent. In our part of the country, gas heat is practically the only source of fuel we use and we do not desire to return to wood stoves. In short, we have been consuming a lot of gas—a tremendous quantity of natural gas of which we have produced very little ourselves. As a matter of fact, our northern Ohio community has made just about as great a contribution to the domestic economy, to the welfare of the great sovereign States of Texas and Oklahoma, as almost any other section in the country.

Now, it will be undoubtedly mentioned that Cleveland has one of the lowest gas rates in the country and that is true. And there is a very important reason for it. Our low gas rate stems from the prudent activity of our distributing company, the East Ohio Gas Co., in establishing huge areas in the Akron-Canton area for the storage of natural gas. The diminished wells in the Canton, Ohio, area, which formerly provided the early gas for our community, are now being used as tremendous reservoirs where gas is pumped in the slow seasons of consumption in the warm weather months and then used during the cold season when it is pumped out of the reservoirs and into the lines of the consumers. Therefore, the northern Ohio distributing company can make a steady and constant purchase of gas into its territory. In addition to that, perhaps no other community in America uses the tremendous volume of natural gas for industrial purposes than we do in the greater Cleveland area. It is mixed with other industrial gases and used by the basic industries of the Cleveland area in the production and fabrication of steel and in the manufacture of coke and in many other industrial ways so that while our domestic consumption has been large, our industrial consumption has also been large. As a large consumer, we are entitled and have received a large quantity consuming price—a lower price—the benefit of large volume consumption. In addition to the maintenance of reservoirs, our local distributing company has done a splendid job of selling natural gas not only as a clean and efficient household fuel but also as a useful fuel for the operation of appliances. We perhaps have more gas water heaters, gas incinerators, gas refrigerators, and gas stoves per capita than perhaps any other community in America. The local distributing company has done a tremendous job of stimulating and extending gas consumption on the basis of its low cost, and we have come to rely on natural gas.

Much has been said about the relatively low price of gas at the wellhead and the high price at the point of distribution to the retail consumer. But it must be borne in mind that the producer digs a well and the gas flows out—usually under the natural pressures of the earth. Most of the time the finding of gas is an incidental happening—a bonus—discovered in the search of oil. The pipeline people must build and maintain pipelines and must maintain pressure through the lines, but the big operational cost features naturally devolve upon the distributor who must build a tremendous distributing system down every street of every city and into every home in which he must maintain an expensive meter. There is a thousand times more earth displaced in the laying of distribution lines than in the drilling of gas wells. And the distributing company must maintain the pressure of gas throughout the system and be sure that it is of sufficient thermal strength to be useful as a fuel. In addition, the distributing company must maintain the huge reservoirs I spoke about, with excessive pumping facilities. It must stimulate the use of gas for space heating and for the operation of household appliances and must in the northern American cities maintain a constant inspection system so that the use of natural gas in a home or in a factory is adequately flued so that there is no resulting danger to human life.

We in Cleveland and in northern Ohio have nothing to say about whose gas we use or where it comes from. It comes through the transmission pipelines and the distributing company's pipelines. We have nothing to say about the price that was paid for it by either the distributing company, the transmission company, or the agents of the wellhead producers. If we had oil furnaces, we could bargain for our oil. It could be trucked into our homes from any part of America, from any oil distributors in our country and we might have a choice of either burning Pennsylvania oil or Oklahoma oil or California oil which is transported all over America by oil tank cars. And if we used coal, we would have the choice of using Ohio coal, Kentucky coal, or Pennsylvania coal that could come from any of thousands of mines, and we could choose between anthracite coal or bituminous coal or design our furnaces to burn coal dust or coal bricks in some form. We could purchase our coal directly from innumerable retail outlets. But when our economy, when our lifeblood, when the very stability and usefulness of our homes depends only on the natural gas which flows through the pipelines into them, then we are completely at the mercy of everyone along the line who has anything to do with that gas, producer, transmitter, and distributor.

It has been declared that we could adequately regulate the price through our State public utilities commission, and this is nonsense. What can the State public utilities commission of Ohio or any other State do about the price of gas before it reaches the State line? The answer is "Absolutely nothing." It would have and does exercise dominion over the activities of the distributing system which is within the State and it can and does review the charges made upon natural gas and the price factors that go into natural gas that is distributed by our local distributing system. But my State cannot exercise any dominion at all or raise any questions at all concerning the transmission cost of natural gas to the Ohio line or at the producer's wellhead in the Southwest. Therefore, the only hope that we have for any kind of check on the reasonableness of the price of gas that comes to us is through the Federal Power Commission, under the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which specifically directs the Federal Power Commission to provide such regulation and pricing as are necessary in the public interest.

Prior to 1947, there were relatively few independent producers of natural gas. After a series of Federal Power Commission rulings, with which I did not agree, and with which most of our

northern gas consumers did not agree, there developed on the horizons a great number of producers of natural gas who, relying upon those decisions, considered themselves exempt from the regulation of the Federal Power Commission; and the number of independent companies has continued, and is continuing, to multiply to the end that the price of gas at the wellhead may be freed from Federal control. Everything was fine with the so-called independent producers until the Phillips decision came along and said that it was all wrong; that if gas was intended for transmission in the interstate pipelines it was subject to regulation.

Let us analyze the increase in numbers of the so-called independent producers of natural gas. There were some in 1938, but the fact is that the Federal Power Commission conveniently does not have records of the number of independent gas producers in the succeeding years until the year 1953 when it determined that there were 4,545. The fact is that the number of so-called independent producers of gas did not increase until it became very profitable for them to increase under the subsequent favorable rulings of the Federal Power Commission. Now, just how independent are these so-called independent producers? It looks to me that they are nothing more than the legally divorced spouses of the principal transmitters of natural gas from the Southwest. Although they were legally divorced, we find that they are still very, very much in love. They date each other very frequently and they are not the least bit clandestine about it. They consort together in public places and are represented by the same lawyers. Are they really independent? Who incorporated them and who owns their stock and who controls them and who is their spokesman? And just how much has the Federal Power Commission done to analyze the nature and the character of the so-called independents? The Commission could not have done very much to identify them if it has no records as to their numbers prior to 1953.

There has been considerable talk throughout these hearings on the effect that the Harris bill would have to conserve the natural-gas supplies and at the same time make more gas available at no higher price to the consumer. It cannot do all things for all people. It simply cannot. It was pointed out by the officials of the Federal Power Commission that we have reserves that would last 22½ years at the present rate of consumption. But the fact that is overlooked is that the present rate of consumption is only a fraction of what current increased demands could make it, particularly in view of the anticipated increase in the population and the development of our industry. I doubt whether the present reserves are sufficient to last 10 years. The shoe may end up on the other foot. The great gas-producing States of Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma may some day, sooner than they now believe possible, find themselves in the same plight as Ohio. The wells may become depleted and become useful only as storage bins for gas that might even have to come into Texas and Oklahoma from other States. If that were to happen, would Texas and Oklahoma feel then as they feel now about the regulation of the Federal Power Commission on this important subject?

It has been brought out during these hearings that 45 percent of the gas produced in Texas goes into interstate, while 55 percent remains in Texas. What was overlooked in the discussion is that most of the 55 percent of gas remaining in Texas is pumped back into the wells to be mixed with and prepared with other gas for ultimate consumption in interstate use. The 45 percent estimate on interstate shipment is not correct.

The Harris bill speaks of a fair field price. The fair field price of a substance—any substance in demand—is what the market will pay. A fair field price of natural gas at the wellhead will move the areas of competition from the field—the producing end—to the consuming end in the development of vigorous competition between cities and urban centers needing the gas. Apparently some Indiana communities are willing to get the gas at any price. We cannot bid for gas at the Texas county gas auctions. The struggle which we witness in this hearing is a struggle between the have and have-not areas of this country with respect to natural gas. We call ourselves the United States of America; we are united in the Federal form of our Government in the national welfare, but this process of picking away at the very thing that makes America strong will destroy us. We are an economic unit, and the interdependence of one section of America upon another will strengthen the land.

There has been considerable discussion before this committee on whether or not natural gas produced for interstate commerce is a public utility. As far as the United States is concerned, that question is moot. Under the long chain of Federal decisions, the test of Federal regulation is whether the subject or substance passes through interstate commerce. As far as the consumer is concerned, there is absolutely no question. Most definitions of public utility concern themselves chiefly on whether there is monopolistic control. To the gas consumer of the North, whose natural gas comes to him from a producer over whom he exercises no selection, through a pipeline transmitter over whom he exercises no selection and through a distributor over whom he exercises no selection, gas is a public utility. He is at the complete mercy of the people who provide, transmit, and control the flow of natural gas to his home.

I am in perfect agreement with the distinguished trained judicial minds of the United States Supreme Court in the Phillips case. And what are the Southwest producers endeavoring to do now? They do not like the Court's decision so they want to overrule the Court by an act of Congress. The calm judicial temperament and the wisdom of our highest Court in the Phillips case is being circumvented by regional emotions. History tells us that the upset of judicial decree by intemperate legislative action does not result in ultimate national good.

Now the Federal Power Commission comes here today and tells us that they do not want to fix the wellhead price of natural gas going into commerce. Do they want to escape their public duty? Well, they do not say. The Natural Gas Act tells them what to do and the United States Supreme Court in the Phillips case gave them a mandate. It says the Commission must fix the field price of the wellhead producer. And they have the broadest authority under the law as it now stands to fix formulae, flexible formulae for the pricing of natural gas. It seems to me that the law is satisfactory just as it is. If the Commission arrives at an unjust or arbitrary formulae, the wellhead producer or the transmission line may go to the courts and get the formulae corrected. If the consuming public does not like the formulae, they can go to the courts and get it changed or they can exercise their public prerogative as voters and dismiss the Federal Power Commission if they disapprove of its work.

Now if it should be decided that the Federal Power Commission must be guided in the factors surrounding regulation and the determination of wellhead price, I have a bill which I think is fair. It leaves the production of wellhead gas under Federal Power Commission control if it is intended for interstate shipment in accordance with present law. With respect to pricing formula, it says that producers of natural gas at the wellhead should be allowed a fair and reasonable return on their investment, and I would be willing to see the measure amended to specifically include a producer's dry-well experience in determining the investment factor. I recognize that a dry well can cost a considerable sum of money. Now, I am not saying that 3, 4, 5, or 6 percent is a fair and reasonable return on this kind of investment—you can get that kind of return on investment today with no risk factor. Why not let the Federal Power Commission take these facts under consideration and allow a producer a fair and reasonable return on his investment which will include the factors of risk, the high cost of dry wells, and problems of reaching transmission points.

I do not know extensively of the terms that surround the whole atmosphere of natural gas regulation, I have studied the problem here and I have followed it for a long time as a member of the Ohio State Senate and as a member of the Cleveland City Council. It seems to me that despite all the talk about escalator costs, fair field prices and favored-nations clauses, the issue before us simply boils down to a political decision. Are the people of the sovereign States of Texas and Oklahoma and the other gas-producing States of the Southwest which produce the natural gas, privileged to charge whatever price they see fit for the natural gas on which they find themselves? That is the Harris bill. Are the northern consumers of natural gas who have no choice about whose gas comes into their homes going to suffer the lack of any effective public regulation on this

important natural resource upon which they have become so dependent? In short, is the public to be served in any way by the Harris bill?

The people of my State and the people of my district do not want to engage in combat with the good people of Texas and Oklahoma and the Southwest. All we seek is peaceful coexistence. We seek in natural gas what another distinguished Texan, WRIGHT PATMAN, seeks in other fields, fair and reasonable trade policy. We do not want to pay a tariff on our gas to Texas, Oklahoma, and the other States of the Southwest. We want the good people of the Southwest to get everything to which they are entitled for their enterprise and for the bountiful things the Lord put in their earth and forgot to put in ours. They are entitled to very much consideration for their enterprise and for their risks in drilling for oil and gas—but some of the national interest in the earth of the Southwestern States is something that the Northern public feels entitled to because we are also part of the same United States. We live in the same Republic, we feel entitled to participate in the bounties of another part of our Nation at a reasonable cost because the people of Texas, Oklahoma, and the Southwest did not put that gas into the earth.

The decision which confronts this Congress is very technical, but it is primarily a political and economical conflict between regions. Should the rights and interests of 88 million people be disregarded in the interest of several thousand so-called independent producers of gas? My bill and a Federal Power Commission which is constrained to work could do the job in fairness to all groups concerned.

## Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at American-Jewish Tercentenary Civic Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered on March 20 at the American-Jewish Tercentenary Civic Assembly, sponsored by the Norfolk Jewish Community Council of Norfolk, Va.

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

REMARKS BY HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, IN OBSERVANCE OF THE AMERICAN-JEWISH TERCENTENARY CIVIC ASSEMBLY SPONSORED BY THE NORFOLK JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, NORFOLK, VA.

It has been a long time—more years than many of you in this room can remember—since I have been in Norfolk. But I am glad for the opportunity to come tonight to this fine southern city, one of the great seaports of our eastern shore, and to meet with the leaders and members of the Norfolk community.

Like all of you, I am a port city man. Some of my earliest and most unforgetable impressions as a boy are of New York Harbor and of the ships sailing into that harbor and up the broad bosom of the Hudson River.

And I have southern connections, too. My father and his brothers, who came to this country over 100 years ago, settled in Montgomery, Ala. They lived there for many years and sank deep roots there.

Most of my family were Confederates. I wasn't around at the time, but I heard from my mother's and my father's lips the stories of the privations, the suffering, and the tragic sacrifices of those days. My parents moved north after the end of the War Between the States, and I was born in New York, but I have always had a sense of special kinship and sentimental attachment to the part of America below the Mason-Dixon line.

My friend and colleague, Senator LISTER HILL, often calls me the third Senator from Alabama.

My father and his brothers came to this country from Germany in the late 1840's. They came as refugees—refugees from tyranny; refugees seeking and loving liberty. For them America was the land of their aspirations; a land, though alien to their tongue, completely native to their dreams and hopes.

I think the same can be truly said of most of the hundreds of thousands and millions of immigrants who have come to these shores, in the distant past down to the immediate present.

Tonight we observe the 300th anniversary of the first arrival in this country of a special group of immigrants—those of our own faith—that hardy group of 23 Jewish refugees who set foot on the island of Manhattan in September 1654.

They came from Brazil, seeking home, asylum, and freedom of worship.

Manhattan was then, of course, part of the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam, presided over by the redoubtable Gov. Peter Stuyvesant. Governor Stuyvesant regarded these new refugees with distrust and dislike. He ordered them straightaway into jail and sought permission to expel them from New Amsterdam—permission from the Dutch West India Co., which exercised most of the powers of sovereignty over the colony.

But the West India Co. decided that the Jewish refugees should not be expelled, but should be permitted to remain as long as they did not constitute a burden upon the community.

It was not an easy prospect. This little group faced prejudice and discrimination; but they had known these evils before. They had to win, one by one, the rights which we take completely for granted—first, the right to hold their own religious services and to have their own burial ground, then the right to enter business, and then to own their own homes.

The most vital barrier was breached only a year after the arrival of the 23 by a young man whose name deserves to be remembered in history, Asser Levy. He secured for himself, and then for his fellows—the right to join the common militia, and bear arms in the common defense—a right generally denied to Jews, not only in New Amsterdam, but throughout the civilized world.

The willing, and even anxious, acceptance of the common obligation of military service led to the grant of common rights; only 2½ years after their arrival, the Jews of New Amsterdam were accepted as equals among equals. They won not only acceptance but inclusion—inclusion in the rights and obligations of common membership in the community at large.

Such were the beginnings of the Jewish community in America. In each of the 13 American Colonies the story was, of course, different. In many, the progress toward the achievement of equal rights and full citizenship status was slower and more arduous. But ultimately the goal was won, and Jews were accepted as full members of the community of America, distinct in faith, but undistinguishable in the eyes of the law.

Those early Jews, and those who came later, played their sufficient part—and more—in the dramatic story which is the history of America.

They worked, they saved, they fought, they built, they invented, they dreamed, and they created. This was freedom. This was America.

For our contributions we Jews ask no gratitude of America. Instead we are and must be the grateful ones—grateful for the opportunities which have been here given to us and to all others. It should be a source of deep pride to us that we have been able to transmit to our country and to the whole civilized world the ethical and spiritual ideals that have come to us through the centuries.

There is a wonderful continuity to the ideals to which Israel has adhered thoughout the ages. Judaism has a history which is characterized throughout by a deep yearning for liberty—a yearning which sprang from its own bitter experience. Jews seek in spiritual and historic terms not as theorists, but out of the pain of countless generations who have remembered the injunction to bring freedom, justice, and peace to all men even as they themselves were brought to freedom out of bondage in Egypt.

Yes; we, as Jews, must be proud of our ancient traditions, as we, as Americans, must be proud of our national history.

But both as Jews and as Americans, we have a special obligation to live and work, and to sacrifice, if need be, for the maintenance of those traditions, both ancient and modern. We have a special duty to reflect in our daily lives, a true dedication to the ideals of both the ancient Prophets who enunciated our faith, and of the early Patriots who founded our Nation.

We must never forget that of which we will soon be reminded by the Passover—that our spiritual forefathers escaped from bondage, with the Lord's help and guidance, and wandered for many years until they found, at last, asylum in the Promised Land.

And, so, to the fathers of our country—and our actual forefathers—came here as refugees from religious ,political, or economic oppression. And here in America they reenacted the age-old drama of finding the promised land.

In view of these traditions, let us bear constantly in mind the Lord's injunction, repeated again and again in Exodus and Leviticus, but best phrased in the 33d stanza of the 19th chapter of Leviticus:

"If a stranger sojourn in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwells with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

As Jews, this is our mandate; as Americans it is also our mandate. It was so understood by the early Americans, who founded our Republic, who were steeped, as we are no longer steeped today, in the wisdom and the morality of the Biblical prophets.

George Washington said in 1783:

"The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions: whom we shall welcome to a participation in all our rights and privileges if by decency and propriety of conduct, they appear to merit the enjoyment."

Today we have departed far from these injunctions and principles. We have indeed rejected our bold and courageous traditions, in favor of selfish and narrow fears.

I refer, at this point, to our present-day immigration laws * * * laws which not only establish unreasonable limits on total immigration, but cruelly discriminate among would-be immigrants on the basis of national origin and race.

Our present-day immigration laws establish myriad obstacles and hazards not only for the would-be immigrant, but even for the casual visitor to our shores—the tourist, the scholar, the scientist, and the student.

Our laws presuppose that every alien is a potential spy, saboteur and criminal—an assumption which is never wholly removed, even after the alien arrives here * * * even after he becomes a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Our laws for admission and exclusion of aliens clearly reflect this assumption. Our laws for deportation are based on the same principle.

Only last year and until very recently, our Government was clapping aliens in jails—alongside criminals and derelicts—alien visitors and would-be immigrants alike—if there was any irregularity in their admission papers, if there was any question, doubt, suspicion or technical error in their elaborate documentation.

How repugnant this is to our traditions. When Gov. Peter Stuyvesant treated the 23 Jews who arrived at New Amsterdam 300 years ago in this manner, he was quickly reproved and overruled by higher authority.

In this respect, how far have we come in these 300 years? Or how far have we gone backward in the last 10 years?

In that day, 300 years ago, the Jews who arrived at New Amsterdam were, within 2½ years, granted full and inalienable rights as citizens of the colony.

Today, under our laws, every naturalized citizen is, in major respects, a second-class citizen. His American citizenship can be revoked for the performance of acts which a native-born citizen can perform with relative immunity.

Even a native-born citizen can lose his precious American citizenship for acts which are of relatively minor significance or of no significance at all.

A native-born American citizen named Andrew R. Jones, who was born in Texas, was deemed recently to have lost his American citizenship because, while living in Mexico, he took a job with the Mexican National Railway, which is owned by the Mexican Government.

On my desk in Washington, right at this moment, is the case of a woman—an American citizen—who went to live for a time in Trinidad, an island in the Caribbean. While there, she voted in a local election in her community—an election having to do with the improvement of sanitary facilities and roads in her locality. She, too, has been ordered deprived of her American citizenship—the most precious right any of us has or can have—more precious, in my judgment, than life itself.

If the ruling in this woman's case is upheld on appeal—and under the McCarran-Walter Act, it probably will be—that woman will be without a country, without nationality. For this law does not merely take from an American citizen the rights of citizenship. It strips him entirely of his American nationality.

I have cited just a scattering few of the incredible evils built into our immigration and nationality laws. There are many, many more. They are immoral, unjust and cruel.

Moreover they reflect senseless contradictions. The national origins quota system is based on the absurd theory that we should restrict admissions into the United States today to a composite group reflecting precisely the same proportion of national blood strains that existed in America in 1920.

Of course, the theory, itself, is repulsive to the spirit of America. But it doesn't work, in any event. It doesn't work because Great Britain, which under the national origins quota system, is given almost half the total quota of admissions into the United States, is no longer a significant source of immigration. The British don't want to emigrate to the United States today.

Most of those who do want to come to America, and who do succeed in surmounting our own Iron Curtain—or rather our red tape curtain—are from Italy, Poland, Austria, Norway, Holland, Greece, and other similar countries in Europe. But the national origins quota system restricts admission of persons born in those countries to a relative handful.

While we have erected this ponderous barrier of racial and national restrictions against legal immigration from Europe—so that a bare 100,000 are admitted annually—the gates are open wide for illegal immigration across the Mexican and Canadian borders.

According to official estimates, more than 2 million illegal immigrants entered the United States in 1953 across the Mexican border—2 million illegal immigrants from Mexico alone—with no screening of diseased, criminal, and subversive elements.

One hears very little outcry of alarm in Washington over this phenomenon against this illegal flood which provides cheap labor for the big plantation farms of the South, Southwest, and Northwest. No, the outcry is against any liberalization of our immigration laws which would permit the entry of a few additional worthy qualified and appropriately screened and selected immigrants from Europe and elsewhere.

My friends, there is no more urgent task than that of revising and overhauling our immigration and citizenship laws: to make them conform to the traditions of America and to the principles of decency, humanitarianism, and justice.

I would emphasize here, just in case there is any question about it, that immigration is not a problem of selfish interest to Jews.

The number of Jews in non-Soviet Europe who need and want to emigrate to the United States is extremely small. There may be ten thousand, perhaps, who want to come to the United States and would come if our laws permitted it. Most of that number are refugees and escapees—long-time victims of religious and political persecution and discrimination.

These few are but a minute part of the large number of Europeans who critically need to find homes, freedom, and opportunity in other parts of the world. A reasonably limited number of these should be admitted annually to the United States—on the basis of their need, and of ours.

So let no one think that we as Jews are interested in this problem because we want to bring Jews over to this country. Our interest stems from a higher motive: from our noble and ancient traditions—and from our recent traditions as Americans—the traditions of justice and of humanitarianism. We believe, as Jews and as Americans, that discrimination based on national origin is an evil thing and that prejudice and fear are ignoble sentiments which do not befit us and which do, in fact, demean and endanger us all.

We believe in the tradition of hospitality. We believe in America. We believe that Americanism is not in the blood stream, but in the life-giving air of freedom which we breathe in this land of ours.

Our Judaic tradition reflects, in all its parts, a fierce and unyielding faith in freedom, in the equality and dignity of man, in the sanctity of the law, and in equal justice under law for every man.

This tradition is also, happily, the tradition of America—indeed, it is the tradition of all that is best in western culture and civilization. And this is another great tradition which we have need to translate more accurately into our daily practice than we have in the recent past.

The national wave of hysteria which was called McCarthyism was a direct departure from this tradition. It was a violation, even a rejection of that tradition, and of our faith in freedom. It reflected a loss of faith in our fundamental values. That hysteria betrayed a lack of courage to face the difficult and dangerous problems of the present day.

As a nation, we seemingly forgot, for a time, that the strength of freedom and democracy lies in its very tolerance of unorthodoxy.

"If there be any among us," Thomas Jefferson said in his first inaugural address, "who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments to the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

How different this spirit of tolerance is from that shown in the recent past by some of the investigating committees of the Congress!

Of course, I do not advocate tolerance toward overt acts or conspiracies against the safety and security of the United States. Those must be detected by the duly constituted police and punished with the full, unremitting vigor of the law, in the courts of the land.

We must, of course, be eternally vigilant against sabotage, espionage, and genuine subversion. The Communist conspiracy must be effectively dealt with, under law, subject to the principles of our Constitution.

But in my judgment the forces of McCarthyism did as much damage to America during the last 5 years than anything the Communists have ever hoped to achieve with their vile, vain plots, and projects.

The forces of McCarthyism raised the banner of fear in every corner and cranny of America, in every school and library, in every assemblage of public officials, in every Government office and outpost. They poisoned the wells of American politics, with the suggestion that the whole Democratic Party was soft toward communism, and even guilty of treason.

These evil forces divided America not on the real issues of the day—the most urgent ever faced by America in all its history—but rather on the question of who was loyal and who wasn't, who was a person to suspect of softness toward communism—and who wasn't.

They made American championship of the cause of freedom a cruel joke throughout the free world. In the eyes of a good share of mankind, McCarthy became the dominant figure in America.

Senator McCarthy has been eclipsed—temporarily, at least—by the action of the Senate in censuring him last December, and by the action of the American people in electing a Democratic majority in Congress, thus automatically depriving him of his committee chairmanship.

But the forces which raised McCarthy to such eminence in America and the world are by no means defeated. They seem, for the moment, on the ebb, but they are still strong and pervasive. Their effect and influence are still evident in every phase of our national life.

The widespread pall of fear is far from lifted. It still hovers over us. Few men in public life or in government employment, or even in private life, dare yet to act, to write or to speak without adjusting their acts, their writings or their words to the present-day atmosphere—the atmosphere of apprehension, lest they be charged with being soft toward communism.

Basic questions of foreign policy—our attitude toward China—cannot be candidly and reasonably discussed because of this atmosphere. And there are scores of similar issues where the same thing is true.

It is our task—the task of all of us—to clear this atmosphere and to tear down the curtain of fear which hangs between us and the true ways and practices of freedom.

This is our task above all others. And we of the Jewish faith have a special challenge in this regard. As the guardians of the great tradition of the prophets, as men and women who know from the history of our people the meaning of fear, hate, prejudice, and hysteria, we must be in the forefront, in common ranks with all freedom-loving Americans, in the eternal struggle for the sacred cause of freedom.

Difficulties must not daunt us. The strength of the opposition must not frighten us. Concern for our own safety and welfare must not impede us.

We must dedicate ourselves to this holy cause, God's cause—the cause of liberty and of human dignity.

This is the challenge of this tercentenary. This responsibility we dare not shirk. We do not ask the Lord to be on our side. Let us be on His side. Let us then proceed, with strong and active faith, to the tasks before us.

## The Right Honorable Mario Scelba, Prime Minister of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, like most of the European countries at the close of World War II, Italy faced a gigantic task of national reconstruction. When the fighting ended, there seemed to be insurmountable difficulties to be overcome if Italy were to survive as an independent nation. Resolutely facing this tremendous task of reconstruction, the proud and cheerful Italian people, through their leadership, performed miracles. During these fleeting 10 years, a nation bent with the burdens and tragedy of war has risen again to command world respect. From dictatorship domination, the Italian people have gained democracy and freedom. From chaos they have progressed on the way to orderly, honorable, and dependable government. From the darkness of tragedy, the Italian people have moved into the warm sunlight and cheerful life and living to which they have been accustomed for centuries.

This remarkable progress has required leadership and statesmanship of the highest ability. It has required determination, energy, and patience. It has required physical and mental courage. It has required honesty and a fearless comprehension of the problems to be solved. Today we are to meet and to see and to hear from a great Italian statesman who possesses all of these remarkable qualities of leadership.

As our guest here in the Congress today, we are honored to have a statesman from Italy who, perhaps more than any other person, is responsible for the reconstruction of the great Italian nation. Our honored guest this afternoon is the Right Honorable Mario Scelba, Prime Minister of Italy. When he arrives, I know that every Member will want to be here to extend to him heartfelt greetings and the warm hospitality of the American people through their Members of this Congress. He is deserving, not only of our praise but of our appreciation.

During her long and glorious history, Italy has provided many brilliant and able statesmen. In their time, they served their country so well and with such great ability that they gained the respect of the leaders of nations all over the world. None of these noted Italian statesmen, however, has done more for their country than has our guest today, Prime Minister Scelba. In the course of his administration of the Italian Government, he has prevented revolution, blocked the progress of communism in his country, and has developed the cause of democracy and freedom in Italy to the extent that communism no longer is a threat. While steering this course which has meant so much not only to Italy but to the free way of life, the Prime Minister has reconstructed his country, torn by the chaos of war, so that today the Italian people once again are able to see the light of prosperity and happiness. Without his genius of leadership, Italy could well be, at this hour, under the domination of communism. Having saved his noble country from this tragic fate and having saved the Italian nation for the free world and the free way of life, Prime Minister Scelba has engraved his name forever on the glory pages of history.

Prime Minister Scelba is a humble man, who, like Abraham Lincoln, is responsible for his own education. He worked his way through school and university. He is a lawyer holding a doctor's degree in jurisprudence. He has held many offices in the Italian Government. In 1945, under Prime Minister de Gasperi, he was Minister of Posts and Telecommunications. In 1947, he was promoted to Minister of Interior, an influential position of prestige. After the fall of the De Gasperi government, Premier Scelba formed a government which was approved by the Italian Senate in February of 1954. In the short time he has had control of the Italian Government, he has performed such miracles as the defeat of communism and has saved the Italian people their freedom and respect.

Throughout the United States of America there are many Americans of Italian descent. These citizens have helped to make America the great Nation it is today. They occupy high positions in the learned professions, in Government, in science, in research and education. They have made great contributions to American art and culture. In my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts, there are many of our citizens of Italian descent. As elsewhere in the country, here in my home State they also occupy important positions of responsibility. Because of their Italian descent, I know these thousands of American citizens are proud of the country of their origin. They are proud of the accomplishments of Prime Minister Scelba. They join with all other Americans regardless of their national descent in welcoming this great Italian statesman to America and extend to him complete and unreserved hospitality. It is their hope just as it is the hope of every American regardless of his origin that from henceforth on Italy and America will stand shoulder to shoulder in the cause of freedom, the free way of life, justice, and peace. America today is both pleased and proud of its association and cooperation with the great people of Italy in the cause of freedom and peace.

## Secrets of the Airplane Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, before we consider H. R. 4393 we should take note of all available evidence pro and con the carrier.

I was amazed to read recently that—

The Navy is using almost as many defensive aircraft to protect its 17 attack carriers as the Air Force has been authorized for defense of half the continental United States.

This statement appeared absurd to me until I began to check it for accuracy. Much to my amazement, I found it to be true.

I found that each carrier needs about 70 planes for purely defensive reasons. Seventy defensive fighters for each of 17 attack carriers makes a total of 1,190. I also found that the Air Force has been authorized 34 air defense wings by 1957. Each of these wings will have 75 fighters assigned. Thus, the Air Force will have only 1,275 fighters to protect half of the United States.

They tell us that carriers are not vulnerable. But these 17 carriers will need as many fighter aircraft for protection as we are allocating for the protection of our great cities such as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, St. Louis, Washington, D. C., New Orleans, Birmingham, and Miami.

I think these facts should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the following article presented by Mr. Drew Pearson, Sunday, March 20:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

NAVY DIFFERENCES

Two discussions have been taking place in Washington, one public, one highly secret. On both depend the safety of the Nation.

Discussion No. 1 was a secret meeting of admirals and high naval officers at which it was admitted the airplane carrier is more vulnerable to enemy attack today than during the last war.

The terrible tragedies that took place on United States carriers, in which men died by the hundreds during Kamikaze attacks, are still fresh in the minds of many. Yet the vital fact that carriers are even more vulnerable to such attacks today than they were 10 years ago was not conveyed to the Congress which must decide whether more carriers are built.

The carrier is more vulnerable now, the conference of naval experts decided, because it no longer can count upon radar to detect approaching enemy attacks. Jet bombers fly faster than World War II planes, and without whirling propeller blades they are harder to detect. Also, higher frequencies have been adopted for search radar, the antennas are too small, and the ships' motion prevents stabilizing the search antenna.

That means, admitted the Navy's top experts at their secret meeting, the chance of warning a carrier against a jet attack is zero. Yet none of this information was transmitted to Congress, which has to decide whether the taxpayers should spend millions on carriers or put their tax dollars in other weapons.

PROTECTING CARRIERS

Best evidence of the carrier's vulnerability is the fact that 70 percent of its planes are held back to defend the task force and only 30 percent can be spared for attacks on the enemy. During the Korean war, for example, the Navy boasted of flying 183,000 sorties. But of those, a staggering total of 128,000 sorties was strictly defensive and didn't drop a single bomb on enemy targets.

The Navy is using almost as many defensive aircraft to protect its 17 attack carriers as the Air Force has been authorized for defense of half the continental United States. Most Congressmen don't know that, not because it's a secret but because they don't have time to read appropriations hearings.

But to defend its 17 carriers, the Navy will use 1,190 fighters. To protect half of the United States, the Air Force has been authorized only 1,275 fighters.

Furthermore, carriers are vulnerable not merely to air attack but to submarines. Of the 36 vessels in a typical task group, 32 are assigned to defense of the group. If the task force sticks together in tight formation to avoid submarines, the whole force can be destroyed by one atomic bomb. But if the ships are spread out to minimize the effect of atomic attack, submarines can slip through the defense. This has got naval strategists in a dilemma.

The Navy's chief argument against Air Force bombers is that they are tied to land bases. Yet the carriers are equally dependent on land bases. In the Mediterranean alone, the Navy maintains more than 40 land-based installations.

What embarrasses the admirals most, however, is that the supercarriers are too big to pass through the Panama Canal. For all practical purposes, this means the supercarriers are limited to one ocean.

NOTE.—Significantly, Britain, a seafaring nation, has cut its carrier program to the bone, is concentrating on constructing land-based bombers. Russia also is wasting no money on carriers, is feverishly building submarines.

## Burlington, N. J., Celebrates the American Jewish Tercentenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1955, I had the great honor and privilege of delivering the following address on the occasion of a dinner in celebration of the Burlington, N. J., American Jewish tercentenary:

It must have been a prophetic vision which led a small band of Jews to a tiny Dutch colony in the New World some 300 years ago. They were seeking what all of us want most at our deepest cores—that sense of human dignity that can only come from freedom. The route to New Amsterdam had been tortuous and, once settled there, this small group of Jewish settlers learned the lesson that history repeats over and over again—the right of freedom is never won handily and outright but must be continually earned by renewal of efforts. That this was done by these few Jews as they fought for the improvement of their status among strangers is only one measure of the contribution that they made in the New World. For the rest, they reintroduced to our hemisphere the ancient tradition upon which our civilization had originally been based, for they brought with them the culture of a people whose remarkable cohesiveness had persisted through centuries of exile and dispersion.

This is, indeed, the hallmark of the subsequent 300 years of the history of the Jews in America. These first Jews, few in number, were the forerunners of sizable groups of Jewish immigrants during the great period of our expansion in the 19th and early 20th centuries, who were to establish their mark indelibly in the fabric of American life. Always, the impelling force that led them onward, as it was also for other newcomers, was the search for opportunity and freedom. The meaning of what America stands for and the meaning of what these 300 years of Jewish life stand for, are thus linked inseparably.

Escape from intolerable religious, political, or economic pressures and search for conditions of freedom brought most of our ancestors to the New World. Pioneers in a largely unsettled country, they had to struggle to establish the conditions they sought. When the colonists finally proclaimed the independence of the country in which they lived, they then set about to make permanent the conditions under which freedom and democracy can flourish. Our country was fortunate to have among its citizens the gifted men who wrought out the Constitution which established as rights the freedoms they had sought. Even then, of course, the struggle for freedom was uneven, for there are always those who seek its deprivation.

As the Nation spread across the continent in the years that followed, always there were new waves of incomers from across the seas to help develop its possibilities and build its life. Always there were groups of Jews among them. And as the country and its life expanded, new problems arose and new institutions grew to keep pace with their solution. At the same time, as the pioneer country started to mature, it developed a rich culture, always infused with the qualities of geographic or ethnic heterogeneity. The Jews have contributed signally to this culture.

It was partly the group cohesiveness of the Jews that enabled them to make a positive contribution to American life. Of course, as individual Americans, they have made their own contributions to business and the professions, to science and art. These contributions are indeed vast. Although it is as a group that I mainly wish to discuss tonight the contribution of the Jews to the life of America, I want to emphasize that it is almost impossible to separate the contributions of individual and group. For just as there are interactions between groups, so there are interactions between individual and group. To attempt to understand all the multiple interactions that occur is to appreciate the value of democratic life. Moreover, in a country where everyone is an immigrant or a descendant of immigrants and whose people are as heterogeneous as are ours, there is no one pattern of culture. There are, rather, patterns of culture, and we should be proud of our cultural pluralism, for it has contributed to the richness and the variety of American life. For anyone to have imagined that he wanted to assimilate in such a country—lose his identity as a member of his original group—was sheer nonsense, for the reason that this is actually impossible in a country based upon multiple cultures. Assimilate to what? To the dead center of all the cultures that went to make America what it is? If this were at all possible, it would indeed be the kind of uniformity and conformity that we do not want in a democracy.

There was a time when many in America did feel that this kind of assimilation was possible. They tended to disregard or to minimize the cultural contributions of our immigrant groups. Our depreciation of these contributions was due not only to our ignorance but also to our growing pains, which gave us an excessive zeal to prove our Americanism as if it could only be something altogether native and uniform. We are rectifying this error today.

By an unfortunate terminology, we used the expression "Americanization" as descriptive of the process of adjustment to American life. This lent itself to the connotation of assimilation. Now we know that what Americanization really means in a positive way is the interaction of the values of the various cultures within American life and the contributions that this makes to the growth of our democracy.

The great waves of Jewish immigration into this country occurred in the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century, as indeed did all sizable immigration to the United States. By 1924, when we began to close the doors on immigration by adopting restrictive immigration policies, the country had benefited by a great influx of peoples and cultures, largely from Europe. The early part of the 19th century brought Jews mostly from Western Europe; the latter part and the early part of the 20th century brought Jews largely from Eastern Europe. In Europe, from which they had come, there had been periods when the ghettoes and the forced segregation had eased, and consequently the culture they brought with them was not only what had been preserved from their ancient homeland but had taken on something as well of the country of residence. Indeed, in our own country, the early Jewish immigrants had been thought of as Germans, or whatever, rather than as Jews.

Settled largely in the great urban centers, these immigrants proceeded to build their own institutions for their adjustment to the life in America. Yiddish literature, press, and theater flourished. Religious schools for children, schools for adult education, hospitals, synagogues—all these burgeoned throughout the land. Yet these were no mere centers of cultural isolation, despite the fact that they originally arose to meet the needs of those who were unacquainted with American life. As they grew, many of the institutions began to serve people from other groups as well as Jews. Their contributions lay, moreover, in those intangible values which offered nourishment to human communion, and thus permitted their members to carry on their workday lives with greater zest, and in those values which irrevocably made their way into the stream of American culture. We tend to regard as unique, for example, the genius of Charlie Chaplin or of Saul Steinberg for their gentle tragi-comic irony. But this characteristic, I understand, is one of the distinguishing features of a whole body of Yiddish literature. These two merely expanded their horizons to take in larger areas of life than that which the writer in Yiddish knew. The fact that we do appreciate these two men of genius in the arts is a reflection of something in the rest of us which we cannot articulate because we have been influenced by other cultural sources but which we can respond to because it is part of our universal human heritage.

We are able to assess somewhat more tangibly such contributions made by the Jews in public welfare work, for example. Here the Jews have been in the vanguard in establishing modern facilities with high standards. Hospitals, clinics, sanitariums, orginally set up to take care of Jews, are now among the best in the country and are operated on a nondiscriminatory admissions policy. Orphanages, homes for the aged—other community services—were among the varied welfare establishments created. One of the significant achievements was the early federation of various local charities for purposes of fund-raising—a development later taken over in many communities in the United States by other groups of public welfare agencies.

In other areas of public life there have been significant contributions by the Jews. The American labor movement is indebted to many Jews for their leadership. But I especially want to mention a contribution in keeping with the democratic tradition upon which this country was founded—the defense of civil rights. This, unfortunately, arose as a necessity toward the end of the 19th century, when incidents of antisemitism began to appear. As incidents began to spread, particularly when influential men accepted the slanders of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, leading Jewish organizations arose to combat anti-semitism. Although the original motivation was the defense of their own people, Jewish groups have ever since been among the greatest champions of the rights of all minority groups and of freedom for the individual. There have been exceptions of note in recent months, but they are isolated individual cases.

Meanwhile, in Europe too, the Jews had been making gains. They were coming out of the ghettoes; they were contributing to the cultural and economic life of the countries where they were settled. Before 1939, Europe had the largest number of Jews in the world, some 10 million. The Americas were next, with some 5½ million. In both Europe and America, in the 1920's, a strange kind of madness settled over the people which prevented us from being prepared for the profound disturbances that were even then in the making and which later shook the western world.

The ugly resurgence of racism as a political dogma became entrenched in two once-proud countries of Europe while we were trying to cope with our own problems of economic depression, and soon this dogma had been translated into a policy terrifying in its implications. The racist slaughter directed against the Jews was probably one of the most obscene acts of barbarity in all history. When the holocaust was finally over, we knew that some 6 million Jews had been annihilated, 60 percent of the total Jewish population of Europe, over a third of the total Jewish population of the world. Under such terrible circumstances did America succeed Europe as the largest center of the world Jewish community.

It seemed then in 1946 that America was to be the principal repository and the main standard-bearer of Jewish culture in the world. Many of the remaining Jews of Europe were uprooted and homeless; tagged with the initials "D. P." they were destitute and desperate. This did indeed impose a double task upon American Jewry, which responded with a sense of responsibility that matched the urgency of the times. The task of rehabilitation was undertaken immediately. And American Jewish institutions gained in strength as their constituents felt their own sense of responsibility.

Meanwhile, the most momentous development in the modern history of the Jews was taking place. The events in Hitler's Germany had given a new impetus to the Zionist movement, in America as well as elsewhere wherever Jews resided. From the beginning, Zionism had won the support of American Jewish leaders who had a consciousness of Jewish history. In the early and formative years of the movement, it did not attract large numbers, but it did have the keen enthusiasm of great Jewish figures whose names made their mark both on American history and Jewish history. Men who were great Zionists were also great Americans. For Zionism itself was an eloquent expression of an American ideal—the right of all people to self-determination.

All through the years of the Hitler terror, the Jewish people of this country helplessly watched the destruction of their fathers and mothers, their brothers and sisters, powerless to stop it. But when the time came and they were able to make a decisive contribution to the rehabilitation and to the resettlement of the scattered and suffering survivors, they became a powerful and vital force, strong enough to influence the course of history. They wrote a glowing chapter in Jewish history, for in 1948, after some two thousand years of dispersion and wandering, the Jewish people restored their ancient homeland. This was made possible by the heroism of the Jews of Israel, who were ready to fight and sacrifice life for freedom. But it would not have been possible had it not been for the dedication, the zeal, the determination of the American Jewish community, mature enough to meet its obligations and to keep faith with the summons of history.

Having won its objective, the American Jewish community did not relax its efforts, and year after year since Israel was established, it has made unprecedented contributions to enable Israel to meet the gigantic tasks it has set itself.

Yet, throughout this period there has been a tiny minority within the American Jewish community which resisted Israel's reestablishment and which has never quite reconciled itself to the existence of a Jewish State. We in Congress are aware of the activities of this small minority. They write us letters. They send us pamphlets. But they will not arouse much sympathy in Congress, or anywhere else, for they do an injustice to both themselves and to their Christian neighbors. There was never a basis for the fear that the establishment of Israel would in any way affect the status and security of the Jewish people of America. Any such suggestion is an unworthy reflection on the understanding and integrity of the American people themselves. Indeed, the restoration of Israel raised the prestige and increased the security of the Jewish community in this country, for the achievement reflected credit and honor on them and enhanced their position in the eyes and minds of all liberty-loving Americans. We would like to share with the American Jewish community the credit for Israel's restoration. All of us in America have reason to be proud that we helped bring this state into being. For its establishment has significance not alone for the Jews but for all of us.

The modern world of the West received its values from varied sources—from the Judaic-Christian religious tradition; from Roman law; from Greek philosophy; from the French enlightenment; from English parliamentary democracy. Basic to all of these is the Mosaic code, a humanitarian document upon which our entire civilization rests. We had thought for a long time, moreover, that we were remote in spirit from the Orient; but we are beginning to learn otherwise. The cradle of our civilization was the Mediterranean area—the crossroad of the Orient and the Occident—and as we are beginning to decry the stress on the materialistic values of the age of technology, we are rediscovering the perennially human values of the Orient.

When modern Israel was established, it took advantage of what was a unique historical opportunity. It built its institutions upon the basis of its ancient cultural heritage. Symbolic of this is the revival of Hebrew in modern form—a language that it had been thought was useful only to scholars studying ancient civilizations. Even more symbolic is the fact that classical Hebrew turned out to be adaptable to modern life. Some of the words are used as they were in the classic Hebrew; some have taken on new meanings; and new words have been introduced from the various languages brought in by the immigrants and by other groups living within the area. At the same time, Israel fashioned its political institutions on the political forms of the West—it set up a parliamentary democracy that is a model for that area of the world.

To interpret ourselves to one another is to add to the richness and the significance of our living together. The cultural heritage of the Mediterranean and the democratic tradition of the West—these have meaning for one another because they are both essentially humanitarian in spirit. Because the Jews in America are particularly able to act as interpreters for the rest of us, you have a special responsibility of enlightenment. That for 300 years American Jews have prospered and grown in the responsibilities they have set for themselves is a happy portent. I am confident that you will continue to work for the enhancement of freedom and democracy everywhere. The tasks that we build for ourselves for the ennoblement of human dignity are among the finest goals that mankind can pursue.

## Federal Regulation of Natural Gas Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in order to protect the consumers of my district and other consumer districts against further exploitation by natural-gas companies. We all know that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was adopted after extensive hearings held in the interests of finding whether it was necessary, in the public interest, to regulate the transportation and sale of natural gas to prevent further consumer exploitation. The answer in 1938 was yes, and I submit after 13 years that the answer still is "Yes." The consuming public needs protection now more than ever.

Since the adoption of the act the gas industry has expanded tremendously, until today natural gas is one of the great fuels by which America lives. Since its inception there have been repeated attempts by selfish interests here in Congress to amend this law in order to have independent producers and gatherers escape its terms and control. Efforts have also been made in the courts of the land by the gas interests to secure decisions which would hold that the regulation of prices charged by producers and gatherers not to be within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. But now in the latest of this series, the now famous Phillips Petroleum Co. against State of Wisconsin decision, the United States Supreme Court has held that the regulation of sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale by

independent natural-gas producers to be within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. A concerted effort by the powerful gas interest to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States followed and is currently in full bloom.

We will soon be concerned here on the floor of the House with the Harris bill (H. R. 4560), which is one of the bills currently being considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I am privileged to be a member. That bill is not only designed to exempt producers and gatherers of natural gas from rate control by the Federal Power Commission but would go further and require the Federal Power Commission to allow transmission companies to charge a "fair field price" for gas at rates which have no relation whatsoever to cost. Obviously, since no one can determine exactly what is a "fair field price," the measure, if enacted, will cost consumers millions of dollars over and above rates now permitted by reasonable regulation.

The oil and gas company proponents of the Harris bill claim that there is competition among the independent producers and gatherers and this competition will set a "fair field price." However, a close look at the factual situation of the process of gathering and sale of this commodity shows this not to be the case. The large percentage of the natural gas coming from our Southwestern States, is produced by a relatively few very large corporations who because of their monopolistic control of gas reserves, have almost uncontrolled power to fix the price of gas entering our interstate transmission lines. The Federal Power Commission report figures show that 3 percent of all these producers control 80 percent of all natural gas sold by these so-called independent producers to natural-gas companies. It follows naturally by the natural law of supply and demand that if we are to have effective regulation of gas rates, we must have regulation from the point of production to the point where the ultimate consumer purchases it.

Supporters of the Harris bill have also sought to buttress their position by drawing an analogy between the price of coal and oil, and that of gas, claiming that competition regulates the price of each. This in my opinion is just not applicable to the situation before us. The analogy falls, when, for example, we consider the differences in the method of transportation between coal and oil and that of natural gas. Coal and oil may be transported by rail, truck or water, enabling the middleman dealer to shop around and give the ultimate consumer the benefit of the cheapest available methods of transportation. Natural gas, however, can be transported by pipeline only. Once established, it is clear beyond comment that these lines cannot be removed from place to place to take advantage of favorable prices. This means that the ultimate consumer has no alternative but to accept whatever grade of natural gas is transported by the sole, monopoly, pipeline company to his area. One is simply not permitted to go shopping elsewhere for cheaper or more economical gas. He buys from a single seller or he does not buy. Since the competitive economic forces in the consumer purchase of natural gas are nonexistent or at best, weak, Federal Government regulation of exorbitant rates is necessary. Furthermore, it is clear that the present regulation of pipeline companies would be completely emasculated unless regulation of producers and gatherers at the wellhead were also present. This was made especially clear to me at the hearings on the Harris bill now in progress before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which I am privileged to be a member. Under existing law, pipeline companies and producers have continued to expand and have had no trouble in getting financial and other aid in such expansion. The Harris bill, as well as other proposed bills which seek to exempt producers and gatherers of natural gas from rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission, would exempt a large segment of the gas industry from proper regulation and thereby benefits primarily only a few large corporations. Enactment of such legislation gives a new lease on life to the very practices the Natural Gas Act was designed to prevent.

The need for such an amendment is made clear by the mental attitude displayed by the oil interests. This public-be-damned attitude was summed up by Lt. Gen. Ernest Thompson, representing Texas natural gas interests, who stated at these hearings that if the price for natural gas went beyond the ability of the consumer in our New England section of the country to pay, he could switch back to coal and oil. Mr. Thompson stated:

> They could always go back to coal any time they think gas is too high. There still would be a free choice to using coal, oil, or gas.

In answer to a question of mine as to: "What happens to the local public utility such as the Mystic Valley Gas Co. in my own district which has invested millions of dollars in laying a pipeline to meet the monopoly's main pipeline in order to service our communities, when the price gets so high for the consumer that the consumer no longer could pay the price asked for natural gas?" General Thompson stated:

> They would have to find some other line of business, more profitable.

What, too, of the small investor who has bought shares of stock in this company and has submitted to public utility regulations on the heretofore solid ground that he was assured of a small but steady profit on his investment? Should we do away with the interests of the consumer, the local public utility, and the small invester, by sacrificing him to the greed of the all-powerful oil interest? My answer is no.

It is from this type of attitude expressed by Mr. Thompson, as 1 of 3 members composing the commission which has jurisdiction over oil and natural gas in Texas, that the public-be-damned attitude is most clearly seen and fills me with fear in the years to come for the consumers of our great country. To point out that our consumers need protection from this state of mind is unnecessary.

There is no doubt, that over the years, enactment of the Harris bill, whose main ideas were formerly incorporated in the presidentially vetoed Kerr bill, would increase the cost of gas to the ultimate consumer by many millions of dollars. It is likewise indisputable that the objective of the proponents of this kind of legislation is to seek higher prices from the consumer. Natural gas is a wonderful resource of nature which has come into great demand since World War II. It was given to us by our Creator for the benefit of all of our citizens. We must not permit its great value, created in large measure by the demand of the people themselves, to be appropriated by monopolies through inflated profits. Reason and justice require that the sales of natural gas to interstate pipelines for ultimate public consumption be subject to Federal regulation in order to assure that independent producers and gatherers receive no more than reasonable prices to meet their legitimate costs, including the market rate of interest upon the capital prudently invested in plant and equipment. In the supplying of natural gas to a utility market these producers and gatherers are not entitled to exact "what the traffic will bear," for the consuming public is itself entitled to the benefits which this great natural resource offers after paying the reasonable costs of labor and capital required to make it available for use.

It is my hope that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Congress will adopt the amendment proposed in my bill. The bill which is proposed by me on behalf of consumers everywhere limits the proposed exemption to small producers and gatherers as defined therein. The statutory minimum below which regulation would not apply will be fixed at not more than 2 billion cubic feet per year. The amendment I have proposed thereby would exempt from regulation approximately 97 percent of the producers and gatherers of natural gas making sales to interstate pipeline companies and yet would leave subject to regulation more than 80 percent of the gas sold by so-called independent producers to natural-gas companies. It is obvious that the few major oil companies of the Nation are a close-knit organization, monopolizing the industry and holding, if permitted, a dictatorship over the consumer.

There are 20 million gas consumers in this country, whose interest in the gas rate is only aroused when their individual rates are increased. The average consumer doesn't know why he must pay more for less and if he inquires, such a deluge of exhibits, figures, and charts are showered upon him that he wishes he had not asked in the first place. Rate structures for natural gas have become highly involved for it is to the advantage of the monopoly to make them this way. The individual consumer usually gives up his investigation by saying that he can't understand the graphs, charts, and technical terminology and that perhaps

he shouldn't protest because his individual investment is so small in the overall picture drawn for him. He does not stop to think of the huge collective investment made by him and other gas consumers. The 20 million consumers have presently over $3 billion invested in gas-burning equipment. The gas producing, carrying, and supplying companies—in fact, the entire industry—have little more than half of that amount as a total investment. In our democracy it would seem that the interest of the greatest number of people, with the greatest amount of money invested, should be protected first. The history of the gas industry does not bear this out. The monopoly is trying to bring about conditions whereby they are protected and the consumer must pay and pay to satisfy the industry greed which, history shows, never will be quite satisfied.

And what is the relationship of the protection of the consumer against the producer? The consumer's investment is strictly an out-of-the-pocket expense, for which he is guaranteed nothing. He pays for it with his own money and may continue to pay for long periods of time. The producer, on the other hand, is allowed a 27.5 percent depletion charge annually. This means that out of each million dollars collected, there is $275,000 free of any taxation. While it is quite true that a well will not indefinitely produce large quantities of gas or oil, and perhaps, a depletion allowance is fair, if only to give an owner the opportunity to lay a nest egg aside. But it need not be an ostrich egg. If a well yields a million dollars a year for 5 to 10 years, the owners will have over a quarter of a million dollars tax free for each year and the remainder subject to no more than normal taxation. The allowance, as it stands, practically says that each company or individual who owns an oil or gas well should by some unaccountable reasoning receive preferential treatment given no other industry in these amounts because the life of his income from this source is a limited one. The productive earning period of our American athletes, our writers, our artists—their productive lives are also commercially limited, but they are given no such depletion allowance. My bill would make certain that dominant producing interests, primarily the major oil companies of the Nation, would not be able to assert their monopolistic position in the control of gas reserves to the detriment of the public interest. At the same time it would relieve from the burdens of regulation the small-well owners.

Recognizing the fact that the bookkeeping and other administrating procedures of the Federal Power Commission are a burden on a small company it is pointed out that the amendment proposed by me would exempt from regulation by the Federal Power Commission approximately 97 percent of all independent producers and gatherers of natural gas making sales to interstate pipeline companies and yet leaves controlled by fair regulation more than 80 percent of all natural gas sold by these so-called independent producers to natural-gas companies.

The smaller well owners deserve this protection, in my opinion, as nothing would be accomplished by the regulation of them in any event. Such producers do not control sufficient supplies of gas to place them in a position to affect materially the interstate movement or prices of natural gas. Likewise, the regulation of a multitude of small producers would involve time and expense out of proportion to the benefits obtainable therefrom. By enacting my bill the Congress can dispose of the differences that now exist and at the same time assure the consumers of natural-gas protection against unreasonable rates in conformance with the principles of the Natural Gas Act.

## The Honorable Herbert H. Lehman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the many good wishes and tributes to the junior Senator from New York, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, in the celebration of his 77th birthday. I mention this with particular pride because Senator LEHMAN and I came to Washington in the second session of the 81st Congress to serve the people of New York. We took our oath of office on the same day.

Senator LEHMAN is one of the most active Members of the Senate, and he has brought to that honorable body his vast experiences and the many accomplishments he achieved as Governor of the State of New York. The people of the 10th Congressional District of New York join me in paying him this tribute and in wishing him God's blessings in the years ahead.

I include a tribute to Senator LEHMAN which appeared in an editorial in the New York Times of March 28, 1955:

OUR OWN JUNIOR SENATOR

New York State's junior Senator, as in strict accuracy he has to be styled, reaches his 77th birthday today. In view of his continued energy after so many years of service to the public, the adjective does not seem out of place. HERBERT H. LEHMAN was earning a Distinguished Service Medal as far back as the First World War, when he had charge of procurement for the American Expeditionary Forces; he was twice Lieutenant Governor of this State and 10 years Governor; he carried on the vast transactions of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration during and after the Second World War; he has been a Senator since 1950, always to be counted on when a good cause or a good principle needed defense; he has been a successful businessman whose use of his success has been to help the community.

Senator LEHMAN would be long remembered if he had only a half or a quarter of his career on the record. But it is a satisfaction to believe, as well as to hope, that at 77 his work is not nearly done. We give power and credit to youth in this country, as perhaps no other nation has ever done. But we need the mature mind too, which often goes on growing after the body has begun to weaken and slow down. We need elder statesmen, and we are lucky that we have an outstanding one in our own junior Senator.

## Realistic Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an omnibus social security bill, which would eliminate many of the inequities which now exist under the law.

Specifically it would provide a means whereby the States could combat the adverse effect which our increased cost of living has had upon the recipients of public assistance—the aged, the blind, dependent children, and the physically handicapped. It would allow all States to raise the maximum amount of assistance now paid to persons on public assistance to $100 per month per qualified recipient. This would be accomplished by means of a change in the present Federal matching formula, by providing for larger Federal payments to the States with low per capita incomes, and smaller payments to the higher income States. It would not decrease the amounts which the States now receive.

This bill also embodies the provisions of H. R. 2993 and H. R. 2994, the 2 bills which I introduced earlier in this session, and combines them together with the above provisions in 1 bill. This omnibus bill also includes provisions which reduce the retirement age for women from 65 to 60 and eliminates the loss of benefits by parents and widows due to remarriage, under the old-age and survivors insurance benefits portion of the act. It provides for benefits for widowed mothers of minor children prior to the age of retirement. Finally, it provides a means whereby a widow who, by reason of the fact that she has had to take care of her minor children and has, consequently, become so separated from the labor market that she could not seek gainful employment, may now receive aid prior to attainment of the retirement age.

This omnibus bill also gives more realistic and practical assistance to the recipients of public assistance.

It would give the aged, needy, and physically handicapped the right to earn up to $50 per month, the same amount which the blind are now permitted to earn. It would also allow the needy and dependent children who are receiving aid to earn up to $30 per month. Under the present law they can earn nothing. I feel such a change would encourage these children to learn the values of our free-enterprise system, learn the value of money, and help to teach them to become useful members of society.

It provides that the recipient of such aid may own a home with a valuation of up to $5,000. That there may be no im-

position of a lien upon such home, or any other recovery provision, as a condition to receiving aid. It would eliminate practices whereby the public assistance laws of certain States are used to enforce collections from recipients' relatives. Prohibit the States from making public the names of those persons receiving assistance, and provide that the value of any United States surplus food made available to such persons would not be deducted from the aid for which the recipient would otherwise be eligible.

Because of the uneven residence requirements of the different States, and without interfering with the rights of the States, this bill provides for the direct payment of the Federal portion of such aid to those individuals who meet all the requirements for State aid except for the residence requirements.

## Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for March 24, 1955, on the subject of the establishment of a Department of Peace in the Federal Government:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Washington is beginning to refer to Harold Stassen's new job in the White House as Secretary of Peace, which represents a big step forward for an idea long proposed by West Virginians in the Congress.

In fact, the idea for a Cabinet-rank official whose main concern is the achievement of disarmament throughout the world and thus the improvement of the chances of world peace is being called in some quarters here the West Virginia plan because of its active promotion by people from our State, notably Mr. R. M. Davis, of Morgantown, W. Va.

The Stassen appointment does not go all the way toward achieving the West Virginia plan, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Peace coequal with the other departments of the Federal Government. Legislation would be necessary to accomplish that. However, bills to do that have been introduced in each session for a number of years, and the Stassen appointment has inspired the introduction of additional bills of this nature from Members outside of West Virginia.

In doing so, they usually pay tribute to the West Virginia background of the idea.

Mr. Stassen, whose Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) is supposed to go out of business June 30 of this year, has been named by the President to one of the Special Assistant posts in the White House with a broad assignment to work with the National Security Council, the State Department, and other agencies in the development of broad policies which could lead to world disarmament.

In establishing the plan, the President pointed out that, despite the huge drain on the economies of all the nations of the world as a result of the cold-war arms race, neither we nor our allies could consider disarming as long as the Communist countries, with their aggressive tendencies, continue to build up strength. So it is a question of trying to find a basis on which we and they can stop the race to atomic obliteration of mankind.

There is no reason to think that we are very close to such a goal. In fact, all the evidence points in the other direction. But that is all the more reason why every effort should be made—and no effort should be spared—to try to bring about a climate in which world peace can exist.

The job set up by the President and given to Mr. Stassen is a good step in a hopeful direction. We wish him the best of luck, for the very obvious reason that if he accomplishes even a tiny part of the goal set out for the job, we all will be a mite safer.

There is no greater goal for mankind than the achievement of an enduring peace. Like all great goals, it is extremely difficult to reach. Nevertheless, with God's help, we can, and, furthermore, we must.

## Cinerama Scores Diplomatic Victories in Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the cooperation of several Government agencies and a public-spirited American motion-picture corporation have recently made notable contributions to United States foreign policy in the Near East. This story should be of particular interest to the Congress because it illustrates how this Government's representatives overseas can make a direct appeal to people—rather than just to their Government—in many parts of the world.

Last year the Communists planned a major propaganda effort for the International Trade Fair at Damascus, Syria. They poured millions of rubles into an elaborate exhibit and shipped in trainloads of the best products of the Soviet Union. It was estimated that they spent the equivalent of $500,000.

For the full story of our participation in the Damascus fair, I quote a letter from the then Assistant Secretary of State, Henry A. Byroade:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, January 10, 1955.*

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: This letter is written in response to your request for details concerning effectiveness of the United States Government's exhibit at the recent International Trade Fair at Damascus, Syria. Our exhibit, you recall, was the production "This Is Cinerama" which had previously been shown only in a few theaters in the United States, and whose first overseas demonstration was made possible by Mr. S. H. Fabian, president of the Cinerama Corp. I am glad to be able to report that Cinerama was an outstanding success at the Damascus Fair despite the overwhelming efforts of the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc to dominate the fair with its massive displays of promises, both cultural and economic.

The United States Government has not frequently in the past taken an active part in trade fairs, and at the outset last winter there seemed little likelihood that we would be able to participate as a government, due to severe budgetary limitations. Our Embassy reported to us last February, however, that United States participation might well prove to be the single most justifiable public relations investment the United States could make in Syria in 1954, and that failure to participate would be interpreted as evidence of American indifference toward Syria and the entire Arab world.

We knew that the Communist bloc would attempt a costly and impressive array of exhibits and that the fair would be a propaganda battle between East and West. Therefore when the use of Cinerama was made available to us, along with its equipment and technicians, the necessary funds were somehow found by pooling the resources of several Government departments. Particular thanks are also due to Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau and the Air Force for their splendid cooperation in getting the Cinerama equipment out to Damascus in time for its installation for the opening of the fair on September 3.

The hard work and devotion to duty of the United States Information Service staff at Damascus have already been cited in commendation for their part in insuring the success of Cinerama. I should like to cite a few illustrative examples of the impact which this revolutionary technique made in its first overseas showing. By September 10 the following report had been received:

"Success of Cinerama greatly beyond original expectations.

"USIS has been under state of siege for over week with thousands attempting obtain tickets. To preserve building it became necessary shift ticket booths to regular cinemas. Demands of government officials and private organizations have made it difficult to hold even 750 out of daily 4,000 for theater distribution. Crowds of 2,000 or more line up at each theater in hopes obtaining 1 of 100 tickets given there.

"Pressure of crowds even greater at Cinerama theater, despite continued publicity that admission is by ticket only. Squad of 30 policemen proved wholly unable control crowds attempting to swarm in. USIS finally arranged for squad of military policemen who now maintaining order despite fact up to 2,000 persons stand outside walls and hang from eucalyptus trees to see upper half of screen only. One-inch steel guardrails around entrances bent like solder wire and are being replaced by heavier rails.

"Some tickets are being scalped for as much as 10 Syrian pounds, more than New York price.

"Newspapers continually reporting arrival personnages from all over Arab world and Europe who came primarily to see Cinerama.

"Embassy and USIS officers and their wives continually beseeched for tickets whenever and wherever they appear in public.

"Syrian Prime Minister who missed official opening attending tonight's show with family. Delegation of 100 newspapermen from Lebanon attended last night. Aleppo Bank has chartered 3 buses to bring all employees for Cinerama showing. Advertisements in cities of Northern Syria inviting citizens there to send self-stamped envelope for Cinerama tickets has resulted in deluge of mail—up to 1,000 letters a day.

"Streets rife with rumor that Communists will attempt to stop Cinerama by sabotage.

"Communists only line thus far is that Cinerama is 'unfair competition.'"

From a small Arab principality some 1,000 miles away came the report that local merchants who visited the fair had this to say referring to the Communist efforts: "In Syria the Americans with a small display were nevertheless able to show the superiority of American industry and technical know-how."

An Associated Press dispatch, was picked up by the New Times of Burma on October 4. It read as follows:

"The special Damascus Fair showing of Cinerama, a wide-screen wonder to the Arab world, was due to close on Sunday, ending a

mad scramble for free tickets to the smash hit.

"The United States Information Service (USIS) showed new movie technique in an outdoor theatre, and it outdrew by far Russia's elaborate pavillion at the 4-week International Fair.

"Only the Communists seemed relieved that Cinerama was ending its run. Arabs from all over Syria and from Lebanon and Jordan joined in a last panicky rush for tickets.

"During Cinerama's run, the USIS office in Damascus had to lock its doors to keep crowds out, even though no tickets were passed out there. Crowds screaming for tickets tore down booths outside the USIS office.

"Local movie houses were then enlisted to handle the distribution. Once 2,000 persons, trying to get 100 tickets, ripped down the marble facade of a theatre box-office.

"Black market scalpers peddled Cinerama tickets for 10 Syrian pounds ($3.50) each, and a gang was caught printing counterfeits.

"The big USIS theater at the fair seated 4,000, but as the closing date neared, more and more people stormed the gate. Thousands climbed trees and perched on buildings to glimpse the new-type movies.

"Many people assumed that Americans in town had an inside track on getting tickets and tried every form of persuasion from bribery to threats to pry some loose.

"Except for Cinerama, the Damascus Trade Fair was dominated by vast exhibits from the Soviet Union, Red China, and other Iron Curtain countries. The Soviet added a free showing of Russian films to their exhibit to compete with Cinerama. But their screen was flat. There were no tricky sounds. People stayed away in droves.

"NYET

"Meanwhile, 2 statues, 1 of Stalin and the other of Lenin, which were to have graced the Soviet pavilion at the Damascus International Fair, were sent home today—unused.

"Fair authorities said it was because of a money dispute.

"Syrian architects asked 2,000 Syrian pounds to erect the 2 20-feet high statues. The Soviet Embassy here said 'nyet.'

"There the matter—and the statues—rested until the fair closed at midnight on Friday.

"But Soviet officials said Russia is willing to attend next year's fair. So did the other 25 participating countries."

Finally, I am sure you will be interested to know that the United States is participating in a second International Trade Fair in Asia this year. Cinerama was selected for exhibition in the United States pavilion at the fair in Bangkok, Thailand, which opened on December 7. Our Ambassador has reported that tremendous interest is being shown by the people of Thailand. Requests for tickets have been much greater than the 1,700-showing capacity, and consideration is being given to extending the showing after the fair's closing date.

This account will, I think, give you an idea of the great potential value attaching to American representation at international trade fairs. The President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs (Public Law 663), which the Congress established last summer, will help to insure the effectiveness of additional United States exhibits throughout the world. I hope that sufficient funds will continue to be made available in the future for this program which seeks not only to promote American overseas trade but also to demonstrate the dynamism of America's inventive and industrial genius.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. BYROADE.

Later, in December, the United States Information Agency presented Cinerama again, this time at the fair in Bangkok, Thailand. The Communists were so infuriated they withdrew their own exhibit. The repeat performance was again a standing-room-only attraction. According to Life magazine:

The big show-stopper was Cinerama, which packed the 2,000-seat open-air theater twice nightly, scaring and delighting the audiences.

The Agency had to hold Cinerama over 2 weeks in Bangkok to satisfy the important customers who could not attend the showings originally scheduled.

Bangkok newspapers began receiving letters, obviously Communist-inspired, condemning the show as a "tedious event" and claiming that the film was only "an inferior imitation of a 15-year-old Soviet cine invention." Further, said these letters, "this pirated device was tried out unsuccessfully at the Damascus Fair where the reactionary local government forced the masses to attend."

That statement drew nothing but laughter from the Thais.

The people of this country owe a real debt to the men and women of vision in the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Defense Department, and to S. H. Fabian, president of the Cinerama Corp., for making the story of America live in the minds of our friends in the Near East. These people in the Near East saw the fruits of freedom and the truth overwhelmed the lies of international communism.

## Our Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon be called upon to make appropriations for the Defense Department, which is charged with the defense and security of our Nation. It is now 14 years since the outbreak of World War II and 5 years since the initiation of the Korean hostilities, and we are still faced with the problem of defending ourselves from outside aggressors as well as endeavoring to maintain peace throughout the world.

In many ways today, security is largely a matter of comparative military preparedness. Our opponents, it is apparent, plan to maintain a tyrannical military garrison for years to come and accordingly we too should have in readiness a larger and stronger military force in spite of the fact that such a situation runs strictly against the current of normal American life and traditions.

Based on the present abilities of aircraft, the distance between the United States and Europe is only 5 hours flying time; and between the United States and Asia about 8 hours. In reality, the distances of 3,000 and 5,000 miles of ocean respectively have materially changed and with this alteration, our security. We are playing for the highest stakes ever in the history of our country; the security of our own Nation and protection from outside aggression. The concept of security includes not only the strength to enforce peace, but readiness for war if necessary. The degree of this security depends upon our state of military preparedness. We need to be ready in hours, instead of months, with millions of men, the world around.

Shortly after the present administration took office and the first appropriation bills were presented to this body following the submission of a new budget, we began to hear much of the New Look so far as the defense of our country was concerned. We were told that with the advent of the atomic age and with new and more horrible weapons, we would be able to buy more defense and security for less money. We were asked to believe that through some mysterious formula recently devised, this country depending primarily on airpower and atomic and nuclear weapons, could deal successfully with an enemy which also possessed the same type weapons, but with a numerically superior air force with tremendous numbers of ground troops. The cuts made in the budget for the Air Force for fiscal year 1954 were restored for the fiscal year 1955; but not so with the Army. The funds provided for the Department of the Army have not been adequate in spite of the fact that we may have to deal with a massive enemy army well equipped and well supplied with manpower from satellite countries.

In order that the Members of this body will have first-hand knowledge of the effect of the cuts made by the present administration in the budget for the Department of Army, I wish to insert at this point a quote from a letter I have just received from a young man who was commanding a rifle company in the infantry battalion I commanded during World War II. This individual holds the Silver Star and the French Croix de Guerre with palm for gallantry in action. He was one of the finest and brightest men I have had the pleasure of knowing. At the moment he is a civilian employee of our Government and is assigned to a post located on one of our Pacific Island outposts. He writes as follows:

I took my first break since coming over here when I took 2 weeks' active duty with the * * * regimental combat team. I have a long story to tell. At the present they are the only combat troops on this island other than the Air Force. I worked with the S–3 and was told by the commanding officer to check any and everything. So I did. Boy, am I glad I did not stay in the Army. It is rough. Under present conditions, they are virtually running a cadre operation. The officers and NCO's are good, but the turnover of EM is so rapid that it is more like a replacement training center than unit training. The effect of the Army manpower cuts are quite apparent here and the regimental combat team was recently placed on a reduced strength T/O.

Mind you now, this is supposedly an advance outpost of the United States and the only combat troops here are ordered to operate on a reduced strength T/O. If any funny business starts again, you will have the same situation that the Army had orig-

inally when the Korean fracas started when the * * * Division was in Fort Lewis with phantom battalions and had to practice firing off the fantail of the ship on the way over.

In addition, administrative requirements have more than trebled in the money saving drive. Such reports as mess report, fuel conservation, etc., must be made out and all of this is being done on the officers' and NCO's own time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation as it exists today on one little island in the Pacific which is supposed to be an outpost of our defense efforts. I sincerely hope that when appropriations for fiscal year 1956 for the Department of Defense and more in particular for the Department of the Army are considered by this body in the near future, that each and every Member of this body will remember what this young man has written to me.

## Conventions and the Popular Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, is deserving of our attention. It appeared in the March 28, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine:

CONVENTIONS AND THE POPULAR WILL

(By Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois)

By next year the campaigns for the presidential nominations of the major political parties will be in full flight. Once again complaints will be heard that the party conventions do not accurately express the popular will and that they are in fact largely controlled by a relatively small group of insiders. Proposals will be made for increasing the popular control over the nominating process by means of the presidential primary. But it will then be too late. Only a few State legislatures will be in session in 1956 and the selection of delegates will be virtually completed before the public can awaken and make its will felt.

If reforms are to be introduced into our process of nominating Presidents, they must therefore in the main be effected prior to presidential years. For then there is time to act. This is a most appropriate year since virtually all of the State legislatures will be in session and the presidential election is sufficiently near for public interest to be easily awakened.

We should therefore take stock of the nominating process by which we select our candidates for the Presidency, of the way in which the delegates to the national conventions are selected, how the conventions operate, and who controls them. We should also consider the comparative advantages and disadvantages of a more direct choice of the candidates by the voters through some form of the direct primary.

When Andrew Jackson convened the first National Party Convention in 1832, it was a big step forward. Prior to that time, the Senators and Representatives of the Federalist and of the Republican-Democrat Parties met in Washington during the legislative session and in caucus selected their candidates. As the Federalist Party began to disappear, control of the dominant Republican-Democrats by the so-called "Virginia dynasty" tightened. Thus Madison succeeded Jefferson and Monroe in turn followed Madison.

The advent of Jackson in 1828, however, brought fresh life into the political processes. Jacksonian democracy expressed the turbulent and equalitarian life of the frontier together with the desires of the lower-income groups of the eastern seaboard. It was a popular movement aiming to make ours a government not only of and for the people, but also by them. As an inevitable part of this program, Jackson and his followers attacked "King Caucus" and the dominance of Congress which they alleged, with good reason, had by the combination between the adherents of Adams, Clay, and Crawford flouted the will of the people in choosing John Quincy Adams in 1825 as President instead of "Old Hickory." They called, therefore, for independent national nominating conventions, and in 1832 the revivified Democratic Party renominated Jackson by this process. This had been made possible by the improvements in the means of transportation and communication. With the advent of the railways, conventions became still more practicable, and under the pressure of public opinion the Whig Party finally followed the example of the Democrats in 1840.

Prior to the Civil War it was through the national conventions that the Democratic city organizations of the Atlantic seaboard made their unfortunate alliance with the southern slavocracy and nominated the succession of so-called dough faces, or northern men with southern principles, namely Lewis Cass in 1848, Franklin Pierce in 1852, and James Buchanan in 1856. It was by means of the national convention that in 1856 the new Republican Party largely replaced the old Whigs who so recently as 1848 had been able to elect a President. It was in the Democratic National Convention of 1860 that the Union was really dissolved, for it was there that the South refused to go along with Stephen A. Douglas' program that the territories should decide whether or not they wanted slavery and insisted instead that the National Government, under the authority of the Dred Scott decision, should foster and protect the extension of slavery into the territories and possibly even into the free States themselves. When the Democratic Party split on this issue at Charleston in 1860 and Douglas and Breckenridge faced each other as rival Democratic candidates, the one remaining cohesive national force had been torn asunder. For with the rise of the Republican Party, most of the southern Whigs had felt forced to enter the Democratic Party and a monolithic structure had been started in the South.

It was through the medium of the national convention that in 1864 the Republican Party was transformed into the Union Party and back again into its former self in 1868. It was in the national conventions from 1876 to 1884 that the groups coalescing around Blaine and Grant respectively waged their bitter personal but nonideological battles for power. It was in the Democratic National Convention of 1896, that a new popular impulse surged into the Democratic Party which was crystallized in Bryan's amazing "Cross of Gold" speech and which, despite the temporary dominance of the conservative groups in the party in 1904 and 1924, has continued to this day.

It was in the Democratic Convention of 1948 that, swayed by the oratory of HUBERT HUMPHREY, the party ranged itself definitely behind the program of civil rights.

It is therefore seen that national conventions have in the past played an important and at times a highly constructive part in the political decisions of the Nation. Underneath the sound and fury and the apparently nonsensical irrelevancies which distract and annoy the thoughtful, there is a far deeper logic which is at work in most conventions and which is imperfectly seen except by active participants. It is the effort of divergent territorial and class interests and ideologies to find a successful unity without too great a sacrifice of principle. There are many features of the nominating process which lend themselves to abuse and which tend to produce government by the few rather than by the people. Gross mistakes are made, as at the Republican Convention of 1920 when Warren G. Harding was foisted upon the Nation by a coterie of Senatorial bosses. Sometimes inferior candidates are chosen over superior ones. But there is more sanity in the selective process than critics are frequently willing to grant and in making reforms we should take care not to throw the baby out with the bath.

THE RISE OF PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

Beginning in 1905, under the initiative of Robert LaFollette, progressivism in Wisconsin and the companion movement in Oregon, direct presidential primaries were instituted in a number of States. Here the voters expressed their preference directly for presidential candidates and bound delegates from their Congressional Districts and States to vote for them initially in the national convention. It was these popularly elected delegates who in 1912 furnished the nucleus of the political support for Theodore Roosevelt in the Republican and for Woodrow Wilson in the Democratic Convention.

This innovation was naturally opposed by the professional politicians who preferred the hierarchy of local caucuses, and county, district, and State conventions whereby delegates were named to the national conventions. For in this way, the party leaders believed with good reason, that they could better control the final choice. The party leaders, therefore, in the main fought a delaying action against the introduction of presidential primaries. At times this attitude was one of outright opposition to any direct choice of delegates or candidates while at other times they made the primary vote purely advisory with no binding effect upon the delegates. In still other cases they permitted a popular choice of the delegates but either allowed no designation or an incomplete designation as to whom the delegates were pledged or favored.

As the progressive impulse in American politics weakened during the 1920's, some States gave up the direct primary, while in others the binding quality of the choices was weakened. But the direct primary States still furnished politicians with straws to show which way the winds were blowing and helped them to make up their minds. There is little doubt that the good showing made by Wilson in 1912 and by Franklin Roosevelt in the 1932 primaries helped to swing the conventions their way and that the same was true in the case of Dewey in 1944 and 1948. Similarly the primaries in 1952 confirmed the leaders of the crucial Pennsylvania and Michigan delegations in the belief that Eisenhower would be a stronger candidate than Taft, and hence tipped the scales of the convention in his favor.

The fear that the 1952 conventions would not result in the choice of popularly approved candidates, but would instead be dominated by the national, State, and city organizations led to a marked revival of interest in some form of the presidential primary. Various proposals were advanced in Congress which will be described later, and New Jersey passed a direct primary law.

Had less popular candidates than Eisenhower and Stevenson been nominated in 1952 there would undoubtedly have been a tremendous upsurge of sentiment for the Presidential primary. Even so, there was enough dissatisfaction with the nominating process and the conduct of the conventions to cause

Montana, Nevada, and Indiana in 1953 to provide direct primaries for voting on Presidential candidates and for the pledging of delegates to those candidates who received the popular preference. It is interesting to note that the Montana law was submitted to the voters by referendum in November 1954 and was approved by a vote of more than 2 to 1. The new Indiana law also pledges delegates to vote on the first ballot for those who win in primaries.

In all there are now about 525 delegates to the national conventions who are nominally selected in primaries. However, of that number, about 225 come from the States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, where the party voters do not really have an opportunity to ascertain the delegates' preferences as between prospective Presidential candidates, and these are hence not true Presidential primaries. The remaining 300 delegates, or not far from one-fourth of the total number in each party convention, are therefore the only ones who come to the convention with a clear mandate from the voters of their States as to the candidates they should support.

The 12 States which do have direct primaries of this type are New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Maryland, and California. Nearly 60 percent of the delegates to the national conventions are, however, not elected by public primaries at all, but are instead selected by State and district conventions composed of delegates from lower political subdivisions.

WHO CONTROLS THE CONVENTIONS?

In the main, therefore, it is the party leaders and not the people as such who still control the conventions and select the candidates. This process is far more democratic than the rather tightly controlled methods by which the political parties in Great Britain and the Dominions select their leaders, but it is still primarily based upon the assumption that the selection of Presidential candidates is party business rather than public business.

Fifty years ago this used to be the practice as regards virtually all public offices of a State and Federal character. The direct primary and the direct election of United States Senators have enormously increased the popular power in these other fields but no such comparable development has taken place in the nomination of our Presidents. The people play only an indirect part in selecting the candidates for what is above all others the one office in which the people are interested.

The insiders who control the machinery of a national convention can within limits significantly control its results. By the chairman granting or refusing recognition for motions, by the switching on and off of the loudspeakers, by control over the music and by the planting of claques in the galleries and on the floor, the stage can be largely rigged for or against a candidate. Many of those who watched the conventions of 1952 on television became aware of this perhaps for the first time. It follows that a President who controls the party machinery can with that instrument and with the Federal patronage largely dominate the convention of his party and hence either force his own renomination or that of his successor. The renomination of Taft by the Republican Convention in 1912 was thus undoubtedly contrary to the wishes of rank-and-file Republicans.

Similarly, the party leaders from New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois can exert great influence in the final choice. This was formerly evidenced by the great power wielded by Charlie Murphy, Tom Taggert, and Roger Sullivan, the city "bosses" from those States who, with the aid of the conservative leaders of the southern democracy, nominated Alton B. Parker in 1904 and, had it not been for the shift by Sullivan at Baltimore in 1912, would have defeated Woodrow Wilson for the nomination. They also exercised a great influence in the 1920 convention. Behind these political leaders in turn were the traction and gas combines operating through such financiers as Thomas Fortune Ryan and August Belmont. Similar groups have been influential, although to a much lesser degree, in recent Democratic conventions.

On the Republican side there is little doubt that the big financial interests of the East were largely instrumental in swaying the conventions' choice in 1940, 1944, 1948, and 1952, and that they are now in a powerful position both in the organization of the national party and in those of a very large number of the States.

THE DIRECT PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY VERSUS THE CONVENTION

The proposal for a national Presidential primary was first seriously advanced by Woodrow Wilson and George W. Norris and is now before the Congress in the form of proposed Constitution amendments sponsored by Senators LANGER, of North Dakota, and SMATHERS, of Florida. The Langer amendment calls, among other things, for the holding throughout the Nation of a Presidential primary upon a given day under which the candidate who received the largest popular vote in the given party primary would be the nominee. Under this plan the Federal aspects of the electoral process would completely disappear, and a vote in New York or Pennsylvania would count as much as one in Nevada or Delaware. The smaller States which would lose much influence under this method naturally oppose it with the result that it would be virtually impossible for it to be ratified by the States even if Congress were to approve it.

To meet this difficulty, Senator SMATHERS, of Florida has proposed a variant of the Norris-Langer method. His amendment also calls for a national primary upon a given day, but he retains the electoral college principle upon which representation in the national conventions is fundamentally based. The votes in each State would have the same influence upon the Presidential nominations that they now have on the final elections. The small States would therefore be given the advantage they now enjoy through their equality of representation in the Senate.

Turning now to a comparison of these two alternatives, it is obvious that a national primary under the Smathers method would reflect the popular will far more adequately than does the present convention system. But it also would contain grave weaknesses in comparison with the convention system, which need to be considered.

1. The national primary would accentuate conflicts within the parties, whereas the convention system tends to minimize them.

The great merit of the convention system is that in its search for a winning candidate it tends to discard the extremists and bring forward the men around whom not only the party but the Nation as well may best rally. Underneath all the noise, turbulence, and apparent conflict which characterizes a convention there is, as we have pointed out, a deeper search for unity which will best reconcile the conflicting interests and factions. In the final decisions one can see the working of a kind of political vector analysis in which each set of forces helps to determine the final position.

Were we to substitute a national primary, however, extremists would be encouraged to run for the nomination, and sometimes would win, and the conduct of the primaries would be knock-down and drag-out affairs.

The issues would also tend to be drawn far more sharply and the losers would not be able to exert the tacit influence which they now exercise upon both the choice of the ultimate nominees and the platforms.

Many people would welcome this polarization of politics on the ground that it would lead to a greater stressing of real issues than the present centripetal tendencies of our 2-party and convention systems. But such a sharper conflict of ideas would only be purchased at the expense of endangering national unity which, in view of the Communist threat to democratic institutions, I do not believe we can afford. Moreover, despite all the somewhat formless nature of our political groupings and the tendency of parties and of the Nation to draw together around the center, we have made as much legislative progress during the last half century as any democracy in the world and have at the same time preserved national unity more effectively than in any country outside of the British Commonwealth.

2. It is argued that the party leaders commonly know the hidden strengths and weaknesses of the various candidates far more fully than does the general public. They can, it is said, quietly sidetrack men who have strategic weaknesses which would show up either in the campaign for election or in office. They, however, would either not want to wash this dirty linen during a primary campaign or if they did, passions would be so embittered that united action would later be impossible. There is a strong case for quiet rather than noisy judgments to be rendered on such matters as this in political as in social life. But it is also true that this exercise of judgment can be applied unwisely. Worthy men may be rejected because of their very virtues and unworthy men selected because of their compliance.

3. The national primary would make it impossible to draft reluctant or modest candidates. Men who were not willing to undergo the ordeal of a strenuous primary campaign would be automatically eliminated from consideration. But these are sometimes the very men who, once chosen, would make the best Presidents. Sometimes as high an office as the Presidency should seek the man.

4. Another objection is that the national primary would impose an added burden of strain and expense to what is already an almost crushing load upon candidates. Not only is the Presidency the most exacting job in the world, but the campaign which is required to attain the office is most exhausting. To superimpose a second nationwide campaign would mean that for almost a full year prior to the election the candidates would be subjected to intense physical and nervous pressures, and unless they were supermen, the winner would come to this most important of all jobs in a condition of almost complete physical exhaustion. A good deal of this is already involved in the preconvention campaigns, but it would be intensified by the requirement of a second national election. Additional millions of dollars would also be required to finance the primary campaigns, and the advantages which wealth already possesses in this respect would be intensified.

5. It is obvious that conventions would still be needed to adopt party platforms and that these need to be coordinated with the desires of the presidential nominees. Furthermore, a primary is an extremely poor way to select a vice presidential nominee since no one ever runs for that office, and it is generally assigned to some one who in the opinion of the presidential candidate and the party leaders will balance the ticket by representing a different geographical section and set of interests.

A RECONCILING PROGRAM

The truth seems to be that neither the convention system as it is now operated nor the national direct primary is a satisfactory method of nominating national Presidential

candidates. The need is, therefore, to reconcile the two alternatives and, while retaining the good features of both, minimize their respective defects.

Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, of Florida, and I believe that we have found such a reconciliation. We have introduced such a measure in the last two Congresses and this year have once again submitted it (S. 652) for action. It does not call for a direct national primary but seeks instead to stimulate the States so that they, in increasing measure, will provide for direct primaries as the method of selecting their delegates to the national conventions. Our bill provides that States which agree to operate under the Federal Presidential primary law will receive a grant-in-aid of 20 cents for each vote cast in such a primary. The Federal Government would thus meet the election expenses for the selection of candidates for the most important Federal office. The Federal Government in turn would set up a bipartisan Presidential Primaries Commission of five members who would hold office for staggered terms. A candidate, in order to be certified to run, would have to submit nominating petitions signed by at least 1,000 qualified voters from each of at least three-quarters of the States which had agreed to take part in the program. Candidates so designated would have until March 20 of election years to withdraw, and by March 25 the Commission would certify the names of those still in the race to the participating States.

States which had agreed to come under the system would, in turn, provide for the holding of their presidential primary between April and August. The States would only include on their ballots the names of those who were nationally certified and would only permit each qualified voter to vote in the political party in which he was registered. Increased party responsibility would therefore be provided. The delegates-at-large from a State would be bound to vote for a given period of time for the candidate who had a plurality of the primary votes in the State as a whole. Delegates from the various congressional districts would be similarly bound for the winners in their districts who, of course, might not be the same as for the State as a whole.

There is some question as to how tight the mandate should be upon the delegates. It is, of course, essential that some instructions should be given or otherwise the primary would have no point. Experience has shown that the so-called "advisory primaries" have little meaning or value. But the instructions should not be so ironclad as to prevent the convention from choosing from a number of aspirants, none of whom might have an initial majority.

In its original form, the Bennett-Douglas bill provided that the pledge would be binding on the first ballot and as long as the candidate's vote exceeded 10 percent of the total delegate vote, or until the candidate himself released the delegates. This is substantially the provision which now governs the Oregon and Wisconsin delegations. This created the danger that a convention might be deadlocked between a number of candidates. The control over the votes of the delegates would thereafter largely rest in the candidates rather than in the delegates themselves, and this might result either in hopeless confusion or in a great deal of improper trading. We have removed this defect in our present draft, which provides that delegates may also be released if their candidate polls less than 20 percent of the vote on the third ballot and less than 30 percent on the fifth.

In my judgment, this plan combines the advantages of a far greater popular voice in the selection of presidential candidates while it retains most of the flexibility of the convention system. The primaries would thus be a first sifting of candidates on the basis of their relative popular support. The running of obscure favorite sons for the purpose of giving the delegation bargaining power would be discouraged. But the delegates could still exercise their independent judgment when the primaries disclosed no clear popular choice. The conventions would still be able to balance the ticket with appropriate vice presidential nominees and coordinate the platform with the candidacies.

No single plan is likely to be ideal in all respects, but we submit that this is probably as good a proposal as can be devised. It has the practical advantage, moreover, of being relatively easy of initial adoption by Congress while it would also permit gradual and voluntary growth within the States. It does not require sweeping and immediate changes. The sponsors of the bill hope that it may receive widespread popular support so that it may be passed this year and hence enable some States to act in time for the 1956 conventions.

## Hon. Edna F. Kelly, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have great pleasure in inserting the following article by Ann Cottrell Free, of the North American Newspaper Alliance, on our very charming and lovely colleague, EDNA KELLY:

WASHINGTON, March 26.—EDNA FLANNERY KELLY represents nearly 400,000 Brooklynites and a piece of real estate known as Ebbets Field in the Congress of the United States.

But this Democratic Member of the House labors under the same hardship as do many of her neighbors—except the Dodgers—of not attracting the strongest beams of the national spotlight. The publicity mills across the river in Manhattan seem to grind more constantly than those in Brooklyn where nearly 3,500,000 people live.

Representative KELLY is in there pitching, as the record shows and as her constituents know. Otherwise the voters would not have returned her to Congress three times in a row.

This dean of the Democratic House women Members is well equipped to play to the grandstand if she cared to. She is easily the most beautiful woman Member of Congress. Tall and slim (5 feet 7½ inches tall and 138 pounds), she has long black hair, now beginning to gray at the temples, deep dark eyes and classical features. She is 48 years old.

Though women are often accused of not being able to make up their minds, she ran for Congress the first time because "the men couldn't make up theirs." When a vacancy occurred in the 10th District in 1949, her fellow members of the Democratic executive committee of Kings County couldn't decide whom to nominate.

"O. K.," she said, "to settle the question, I'll run."

She had gone into politics as a widow and working mother. Her son and daughter are now in their early twenties. Soon after the death of her husband, City Court Justice Edward L. Kelly, in 1942, she became research director for the Democratic Party in the New York State Legislature. She brought an academic background as well as "savvy" in everyday politics to the job. She is a history and economics major from Hunter College in New York.

"I was aware of the economic problems of the working mother when I came to Congress," she says. One of the first bills she introduced was one to grant tax relief to widowed working mothers, and widowers, too.

Since she's been in Congress, she has worked for legislation providing equal pay for equal work. Though she has voted 100 percent for labor-backed bills, she recognizes that the big job is to get organized labor to accept the equal-pay-for-women principle.

EDNA KELLY is in the enviable position of being global in her thinking without neglecting the folks at home. As wrapped up as she is in her work as a member of the powerful House Foreign Affairs Committee, she is close enough to home to spend most weekends there.

Her foreign affairs record shows she has been motivated by humanitarian feelings as well as those of national self-interest.

"I sponsored in 1951 a direct grant of wheat from our surplus to India because there was a famine," she recalled. She then contended that the delay in Congress in sending the wheat, and then on a loan basis, could be one of the reasons India has been reluctant to aline itself with the West.

Mrs. KELLY also sponsored legislation to make the United States a member of the Intragovernmental Committee for European Migration. As a result, thousands of refugees and surplus populations have been moved, free of charge, to new homes and a new life.

An economic aid program that is more than token, she feels, is needed for Asia. She is now studying the administration's proposal to add an additional $200 million to the amount appropriated last year. This would make a total of $915 million.

"I believe," she said, "in giving enough. If a man needs a plough, give him a plough. He is the man we must reach."

Her main foreign policy interest, however, is in Europe; she is chairman of the House subcommittee on Europe. She believes in Germany being rearmed, but she cautions, "We may forgive the past, but we cannot forget."

Mrs. KELLY has the opportunity to visit Europe officially this summer, but she admitted she thought she'd stay home this time. Her son is about to become a father and she a "working grandmother."

## Ethics in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 20, it was my honor to speak before the Beth Israel Brotherhood, of Worcester, Mass., at their breakfast meeting in the synagogue vestry.

The meeting was directed by the program chairman, Mr. Jacob Shulinski and I have been requested to include my address, which follows:

ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

For the last few years, and rather especially during the last presidential campaign, we have heard a great deal about the subject of ethics in Government.

The circumstances of persistent atomic danger to our individual and national life

seems to be encouraging a reexamination of our whole moral fabric these days, and that is unquestionably a good thing.

The accompanying public realization that neither private nor party political ambition is a valid excuse for unethical and immoral conduct appears to have inspired our legislative bodies and political parties to seek the higher code of ethical standards the public is demanding. The appreciation of this practical fact has led to the bipartisan creation of congressional committees to investigate and make recommendations for moral improvement in the fields of modern politics and Government.

There is no argument whatsoever about the need and desirability of a continuing high standard of moral conduct on the part of public officials, political parties and candidates. It is true, of course, that the major responsibility for the guidance of public and private morality lies with our religious and educational institutions and parents. However, there is no doubt that the conduct of public officials is also a powerful example influencing the general public toward higher or lower moral standards.

As a matter of fact it seems to me there are currently some very substantial reasons why ethical standards in American politics are perhaps more important to us today than ever before. The Federal Government has grown by leaps and bounds in the last few decades, until now it touches the life of each citizen at innumerable points.

As Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, chairman of a congressional committee which investigated ethics in the Federal Government, remarked: "What could be tolerated when government was small cannot be endured when government is big. For its consequences, if not its causes, can be relatively worse."

Big government, and none of us can deny that we do indeed have big government, affects the income and the welfare of individuals, of groups, and of industries. Members of Congress make the policies which govern the activities of big government, but the administrative officials have a great deal of discretion in interpreting the policies and applying them to specific situations. Furthermore, interested parties or groups are seldom content to let the wheels of government turn unassisted, but are ever present to put pressure on the Congress or the administrators to secure decisions favorable to their interests.

It has been pointed out that corruption in government occurs most often in what have been called the action-laden areas—areas where government action or inaction can make or lose fortunes for individuals or corporations. The letting of contracts, the collection of taxes, the making of loans, the fixing of rates, the issuance of licenses or certificates, the allocation of raw materials, the granting of subsidies—these are the kinds of Government activity which should be examined most carefully for evidence of corruption.

In addition to the increased influence of the Federal Government upon our national life and the resulting increased consequences of any corruption in Government, there are two other aspects of public morality which distinguish the present from the past.

For one thing, major scandals in the past have occurred at times when we were technically at peace, though they may have taken root in war or immediate postwar periods. At the present time, however, we are virtually in a state of war. It is obvious that we cannot afford to let the efforts of our Federal Government to establish a peaceful world be diminished by the stealthy drain of corruption in public office.

Furthermore, there are serious implications in the realm of international relations. The United States holds a commanding position of leadership in the free world. Any deviation from the course, any slackening of effort, any failure to live up to the demand for world leadership would result in serious repercussions in the other free nations. If through corruption in public affairs, the American people lost confidence in their own Government and accordingly were reluctant to make the necessary sacrifices asked of them by the Government, there would be a very real danger that our effectiveness as the leader of the free world in the fight against Communist aggression would be perilously impaired.

We should never forget, as I said, that public officials set powerful examples. The quality of the men and women who hold high public office shapes to some extent the character of the entire Nation.

I am pleased to say that an overwhelming number of impartial witnesses, from all walks of life, appearing before congressional committees investigating the subject, unhesitantly stated their conviction that the vast majority of our public officials are truthful, conscientious, and honorable men. They also unanimously testified that all in all, ethical standards in the National Government are at least as high as they are in business and the professions.

Public officials are, however, still human beings and, therefore, always vulnerable to the temptations which affect persons in other occupations. In truth, there may be extraordinary conditions and circumstances attached to political positions which make it relatively harder to preserve the trust of public office.

This fact was rather pointedly described by the late Harold L. Ickes, when he declared: "I have never known a public official to corrupt himself." After all, for every bribe, favor, or other consideration accepted by a Federal official there must be someone who tenders that bribe or favor to him.

That man is just as guilty of wrong-doing as the man who accepts the consideration offered. I am sure that all of us who think the matter over would agree that there is no reason that we can easily put into words for condemning the behavior of the public official while tacitly condoning the actions of the private citizen—and yet, that is what many of us do.

There is an old maxim to the effect that experience is the best teacher. We have had some experiences with corruption in the Federal Government and there are lessons which we have learned from it.

The first lesson we have learned, or perhaps it is better to say the first lesson of which we have been reminded, is that public officials are apt to show favoritism as a result of personal economic ties with businesses or individuals affected by the program they are administering. This category covers those officials who accept bribes or gifts or favors of one sort or another which are valuable in a financial sense.

Employment, both past and future, is another possible source of corruption in Government. In recent years, more and more businessmen have been brought into the Federal Government, creating at least the possibility that, consciously or unconsciously, they might favor their former employers in the administration of their programs.

A more common occurrence is future employment with private firms affected by decisions in which the public official is taking part. There have been several cases, in recent years, where shortly after a large loan was made to a corporation by the Federal Government, one or more of the employees of the Federal loaning agency resigned to accept employment with the private firm, usually at a considerable increase in salary. The most serious aspect of this practice is that it casts doubt on the impartiality of the Government agency involved, both in the particular case at issue and in all other cases before the agency.

Political appointments, too, are potential sources of trouble. There is some evidence to support the theory that political appointees are more prone to temptation than are career civil-service employees. Also involved are the caliber of the appointees, the political sniping to which they are subject, and the attacks on programs because of the politically selected officials who are administering them. In a somewhat different area, there have been cases in which officials apparently have been misled by their personal friendships.

Administrative faults are responsible for some of the corruption which occurs in Government. Weak organization and dispersion of authority at the top invites subordinate officials to indulge in questionable practices.

Poor procedures or the lack of procedures are responsible for creating a climate in which corruption can flourish. When laws, regulations, or policies are inexact or couched in vague general terms, it becomes easier for an administrator to fail to observe the public interest. Then, too, there is a tendency in regulatory agencies to be less zealous as they grow older; there is an atmosphere of tiredness and routine performance of public duties.

These are some of the major lessons we have learned about corruption in the Federal Government. We have found, also, that corruption is most likely to appear after a major war, when there is a relaxation of effort and a careless attitude of "Let's get back to the good old days." All of us hope that corruption will receive no further stimulus from that source.

After examining some of the problems and some of the sources of corruption in Government, the logical question to ask is—what shall we do about it? There have been a number of suggestions and I would like to tell you a little about some of them. We should remember that no one measure can be expected automatically to eliminate corruption.

Strengthening existing laws and plugging loopholes is one of the suggested remedies for corruption. It is proposed that the criminal law relating to bribery should be extended to provide that payments of something of value to a Government official, with the intent of having him use his influence with some other official, should be included in bribery. Bribes should include offers of employment and other considerations as well as cash payments, and penalties should be increased. The laws governing conflicts in interest could be strengthened relative to private income, participation in making contracts, disqualification in certain cases, and speculation by Government employees. The Administrative Procedure Act might be amended relative to conflicts of interest, discussion of future employment, divulging of information, and a bar on the appearance of former employees before their agencies on any case within 2 years. Lobbyist registration laws also could be strengthened.

Another proposal which has been made is that all top administrative officials should be required to disclose all income from all sources, both public and private, and including gifts and loans. Disclosure often accomplishes more than criminal sanctions.

Existing standards of conduct for public employees should be enforced at all times, and every effort should be made to improve the general quality of Government employees. This probably would involve providing more adequate salaries, better promotion opportunities, improved means of weeding out the inefficient and incapable employees, and an effective loyalty-security program. The cooperation of our schools, universities, and communities, as well as the Congress and the Civil Service Commission would be necessary in this regard.

Improvement of administrative organization is an obvious remedy to some of the situations which are conducive to corruption. There should be clear lines of author-

ity and the means of administrative control should be clear and effective. Congress can help by clearly defining the limits of executive power, by making laws more precise, and by providing adequate safeguards for the public interest.

Another possible procedure is the establishment of codes of ethics. There have been several proposals along this line, the argument being that they would be useful to those who "blunder into wrongdoing" through ignorance and would bolster the consciences of those who were tempted to stray from the accepted ethical standards. The Senate Subcommittee on Ethical Standards proposed including items regarding all business discussions to be held in public buildings during working hours, the disqualification of officials in a decision affecting a previous employer, and a prohibition against becoming deeply involved, either financially or socially, with persons outside the Government who might be affected by agency decisions.

A court of ethics to hear complaints about improper practices of public officials and to secure redress to the ordinary citizen has been proposed. There is relatively strong backing for a Commission on Ethics in Government, to be composed of persons appointed partly by Congress, partly by the President.

This Commission would not only investigate moral standards, but also would recommend measures for improvement. Related to this proposal is another for the creation of a nonpartisan citizens' organization to perform much the same functions.

These are the primary reform proposals now up for consideration. All of them are receiving study and are being pushed with varying degrees of vigor. As I have noted, no one proposal can be expected to provide a cure for the problem of corruption in Government. Certainly, some of these proposals if put into effect would improve the ethical standards in the Federal Government.

However, the greatest force to influence the observance of higher ethical standards in Government lies within each of us as individual citizens contributing to a higher national morality. If each of us in our private and social lives adheres to the divine laws of right conduct and right reason the betrayers of public trust will not long be tolerated in public life. We all have an individual responsibility for the manner in which our public business is conducted. If we increasingly accept that responsibility, we can remain confident that this Nation and this Government will retain the moral character and strength to survive in triumph over the immorality of Communist atheism. It will be only by a preserving demonstration of moral integrity as a people that we will be able to successfully guide ourselves and the civilized world to peaceful understanding and prosperous progress in an atomic age.

## The Great Debate on Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention an article which has been prepared by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable STEWART L. UDALL, who ably represents the fine State of Arizona in this Congress. It is my understanding that this article, entitled "The Great Debate on Reclamation," is being distributed to Congressman UDALL'S constituents through the press and will be available for publication tomorrow.

Congressman UDALL'S statement so ably and clearly presents his views and so finely outlines the tremendous values of reclamation to our country that I believe it deserves a place in the RECORD and I request permission to insert it, so that it may receive a wider circulation.

In making this request, I would like to note further that I am in full agreement with the statements made by my honorable colleague and that I believe they reflect the views of many others who are sincerely interested in the future of the reclamation program as a tremendous factor in the development of the West and the economy of the Nation.

The article follows:

A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

(By Representative STEWART L. UDALL)

THE GREAT DEBATE ON RECLAMATION

There is a rising tide of antireclamation sentiment here which threatens western development. If the upper Colorado project gets to the floor, I suspect that discussion of this bill will be only part of a larger debate on the future of reclamation itself. To some extent this debate has already begun, and it seems essential to me that we keep close watch on the forces and arguments marshaled against us, for the West's continued growth is closely linked to the future of reclamation.

At the outset, we must recognize that at nominal cost groups of farmers have, where conditions were favorable, brought water to much of our western land without Government aid of any kind. Since 1902, however, the Bureau of Reclamation has constructed many projects too large to be tackled by local interests alone. Naturally, the easiest and most promising works were built first—projects like Salt River, Boulder, Grand Coulee, and Central Valley of California.

It is now apparent that the projects yet to be built (like central Arizona, and upper Colorado) are relatively hard projects where repayment by the water users may take longer and the Government must assume greater risks. However, this should not be a fatal stumbling block, as Teddy Roosevelt originally conceived the reclamation program as a bold, risk-taking venture—a western equivalent of eastern projects to develop rivers and harbors.

Until recent years, as the easy projects were completed and more difficult ones tackled, the reclamation and budget people here tended to liberalize the ground rules so that projects previously regarded as unfeasible financially could qualify: basin-wide accounting plans were approved; repayment periods were extended; and the principle was established that farmers could build power dams and use the net revenues to pay off prohibitive water costs.

It may be that the antireclamationists have been emboldened by right hand versus left hand actions within the Eisenhower administration. While the President on the one hand endorses upper Colorado and Fryingpan, his budget director has been busily drafting new regulations which would probably prohibit similar future projects, his Interior Secretary has exhibited a lukewarm attitude toward reclamation, and his proposed appropriations for new construction next year sets the lowest point reached since 1950.

The opponents of reclamation have burst upon this scene opportunely and now dispute its accomplishments and seek to discredit the entire program. Their chief spokesman, Raymond Moley of Newsweek magazine, calculates that the way to beat reclamation is to pit East against West and he is out to sell his arguments to Congressmen from the populous Eastern States. Moley has turned out a pamphlet denouncing the sorry record and waste of the Bureau of Reclamation.

We fully expect that the water resources task force of the Hoover Commission will shortly join this chorus. Its chairman, former Governor Leslie Miller of Wyoming, boldly strode into our upper Colorado hearings 2 weeks ago and bluntly testified that in his opinion the entire plan—including the participating projects in his own State—was economically unsound.

The trouble with these sincere people is that pencil in hand, they look at the entire reclamation venture from the narrowest perspective, merely in terms of money directly paid into or out of the Treasury. Like overprudent bankers, they are so intent on these debits and credits that they fail to take into account the tremendous values produced where the economies and living conditions of entire valleys are transformed by successful reclamation projects.

In their excessive prudence, they overlook the millions of dollars of flood damage that would be sustained periodically by farms and cities if the reclamation dams were not in place.

(Not long after it was dedicated the new Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande stopped a disaster-bent flood in its tracks and saved a substantial part of its total cost.) They point to the current farm surpluses and say the new farm acres are not needed. This is fainthearted thinking that misjudges the surging growth of our country and the resourcefulness of its people.

The cornerstone of the reclamation program has been interest-free loans, a feature particularly condemned by these critics who fail to note that the principal invested will come back manyfold when new valleys are opened up to farmers and fresh sources of income are created. It is a fact that acres put under cultivation by the Bureau of Reclamation produced total crop values in 1953 alone of nearly $1 billion.

Nor do these people concede that a substantial part of the $3 billion we have expended thus far on reclamation will eventually be directly repaid, while the full $7 billion the Government has spent at the same time on national rivers and harbors projects has been paid out without expectation of direct repayment.

Who, we might ask, are these "debit and credit" men who cry "failure"? Need we westerners bother to answer them at all when our green valleys mock their words, our prosperity mocks their logic, and our cities and farms testify they have misread our history?

## A Eulogy to Walter White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the shocking news of the passing of Walter White reached me in Washington at a time when I am unable to return to the city to join the many thousands who paid their final tribute of respect to a man who gave his heart and soul for the full freedom of all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or color. It will never be the fate of Walter White that "the evil that men do lives after them;

the good is oft interred with their bones," for his goodness outstrips all evil, and as long as history lasts, and there is the cry for full human freedom, Walter White's name will be echoed down the corridors of time as the symbol of a true champion of human rights.

In recent years many distinguished citizens, because of their identification in the struggle for human rights, have been designated as Mr. Civil Rights. Walter White was truly the one man in these United States who had the right to receive the coveted title of Mr. Civil Rights. He lived, breathed, and walked civil rights. He was not called Mr. Civil Rights, but without his courageous fight for full freedom, advancing where others, in fear, retreated, the cause of dynamic democracy would have been lost long ago in the United States, and perhaps the world over. Without Walter White, civil rights would have been sleeping in the laps of the forgotten past. He magnified civil rights to such a degree that the walls of prejudice, segregation, and discrimination came tumbling down in the Army and the Navy, in our educational system, our judicial bodies, and in both high and low places of the government and especially in the Capital of the Nation.

He, like others, has served his day and generation and has now fallen asleep, leaving behind the most formidable organization for human rights in all the world. The debt we owe to him can never be paid in words, but we can accept the mantle of responsibility which he wore so nobly in championing the rights of the disinherited and the downtrodden.

Here it can be said of Walter in the words of St. Paul the Apostle, another fighter for human rights: "I have fought a good fight; I have finished the course; I have kept the faith."

TRIBUTE DELIVERED AT THE FUNERAL OF WALTER WHITE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, BY CHANNING H. TOBIAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NAACP, AT ST. MARTIN'S PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY, THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1955

A memorial service will be conducted in Walter's honor at the annual convention of the NAACP at Atlantic City next June, therefore my tribute at this time can be brief.

There is a very real sense in which Walter White needs no spoken eulogy. Nor is it important that a material monument be erected to his memory. A Man Called White, his autobiography, tells a large part of his life story, and a new book written by Walter but yet to be published entitled "How Far the Promised Land" will complete the picture. But the true story of his services is to be found written in the hearts of those whom he helped to liberate from the bondage of second-class citizenship.

Together with Mary McLeod Bethune I was with him when he protested to President Franklin D. Roosevelt against Jim Crow redistribution centers for our soldiers returning home from service in the war, and heard the President tell him that the Pershing Hotel of Chicago, taken over for a center, would be returned to its owners, and that the Theresa Hotel of New York, under consideration for a center, would not be taken over, and that Negroes would be accommodated in the regular redistribution centers without discrimination. Largely as a result of this protest and subsequent efforts by Walter White, Thurgood Marshall, Roy Wilkins, Louis T. Wright, and others associated with them, servicemen of color today bear the arms of their country as Americans and not as Negroes.

I sat beside him in President Harry Truman's office in the summer of 1946 when he struck a telling blow against mob violence which resulted in the appointment of the President's Committee on Civil Rights—the committee that after a year's work issued the memorable report entitled "To Secure These Rights"—a document that moved the conscience of America into aggressive action against double standards of citizenship based on race.

Along with Arthur Spingarn and Theodore Spaulding in a room of the Commodore Hotel in this city I heard Walter's plea to President-elect Eisenhower to do away with racial discrimination as far as his executive influence could be used to that end. In spite of the fact that Mr. Eisenhower was flying the next day to Korea, he prolonged our visit from 15 minutes to an hour. I was not, therefore, surprised that one of his first appeals after assuming office was a strong personal word calling upon the District of Columbia to set the example for the rest of the Nation in abolishing racial discrimination. Today the hotels, the restaurants, and the public utilities of the city of Washington operate on a nondiscrimination basis. No wonder that Ralph Bunche, who once said that he did not wish to rear his children in Washington because of racial segregation, now says that because of the changes that have come about in recent years he would have no objection to living there again.

These are but a few highlights of what Walter accomplished in top level conferences. They are important because they illustrate the method of the NAACP in dealing with controversial issues growing out of racial discrimination. It is a method that blinks no facts and engages in no double talk. But it is also a method that does not make use of rabble-rousing as a technique. It recognizes progress when it comes to pass, as will be seen in Walter's new book, How Far the Promised Land, already referred to. Finally it is a method that looks forward to the completion of Lincoln's work of emancipation and the realization of his dream of freedom for all in the true American way.

Looking this way today and wanting to be a part of this tribute are sharecroppers of the deep South who are no longer voteless; dining car waiters and pullman porters who are now privileged to serve their own people as they do other people without discrimination; public school teachers whose salaries are no longer determined by the color of their skin; servicemen in every department of our defense forces who have been liberated from Jim Crowism; workers of all kinds who now enjoy union protection; children who have been lifted to a plane of self-respect by the Supreme Court decision in the school cases; and thousands of white people who have been liberated from the blighting evil of race prejudice. I am conscious of the presence of this vast unseen audience.

Also the leaders of millions of the darker peoples of the world like Nehru of India; Matthews of South Africa; Mkrumah of Gold Coast; Azikiwe of Nigeria; Tubman of Liberia; Haile Selassie of Ethiopia; Manley of Jamaica; Magloire of Haiti; and others join us in this tribute.

If Walter could have one word to say to us now, I imagine it would be something like this: Board members, staff, constituency and friends of the NAACP close ranks and go courageously ahead to the accomplishment of the unfinished task with assurance of ever-growing support from all those who cherish the ideals for which we stand. As one of those fortunate enough to be with him in the office for a little while on the day of his departure, I saw in him again that characteristic mixture of protest and optimism which leads me to conclude with that great poem of Walter's mentor and predecessor in office, James Weldom Johnson:

"Lift ev'ry voice and sing
Till earth and heaven ring.
Ring with the harmonies of Liberty;
Let our rejoicing rise
High as the list'ning skies,
Let it resound loud as the rolling sea.
Sing a song full of the faith that the dark past has taught us,
Sing a song full of the hope that the present has brought us.
Facing the rising sun of our new day begun,
Let us march on till victory is won.

"Stony the road we trod,
Bitter the chast'ning rod.
Felt in the days when hope unborn had died;
Yet with a steady beat,
Have not our weary feet
Come to the place for which our fathers sighed?
We have come over a way that with tears has been watered,
We have come, treading our path thru the blood of the slaughtered,
Out from the gloomy past,
Till now we stand at last
Where the white gleam of our bright star is cast.

"God of our weary years,
God of our silent tears,
Thou who has brought us thus far on the way;
Thou who has by Thy might
Led us into the light.
Keep us forever in the path, we pray.
Lest our feet stray from the places, our God where we met Thee,
Shadowed beneath Thy hand,
May we forever stand.
True to our God
True to our native land."

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 23, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

Walter White was one of the most important leaders in one of the most important struggles of his day. As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, he was regarded as a leader and spokesman for the American Negro, a man who had long ago earned the affection of his own people and the respect of others.

In his long service to the Negro, Mr. White had seen the virtual elimination of lynching, the enactment of fair employment laws, the reduction of discrimination, the outlawing of segregation in the Armed Forces, the approach, heralded by the Supreme Court decision, of racial integration in the Nation's schools. For all these objectives he had labored zealously and devotedly; he crusaded not by inflaming passions or by preaching violence, but by putting his faith in democratic ways and the conscience of his fellow citizens. And he lived to see his faith and hope justified.

Walter White might have led a different life, apart from racial strife. He was but one-sixty-fourth Negro and could have, if he had chosen, remained a white man to the world. But his people needed him and perhaps he, too, needed them. With their help and the help of other friends, he accomplished much. If, when he died, much still remained to do, none knew better than Walter White that freedom is a never-ending job.

---

[From the New York Times of March 23, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

Walter White was the adviser of statesmen and soldiers, in peace and war. His work for the Negro was enormously effective over more than three decades. That he was the author

of President Roosevelt's Executive Order on Fair Employment Practices in war industrise is but one evidence out of many of the weight of his counsel and his vision. In his post of executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People he was at the center of the conflict between bigotry and democracy which the so-called race question involves. Considerable progress has been made, in recent times here, in resolving this conflict. A great deal of what has been achieved can be directly traced to his influence.

Blue-eyed and fair of color, Walter White did not need to identify himself as a Negro. He did so deliberately, and in its way this act made a special mockery of race discrimination.

---

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 23, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

Walter White devoted all his mature life to the struggle to eliminate the legal, economic, and social handicaps resting upon the Negroes in many parts of the United States. He sought, that is, to have the principle that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights accepted in practice as well as in theory.

In the beginning, the fight was up a steep hill. In some parts of the country the Negro was held to be a lower order of being and hence not worthy of the full protection of the law as accorded to white men. Accused of crime, he could be lynched with impunity and often was. Great national organizations, such as the Ku Klux Klan, were largely intended to keep him in his place.

Walter White's methods were not violent. He enlisted the support of able lawyers, both colored and white, to fight the battles of the Negro in the courts and in the press. He was instrumental in extending the scope and influence of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and was its recognized spokesman. In the face of constant rebuff and frequent defeat, he struggled on. He chose the ground for his successive skirmishes with great care and, as the years passed, the victories came gradually to outnumber the defeats. The most massive of these triumphs was the Supreme Court decision of last year outlawing segregation in the public schools. This was a personal victory for White because it was he who discovered and brought into the action the young Baltimore lawyer, Thorogood Marshall, himself a Negro, who steered the case through the courts.

All this is the more remarkable in that Walter White, though proudly acknowledging his Negro blood, was a blond. He was whiter, even, than most of us. He could easily have passed, as the saying goes, into the ranks of the dominant race. Instead he chose to remain among the Negroes, fighting their battles and, in the end, winning their victories. We do not pretend to understand his full motivation for this remarkable devotion, but we are certain there was an element of nobility in it.

---

[From the Baltimore Sun of March 22, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

Walter White was a fortunate man. He recognized his mission in life at an early age, he bent all his talents to it over the whole span of his manhood, and he saw his crusade marked by one success after another. The mission was to secure to American Negroes the economic, educational, and social rights enjoyed by other Americans. And he lived to see what was possibly the most profound vindication of his long fight, the Supreme Court decision abolishing segregation in the public schools.

Not many men are blessed with so clear a pattern in their life's work. Yet the pattern was only dimly seen when Walter White joined the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as a young man of 25. In those early days of the fight against white-hooded bigotry and flaming intolerance the first task was to eliminate the pattern of violence. Men of good will everywhere were active in that part of the fight, but over the years Walter White could claim credit for much of the success. The race riots of Arkansas in 1919, when 200 Negroes died, and the lynchings of the 1920's, ranging from a dozen or more to as high as 64 each year, are now things of the past.

In later years the NAACP's efforts, under Mr. White's leadership, were devoted to securing Negro rights through laws and regulations, national and local. In the periodical press, before congressional committees, in dozens of court cases, the battle to chip away discrimination went on. Not all the battles turned into victories. Many, including this newspaper, felt that the NAACP's attempts to secure legislative redress for the Negro's social plight were extreme and clashed with equally valid individual rights.

But if Walter White's crusade was militant it was also conducted within the framework of law and order. The implications of all that has been won are still to be accepted and worked out. But one great chapter in the Negro's fight for equal rights closes with the death of the most effective leader that cause has seen.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 24, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

It was given to Walter White to enter and experience much of the promised land to which he led his people. As a boy in Atlanta, Ga., he knew at firsthand the horror of race rioting and the ugliness of a lynch mob. He lived through racial discrimination in housing and schooling and recreation. But before his death the pattern of race relations in the United States had undergone a tremendous transformation. Violence against the Negro had virtually disappeared from the South. And segregation in public facilities had been declared by the courts of the land to be in contravention of the Constitution.

As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Walter White played a dynamic part in effecting this change. And as a man, Nordic in appearance and predominantly of Caucasian ancestry, who chose freely to identify himself as a Negro, he played a dramatic part in helping his fellow Americans to understand the folly of race prejudice. He gave his life to a heroic cause now well on its way to triumph.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

Some leaders are made by their times, and Walter White was one of the number. In a different era than our own "age of confusion" he might have chosen different work. Conditions being what he knew them to be, he rose to their challenge and, heading the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, waged a campaign of reform and correction which already is historic. His cause was good, and he did not spoil it by unworthy methods. Americans of all groups recognized him as a spokesman for millions. He lived to see many of his objectives written into the law of the land. Even more important, perhaps, he saw them accepted into the standard pattern of American thought and American behavior. Thus, he served the entire national community and, beyond that, the high ideals of democratic civilization throughout the world.

---

[From the New York Amsterdam News of March 26, 1955]

WALTER WHITE

When Walter White died at his home last Monday night the entire world lost a dedicated champion to the cause of freedom. As the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Mr. White had spent 37 years of his life fighting lynchings and Jim Crow and all of the other more subtle forms of racial oppression. But his interest in mankind did not stop with the race question in America.

Mr. White was a genuine humanitarian ready to do battle for the victims of tyranny wherever he found them. He knew the evils of colonialism from his firsthand contacts with that system and he wrote and spoke out against those evils.

He recognized the stifling dangers of communism to the aims and dreams of free men and women and he pointed out those dangers in his speeches and in his newspaper columns and during his radio broadcasts.

Negroes of America have lost a fearless leader in the long and uphill struggle for full citizenship rights and privileges in the passing of Mr. White, and mankind has lost a true and tested advocate of freedom and liberty.

All of us shall miss him and his courageous leadership and counsel in the unsettled days that are ahead.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1955]

WALTER WHITE'S MANY WORKS—A TRIBUTE TO A DEVOTED AND TIRELESS MAN WHO WORKED MIRACLES IN THE DIFFICULT FIELD OF RACE RELATIONS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Twoscore and nine years ago a fearful thing happened in the city of Atlanta, Ga.—a race riot.

Out of that tragedy came inspiration for a career that has meant so much for the Negro race—and for the white race, too.

A boy of 13 stood guard at the window of his home with his father. Each had a pistol. They were ready to defend their home and their family—a mother and five girls. But the oncoming white mob was diverted when a volley burst from the Negro home next door.

As a result of that experience, the boy, Walter White, decided that, though white of skin, blond of hair, and blue of eyes—he was only one-sixty-fourth Negro—he would cast his lot with the Negro race and devote his life to them to do what he could to stop such horrors as race riots and lynchings and to abolish discriminations of all kinds. He could have passed for white.

Now he is dead, at 61, in New York. The newspapers are recalling how much he has done for his race in the years between with his work for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. For the change—for better relations between the races, for an end to lynching and riots, and for the crumbling walls of segregation—we all owe so much to Walter White.

His life and what he did with it has special meaning for another who was a boy also in Atlanta in 1906 at the time of the race riots, a few years younger than the boy, Walter White. For way back across the years there is a point where somehow the two lives meet—though neither knew the other then—because of the ordeal through which Atlanta went that left its mark upon the young minds of each—and, if you please, upon their souls.

This reporter cannot tell now whether it is remembered experience of the time or something he was told then and afterward that has become the same as memory. It is all like a long-forgotten dream, a dark atmosphere of night and whisperings about the house, and men patroling the streets with rifles and shotguns.

Nothing happened in our neighborhood.

After Walter White had graduated from Atlanta University, he became active with the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and,

in 1918, went to New York as assistant secretary of the association. He had attracted the notice of James Weldon Johnson, who was then secretary of NAACP.

The other young man became a newspaper reporter after college and got another rude awakening when he worked in a small southern city where an atrocious lynching occurred. That left another mark.

Before this time and for many years after, Walter White was on the frontline for his race. He visited the scenes of lynchings to gather the facts for his association as the basis for the campaign he directed through the years to stamp out this crime. Personally, he investigated 41 lynchings and 8 race riots and from one adventure he barely escaped with his life.

All through the years he was working also for removing discriminations of all sorts against his race. It was many years ago, in 1929, that he became secretary of NAACP when Mr. Johnson retired, so that he long had been a familiar figure here in Washington lobbying for antilynching legislation, for a fair employment practice law, and for an end to segregation.

One devoted and tireless human being can work miracles, if he keeps forever at his cause, as did Walter White. So in time the various waves that he stirred up here and there all over the country finally washed up last year into the great white building here where sits the Supreme Court of the United States.

Its decision banning segregation in public schools was a memorial to Walter White.

It was, now that he has gone on, a sort of final chapter in the story that had begun twoscore and nine years ago back in Atlanta, Ga.

One who was there then, too, and who came later to know Walter White and to admire his courage and his patience and his understanding, wishes herewith to say:

"Farewell and thank you."

A message from President Eisenhower to Mrs. Walter White declared:

In the death of your husband, Walter White, there has passed from the contemporary scene a vigorous champion of justice and equality for all our citizens. His devoted service to his race over a period of 40 years was tireless and effective. Permit me to express to you my personal sympathies in your loss.

A telegram from former President Harry S. Truman said:

I am deeply sorry to hear of the untimely death of Walter White. Please express my sincere sympathy to his family.

President Magloire, of Haiti, declared in a cabled message:

The people of Haiti mourn the passing of this great friend of our country.

In a statement on the sudden death of Mr. White, Arthur B. Spingarn, president of the NAACP, noted that Mr. White's "daring and courage in exposing lynchings in his early years with the association contributed greatly to the disappearance of that frightful crime and national disgrace. Guided in its course by his leadership, the NAACP won for Negroes of the Nation the recognition which established for all time their birthright and dignity as American citizens."

Gov. Averell Harriman declared in a telegram that—

Mr. White rendered invaluable service to our country at home and abroad. His life has been an inspiration to all of us.

Said a message from Mayor Robert Wagner to Mrs. Walter White—

In behalf of the citizens of New York, I extend to you and the family of Walter White our deepest sympathy. Our Nation, State and community have lost one of our greatest leaders whose entire life was dedicated to securing equality for all mankind. His whole life epitomized his belief in God's precept, "love thy neighbor."

Hulan E. Jack, president of the Borough of Manhattan, New York City, told Mrs. White in a telegram that—

Your late husband left behind an invaluable and proud record of achievement which brought the hearts and minds of people closer together in the struggle for recognition that all of us are equal in the sight of God. The Nation has lost a great leader and his passing will always remain as a monumental heritage for all people to honor and revere.

A message from James P. Mitchell, United States Secretary of Labor, to Mrs. White said:

Mr. White made a great contribution toward the promotion of brotherhood and the elimination of discrimination in our country. You may be proud of his contribution to the strengthening of our democracy.

Dr. Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations, declared in a telegram:

I have never known a man more dedicated to service of his fellowmen, more inspired by and more ceaselessly devoted to a cause. The American Negro, the American society as a whole, and American democracy, will be forever indebted to him, a stalwart champion of democracy, of human rights and dignity, an American in the proudest and richest tradition of our country, a patriot in the finest sense, a man of wisdom and unflinching courage, a warm and human personality. Walter White was above all a being of greatest goodwill. His name will be writ large on the list of those who have contributed signally to the progress of our Nation.

Heman M. Sweatt, who, as the result of NAACP legal action, was the first Negro admitted to the University of Texas law school, in 1950, said in a message:

I speak for the hundreds of Negro students in the integrated colleges throughout the South whose lives have been enriched because of Walter White's love for us. There is no death for one whose life repelled the winds of fear and whose spirit remains to chant the commands for a people marching determinedly onward into a new sun of freedom.

Among the hundreds of other tributes paid to Mr. White are these:

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN:

He will be sorely missed in the battles that lie ahead and the whole liberal cause has suffered an irretrievable loss in his death.

Lester B. Granger, executive secretary, National Urban League:

Mr. White's contribution toward guaranteeing and buttressing the American Negroes' citizenship status has been of incalculable proportion.

Langston Hughes, author:

America has lost a great man.

Judge and Mrs. Irvin Mollison:

The country has lost a great public servant. For a quarter of a century he was in the forefront of the struggle for equality for all Americans.

J. J. Singh, president, India League of America:

So long as there is discrimination and inequality among men in any part of the world the name of Walter White will be remembered with admiration and reverence.

Robert R. Nathan, chairman, Americans for Democratic Action:

By his courage, wisdom, and tenacity in fighting for the rights, not only of American Negroes, but of all oppressed peoples, he became an international symbol of all that is best in American democracy.

James L. Watson, New York State senator:

The loss of Walter White to the world community will be felt for many years to come.

Adolph Held and Charles S. Zimmerman, Jewish Labor Committee:

The oppressed and underprivileged the world over will miss him as spokesman for racial justice and freedom. America lost in him one of its greatest sons and democracy one of its stanchest defenders.

George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor:

On behalf of officers and membership of American Federation of Labor may I extend our sympathy on the loss of your distinguished officer Walter White who devoted his life and efforts to his work. The fruits of his labor will be an everlasting tribute to his memory.

Walter P. Reuther, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

No one, we suppose, will ever know how many Americans of all races, colors, and creeds were inspired by Walter White to fight for equal justice, equal rights, and equal opportunity, but that number must be legion. We regret that Walter White did not live to see his dearest dream, the end of segregation in our public schools, completely realized. In his name and in his spirit we of the CIO pledge ourselves anew to an unremitting fight for the abolition of segregation and discrimination in our land. That would be the best monument a grateful America could erect to a great American. We can and should do no less.

Harold J. Gibbons, president, St. Louis, Mo., Joint Council of Teamsters, AFL:

It is perhaps symbolic that his death came at the time when many sections of America were at last experimenting with new, vigorous methods of democratic living and learning as a result of the work of Walter White and his associates. With his death, he now belongs to the eternal struggle of man to understand himself and his fellowmen.

Jacob S. Potofsky, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO:

His personal character, his intrepid courage, his flaming eloquence, his immolation in a great cause won the support of Presidents. Not only the colored people of America but all who bear the proud title of American regarded Walter White as a truly great American, in our best tradition.

A. Philip Randolph, president, and Ashley L. Totten, secretary-treasurer, International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL:

Walter White will long be remembered for his brilliant leadership, oneness with mankind, and humanitarian spirit. We share with you the loss of one of the noblest men this world has ever known.

Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, founder and president emeritus of the National Council of Negro Women—(to Mrs. White:

No words can express what I feel in the passing of our illustrious champion, your

devoted husband, my beloved friend. He lived to see the fruition of his unsurpassed courage and faith.

William J. Trent, Jr., executive director, United Negro College Fund:

The Nation and the Negro have suffered an immeasurable loss.

Lewis O. Swingler, editor, Memphis (Tenn.) Tri-State Defender:

Walter White's fight for Negro rights gained importance of worldwide proportions. * * * His was a passion that democracy must speak for all Americans regardless of race or creed.

Mrs. Sidney Hillman:

He did more than any man to help break the chains of oppression, discrimination, and segregation which bound colored Americans with whom he voluntarily threw in his lot.

Mrs. William Thomas Mason, president, National Council of Negro Women:

Walter White will be a symbol to men and women everywhere. His manifold achievements will be a beacon light for all who come after.

David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, CIO:

His life truly mirrors the best in men who devote great abilities and unswerving energy to their fellowmen. * * * The things he has accomplished in a rich lifetime will help all men in the future to enjoy a fuller life.

Dr. Israel Goldstein, president, American Jewish Congress:

He contributed vitally to the extension of equality and democracy in America and his memory will long be cherished by all persons who hold freedom dear.

Dr. J. Oscar Lee, director, department of racial and cultural relations, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America:

We thank God for the courageous and devoted service which characterized Walter White's leadership.

Frederick E. Hasler, Haitian American Association:

His Christlike understanding and sympathy for all mankind set an example for all to follow.

Officers, executive board, and members, Retail Union of New Jersey, CIO:

The world was richer with Walter White in it and immeasurably poorer now that he is gone. We shall never forget or deviate from the humanitarian principles that he fought for so valiantly.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

The magnificent gains of recent years will stand as a monument to his memory. Walter White's passing is to me an occasion for rededication to the principles of democracy for which he lived.

Among the hundreds of other organizations and persons from whom messages of condolence and tribute were received were Representative William L. Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois; Judge and Mrs. J. Waties Waring; Judge and Mrs. Francis E. Rivers; Frederick D. Patterson, director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund; Miss Nancy Woltridge, president, American Council on Human Rights; Nathaniel M. Minkoff, president, League for Industrial Democracy; Judge Ira W. Jayne; L. H. Foster, president, Tuskegee (Ala.) Institute; City Teachers Association, Galveston, Tex.; Judge William H. Hastie; Lena Horne, singer.

Also Mrs. Helen Reid, publisher, New York Herald Tribune; Elmo Roper, public opinion analyst; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations; David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL; John Gunther, author; Chester Bowles, former United States Ambassador to India; E. E. Moore of United States Steel Corp.; the New York office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Senator Stuart Symington; Leslie Huvos, sculptor; the National Congress of American Indians; David Sarnoff of the National Broadcasting Co.; Mr. and Mrs. Bartley Crum; Stanley Issacs, New York city councilman.

Also Marcel Fombrun, secretary of state, Haiti; Michael J. Quill, president, Transport Workers Union, CIO; Rev. Maurice A. Dawkins; Emil Rieve, general president, Textile Workers Union, CIO; New York State Committee on Discrimination in Housing; J. H. Wheeler, president, Mechanics and Farmers Bank, Durham, N. C.; Human Relatitons Committee, Battle Creek, Mich.; Lloyd Garrison; Bishop and Mrs. W. A. Fountain; T. G. Nutter; National Community Relations Advisory Council; American Friends Service Committee; the AME Ministers Alliance, Dallas, Tex.; Catholic Interracial Council; George S. Mitchell, director, Southern Regional Council.

Also Dr. C. B. Powell, president, New York Amsterdam News; United Furniture Workers of America, CIO; Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union District 65, CIO; Frank R. Crosswaith, Negro Labor Committee; Miss Nannie Burroughs; Associated Publishers, Inc.; Chicago Negro Chamber of Commerce; Saunders Redding; Atlanta University School of Social Work; Baptist Ministers Union, Waco, Tex.; Mrs. M. E. Tilly; Mr. and Mrs. Walter Wanger; Herbert Bayard Swope; Spyros P. Skouras; Bishop William J. Walls; Dr. and Mrs. O. Clay Maxwell; Rev. James H. Robinson; Clarence L. Holte; Dr. and Mrs. Ira De A. Reid; Dr. and Mrs. Ernest Alexander; Price Mars of Haiti; Paul R. Green, president, Civic Unity Committee of Seattle; and Charles Mahoney, president, Great Lakes Mutual Life Insurance Co.; the Baptist Ministers Conference of Greater New York and Vicinity; the Methodist Alliance of Charlotte, N. C.; Mr. and Mrs. George Logan; Common Council for American Unity and Commissioner Caroline K. Simon of New York State Commission Against Discrimination.

### WALTER WHITE'S FUNERAL ATTENDED BY GOVERNOR AND OTHER NOTABLES

The "true story of Walter White's services is found written in the hearts of those whom he helped to liberate from the bondage of second-class citizenship," Dr. Channing H. Tobias, chairman of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said at the funeral of the NAACP leader, who at the age of 61 died of a heart attack in his home on March 21.

Officiating at the service held at St. Martin's Protestant Episcopal Church in Harlem was the rector, Dr. John Johnson. The Right Reverend Horace W. B. Donegan, Bishop of New York, read the prayer and blessing, with other members of the clergy assisting. Loudspeakers carried the service to an overflow crowd estimated at 5,000 by the police.

Led by Arthur B. Spingarn, veteran NAACP president, officers, board, and staff members served as honorary pallbearers. Distinguished guests who came to pay a last tribute to Mr. White included Gov. Averill Harriman, of New York, New York State Attorney General Jacob Javits, well-known attorneys like Austin T. Walden, of Atlanta, W. Robert Ming, of Chicago, James Nabrit, of Washington, D. C., and John Bolt Culbertson, of Greenville, S. C.; labor leaders like James B. Carey, George L-P Weaver, and Edward Welch, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Jacob Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, CIO; William Oliver, United Automobile Workers, CIO; Boyd Wilson and James Jones, United Steelworkers, CIO; and Walter Kirschenbaum, Jewish Labor Committee; United States Government officials, Frank S. Horne and Campbell Johnson; Paul Robeson, singer; John Gunther and Marc Connelly, authors; Mrs. Helen Reid and her son, Whitelaw, publishers of the New York Herald Tribune; Mrs. Anne Hedgeman, assistant to the mayor of New York; Mrs. Ralph Bunche, Miss Stella Karn, Mrs. Louis T. Wright and her daughters, Drs. Barbara and Jane Wright; Richard deRochemont, film producer; representatives of various organizations, and many other individuals.

In mourning were Mr. White's widow, Mrs. Poppy Cannon White; his daughter and son by a previous marriage, Jane and Walter Carl; his three sisters, Mrs. Eugene Martin and Miss Madeline White of Atlanta, and Mrs. Alice Glenn of Cleveland. With Mrs. White were her three children by previous marriage, Cynthia, Alfred, and Claudia, and her sister, Ann Fogarty, the designer, who was accompanied by her husband, Tom. Also Mr. Eugene Martin, the Martins' daughter, Rose, Mrs. Glenn's daughter, Dorothy; and Mr. White's cousins, Mrs. Eva Tobias and Mrs. Estelle Gassett.

### RECALLS PRESIDENTIAL MEETINGS

In his brief eulogy, Dr. Tobias recalled instances in which Mr. White had served as spokesman for delegations in conferences with Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. These conferences, he said, had been fruitful in that they opened the way to expanded job opportunities for Negroes, to the elimination of segregation in the armed services, and to the curtailment of racial discrimination in Washington. They also served to help "move the conscience of America into aggressive action against the double standard of citizenship based on race."

These achievements in "top level conferences" are important, Dr. Tobias asserted, "because they illustrate the method of the NAACP in dealing with controversial issues growing out of race discrimination. It is a method that blinks no facts and engages in no double talk. But it is also a method that does not make use of rabble-rousing as a technique. It is a method that looks forward to the completion of Lincoln's

work of emancipation and the realization of his dream of freedom for all in the true American way."

HELPED THE DISADVANTAGED

People all over the world whose lives have been enriched by Mr. White's work are "looking this way and wanting to be a part of this tribute," the NAACP spokesman said. Among these he cited sharecroppers of the Deep South who are no longer voteless; dining car waiters and Pullman porters who are now privileged to serve their own people as they do other people without discrimination; public school teachers whose salaries are no longer determined by the color of their skin; servicemen in every department of our defense who have been liberated from Jim Crowism; workers of all kinds who now enjoy union protection; children who have been lifted to a plane of self-respect by the Supreme Court decision in the school cases; and thousands of white people who have been liberated from the blighting evil of race prejudice.

And beyond our shores, he said, the leaders of millions of the darker peoples of the world like Nehru of India, Matthews of South Africa, Nkrumah of the Gold Coast, Azikiwe of Nigeria, Tubman of Liberia, Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, Manley of Jamaica; Magloire of Haiti and others now join us in this tribute.

Walter White's admonition, Dr. Tobias concluded, would be "board members, staff, constituency and friends of the NAACP close ranks and go courageously ahead to the accomplishment of the unfinished task with assurance of ever growing support from those who cherish the ideals for which we stand."

Following the funeral service, the body was removed to Ferncliff Crematorium for cremation.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Officers and board members present in addition to Dr. Channing H. Tobias and Arthur B. Spingarn included Mrs. Lillian A. Alexander, Dr. Algernon D. Black, Walter Carrington, Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Dr. Nathan K. Christopher, Norman Cousins, Hon. Hubert T. Delany, Mrs. Grace B. Fenderson, Dr. George D. Flemmings, Dr. Buell G. Gallagher, Lewis S. Gannett, Dr. Harry J. Greene, Hon. William H. Hastie, Oscar Hammerstein II, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Mrs. Lillie M. Jackson, Mrs. Daisy E. Lampkin, Alfred Baker Lewis, Z. Alexander Looby, Eugene M. Martin, Dr. James J. McClendon, Miss L. Pearl Mitchell, Mrs. J. E. Spingarn, Dr. James M. Tinsley, Mrs. Jessie M. Vann, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Andrew D. Weinberger, Samuel A. Williams, and Dr. Ulysses S. Wiggins.

STATE LEGISLATURES EXPRESS SYMPATHY ON DEATH OF WHITE

The Missouri House of Representatives and the New York State Senate and State Assembly passed resolutions this week expressing sympathy over the death of Walter White, NAACP executive secretary.

The Missouri resolution cited Mr. White for his courage and leadership in gaining the enactment of legislation which has helped greatly to stop lynching and other such acts of violence and declared that his death is a great loss of all of the people of this United States.

The New York statement noted Mr. White's many contributions to his country and to the United Nations.

Copies of both resolutions were sent to NAACP headquarters.

ALAN PATON, OTHER NOTABLES, SORROW AT WHITE'S DEATH

Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel for the NAACP, telegraphed a message of sympathy to Mrs. Walter White on the death of Mr. White, from Acapulco, Mexico, where he is vacationing.

The renowned civil-rights attorney termed Mr. White's death a "real shock and terrific loss." Mr. Marshall said he would be unable to attend the funeral today because plane reservations were not available.

A cabled message from Alan Paton, South African novelist and humanitarian, expressed sorrow on the loss of Mr. White.

The Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Governor of Minnesota, conveyed "deepest sympathy" on behalf of the residents of Minnesota, and declared that "the passing of Walter White constitutes a great loss to the furtherance of the principles of democratic equality."

Two university presidents sent messages of condolence on the death of Mr. White. They were Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University in Washington, D. C., and Dr. Charles S. Johnson, president of Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn.

Beginning in the dark period of race relations in the United States, [Walter White] risked personal safety, the calumny of demagogs, and the misguided censure of friends to stir the Nation of acceptance of its own avowed principles and light fires of hope for millions of hopeless here and over the world—

Declared Dr. Charles S. Johnson, in a telegram.

We salute a life that has contributed to and been a part of the most important history of this century.

Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson termed Mr. White "a pure-hearted leader who gave a whole life of tireless and courageous devotion to the cause of delivering the Negro people from lynching, persecution, segregation, and discrimination, and for the regaining and firm establishment of their rights as freemen under the Constitution."

Among hundreds of other persons and organizations who sent messages of condolence on the death of Mr. White were Adolf A. Berle, Jr., State chairman, and Ben Davidson, executive director, of the Liberal Party of New York; Judge Thomas L. Griffith, Jr., of Los Angeles; C. A. Scott, editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) Daily World; the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance of Columbia, S. C.; John Hope II, a member of the faculty of Fisk University; Walter T. Deininger, a planter and philanthropist, of San Salvador; and Judge Charles W. White, of Cleveland, Ohio.

ADDITIONAL MESSAGES OF CONDOLENCE

Norman W. Manley, chief minister, Jamaica, British West Indies:

It was very sad to read the news this morning that Walter White was dead.

I had seen him in New York when I was there in January and although he still looked frail his spirit was so high that I thought and hoped that he had every chance for a stable recovery.

His death has robbed the world of one of the most powerful voices that it had on all questions of human justice and race relations. I always felt it a privilege to have known and in some small way on occasion to have worked alongside him.

Please convey to your executives my sympathy to them in their loss and my deep respect and admiration for the name of this great leader whose life spanned the ceaseless effort to improve the status of the Negro in America which is bearing such great fruit not only in America itself but all over the world.

Henry Edward Schultz, national chairman, Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith:

May I, on behalf of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, extend to you and the other leaders of the NAACP our deepest sympathies on the tragic passing of your devoted leader, Walter White. His direction of the NAACP truly helped change the pattern of American life so that preachments more closely approached practices. These changes will endure as a permanent contribution of great import.

Joseph R. Garry, president, Helen L. Peterson, executive director, National Congress of American Indians:

We well know how difficult it is to lose a great and distinguished leader. We share in this sense of loss because Walter White was an inspiration to us, too.

Our deepest sympathies.

Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director, American Association for the United Nations:

Almost 10 years ago I was with Walter White at San Francisco where we served as consultants to the United States Delegation to the United Nations Conference. He made a lasting contribution to those provisions of the United Nations Charter dealing with human rights and fundamental freedoms. We were proud that Walter White was a friend of the American Association for the United Nations.

C. L. Townes, Sr., president, National Insurance Association:

I have just read in the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch front page Associated Press story of the passing of your executive secretary, Mr. Walter White, and hasten this letter to let you know the National Insurance Association, Inc., shares with you in this great loss.

Our association and its member companies through the years have supported the program of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in its crusade to uphold the human dignity and civil rights of all the citizens of this great country as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

We believe the name, Walter White, will stand out as a symbol of justice and fair play for generations to come.

Mrs. Roy F. Layton, president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America:

I learned with sorrow of the death of Walter White who has done so much to build better understanding among people of all races in this country. Please extend my deepest sympathy to his family and to the organization for which he did so much.

Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association:

The Council of Actors' Equity Association * * * learned with sorrow of the death of

Walter White. * * * As a result, the Council adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas Walter White passed away on March 21, 1955, and

"Whereas Walter White has been associated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for over 40 years; and

"Whereas Walter White was the executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People from 1929 until the day of his death; and

"Whereas during his entire association with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People he has been in the forefront of those who believed in the principles of equality and justice for all men; and

"Whereas his achievements will always remain as an everlasting tribute to him: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Council of Actors' Equity Association recognizes that in the death of Walter White, the Nation and humanity have suffered a great and grievous loss; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the council is convinced that its feelings are shared by the entire membership of Actors' Equity Association; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to the president, Arthur Spingarn, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People."

Grace E. Marr, assistant executive secretary, American Nurses' Association:

Many members of our staff join me in this note expressing our regret and sense of loss as a result of the death of Mr. Walter White. We have great respect for the work which the NAACP has done under his leadership.

We would like to convey to you, to all of the members of the NAACP staff and to your board of directors both our sorrow on this occasion and our best wishes for the continued success of your efforts toward the objectives which the NAACP has set and in which many who are not active in NAACP's program concur.

Carroll V. Newsome, associate commissioner, the University of the State of New York, the State education department:

Walter White's sudden and untimely death is a great blow not only to your organization but also to our country and to our State. We will have with us for many a year a shining example, but in these times we could also use his willing hand.

His dynamic leadership was not only evidenced in the economic, political, and legal fields, but it was also, as you know, evidenced in education, broadly conceived. We all are the better for having had his vision and work. May we live up to his high ideals in the years ahead.

Lewis M. Hoskins, executive secretary, American Friends Service Committee:

We, too, in considerable degree share the great sense of loss which you at the NAACP must feel in the passing of Walter White. Almost more than any other contemporary American he has become the symbol of justice for minority groups. In his own lifetime and through his own efforts, he has carried forward and sparked the campaigns for human rights and civil liberties in the United States. Those of us who have known him a bit personally will feel keenly the loss. All America will mourn him, but I am sure will feel the concern he would want us to have.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom:

The national executive committee of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting in Washington, D. C., March 23 and 24, 1955, voted to express to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People its deepest sympathy in the loss of your eminent executive secretary, Dr. Walter White, whose great services to the cause for which you stand are so widely recognized in the United States.

Charles N. Ford, president, United Mutual Life Insurance Co.:

On behalf of the directors, officers, agents, and office employees of the United Mutual Life Insurance Co., I join with the many millions in this Nation and throughout the world who mourn the loss of the great American leader and patriot, Walter White, in paying humble tribute to him and the great institution to which he gave leadership.

We are happy that so many of the rights and freedoms which he labored to win for our people were attained while he was still among us to witness their fulfillment.

E. Roland Harriman, chairman, the American National Red Cross:

I was very sorry to learn of the death of Mr. White. I am sure that his great devotion to his country as well as to his fellow man will serve as an inspiration to all America.

Personally, and on behalf of the entire Red Cross, I hasten to convey to you and your fellow members our profound sympathy.

Clarence E. Pickett, president, Maurice B. Fagan, executive director, Philadelphia Fellowship Commission:

The Philadelphia Fellowship Commission together with all organizations devoted to equal treatment and opportunities for members of all racial, religious, and nationality groups mourned the death of Walter White for so many years the pioneer, mentor, and world leader of such work. The lives of countless thousands have been brightened and democracy has been immeasurably strengthened by the deathless work of Walter White and the NAACP, which he served so ably and devotedly.

Everett R. Clinchy, president, National Conference of Christians and Jews:

The death of Walter White is a deep loss to all men of good will and to all organizations working for the cause of brotherhood. In behalf of the national conference and myself personally, please extend heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. White and other members of Mr. White's family.

Willard S. Townsend, president, United Transport Service Employees, CIO:

With a sense of deep sorrow, we learned of the passing of Walter White. Certainly we have lost one of the most brilliant fighters for human rights this era has produced. The United Transport Service Employees, CIO, join with all freedom-loving people in mourning his loss.

Ellsworth Bunker, president, American National Red Cross:

It is with deepest regret that I learn of the passing of Walter White.

I wish to express to you and to all of his associates in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People warm and heartfelt sympathy.

Frank R. Crosswaith, Negro Labor Committee:

In behalf of the Negro Labor Committee, with which is affiliated trade unions with a membership of over a million workers of all races, crafts, and creeds, I offer our condolence over the passing of your great and illustrious husband, Walter White. In this moment of painful tragedy, we have but one consoling thought in the knowledge that Walter White will be recorded by historians as among those great Americans whose contribution to our strength, to our culture, and to our enlightened concept of human values will be more clearly recognized and appreciated as we continue to travel on along the pathway of human progress, and that neither the wrinkles of time nor the music of years can remove from the memory of unborn generations the name of Walter White. As chairman of the Negro Labor Committee and as one who had the honor of being counted among Walter White's friends, I send to you and your family these words of condolence and sympathy over our common loss.

Marcel Fombrun, Secretary of State, Republic of Haiti:

We wish to express our deepest sympathy in the unexpected passing of this great friend of Haiti, Walter White.

Mrs. William Thomas Mason, president, National Council of Negro Women:

The National Council of Negro Women is shocked and grieved at the passing of one of the world's great leaders, a man whose life was devoted with passionate sincerity to the cause of human freedom and equality. He lived to see in the Supreme Court decision one of the greatest victories in his lifelong struggle. Walter White will be a symbol to men and women everywhere. His manifold achievements will be a beacon light for all who come after.

Dr. Israel Goldstein, president, American Jewish Congress:

The officers and members of the American Jewish Congress extend to you their deepest sympathy on the passing of your dear husband and our cherished colleague in the cause of human rights. He contributed vitally to the extension of equality and democracy in America, and his memory will long be cherished by all persons who hold freedom dear.

David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, CIO:

We of the United Steelworkers of America received with profound grief the news of the passing of a true friend, Walter White. Because he worked so devotedly and closely with us in our common goal of justice and equality for all people we will feel deeply his loss in the days ahead. Walter White provided an inspiration to us. He was a man admired by people in all walks of life. His crusading spirit never faltered as he kept his eyes focused on a goal with which we sincerely sympathized. The steelworkers of the Nation knew Walter White personally because he mingled with us, addressed our conventions, and supported our people as they, too, fought for justice. His life truly mirrors the best in men who devote great abilities and unswerving energy to their fellowmen. And even though he has passed on, the things he has accomplished in a rich lifetime will help all men in the future to enjoy a fuller life.

H. K. Weed, the Alling & Cory Co.:

The announcement over the air and in the papers of the death of your esteemed secretary, Walter White, comes as a great shock to all who knew him, either personally or through his achievements.

He was a great man, and his passing in the prime of life leaves a void among his business friends and others who knew him only by reputation.

Our sincere sympathy is extended to those who have had the good fortune of being so closely associated with him.

Hon. W. Averell Harriman, Governor, State of New York:

Walter White rendered invaluable service to our country at home and abroad. His

life has been an inspiration to all of us. He will be forever in our hearts and memories. I send you and your associates in the NAACP my deep sympathy in this great loss which has so suddenly come upon us.

Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor, city of New York:

In behalf of the citizens of New York City I extend to you and the family of Walter White our deepest sympathy. Our Nation, State, and community have lost one of our greatest leaders whose entire life was dedicated to securing equality for all mankind. As champion of the Negro, his talents and efforts accomplished notable success in his efforts to outlaw lynching, poll taxes, and segregation. The Democratic Party of our country will long be grateful for his inspired assistance in helping to establish the Fair Employment Practices Act during World War II, and his continuing fight with them for civil rights. As executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People he has rendered invaluable service to our entire community. He was always ready with wise counsel and advice to ease the tensions which were inevitable in our great metropolis where millions of people of every race, color, and creed live side by side in truly democratic fashion. We who were privileged to know Walter White, as I was, from the very beginning of my public career will long mourn his loss, and always remember gratefully his integrity and kindliness. His whole life epitomized his belief in God's precept, "Love Thy Neighbor." If there is anything I can do for you and yours at this most sorrowful time, you have only to let me know.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr., State chairman, Ben Davidson, executive director, Liberal Party of New York:

Liberal Party joins with countless others in mourning the passing of a great American, Walter White. He was one of the finest and most valiant fighters for democracy, justice, decency, equality, humanity, and brotherhood of man. He has left behind a great monument of values, achievements, great aspirations, and your splendid organization. His life work represents the road to victory for democracy and freedom in the world of today.

Anson Phelps Stokes:

I want to send you, and all in the office of the NAACP, my very deep sympathy in the death of Walter White. He was unquestionably a patriotic American, and a very able and courageous leader in the cause of minority rights and interracial justice under our Constitution.

Dr. Hilton L. James, president, the Baptist Ministers Conference of Greater New York and Vicinity:

The late Walter White dedicated his life to the high and noble cause of making all of the peoples of our land first-class citizens. He was fearless and faithful in the fight against all forms of racial discrimination. He will go down in history as a truly grand American who was a world citizen. The NAACP has lost its greatest champion. We therefore employ this method to convey to his family and the organization for which he gave himself unselfishly our heartfelt sympathy. You have our prayers for divine guidance and strength in this your sad hour.

Spyros P. Skouras:

Please allow me to extend to you my sincerest condolences on the loss of your dear husband who has so long made such a distinguished contribution to American life. It was a great shock to me because Walter White was my friend of many years standing. I pray that in the record of his great achievements for his fellowmen there will be some solace for you in your grief. If there is anything I can do please command me.

Bishop William J. Walls:

Shocking sadness bewilders me as it does millions of others. Your beloved drops out when he is most needed. He has followers many who will close ranks and move forward as he will still lead with the leaders from beyond the veil. Accept deepest sympathies.

Herbert Bayard Swope:

I send you my deep sympathy on Walter's death. We have known each other for many years and I had high regard for him as a friend and as a dedicated worker in the field that means so much to him. The memories of his courage will be a solace to you in your grief. My warm regards.

Dr. Frederick D. Patterson, director, Phelps-Stokes fund:

The trustees and staff of the Phelps-Stokes fund express to you and all members of the family heartfelt sympathy over the passing of your distinguished husband, Walter White. May the knowledge of his rich contribution to better human relations sustain you in your bereavement.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON:

Terribly distressed to hear sad news. Deepest sympathy to you in your loss.

Chester Bowles:

Shocked and saddened by Walter's death. My deepest sympathy for you in your loss. He was a very great man.

Caroline K. Simon, commissioner, New York State Commission Against Discrimination:

To you and the officers and members of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I wish to express my sympathy on the death of Walter White.

Mr. and Mrs. John Gunther:

We are overwhelmed with grief at Walter's death. Our profound and heartfelt condolences to you for this irrefutable loss, not merely to you but to the American Nation. It is hard to believe that Walter is gone from us and we will always remember with joy our last meeting only a few months ago, when he was dynamic, gay, and brilliantly alert as always. What a wonderfully useful life led. We mourn a true friend and a great American.

Reed Lewis, executive director, Common Council for American Unity:

The common council and its staff want to express their heartfelt sympathy to you and your associates in the NAACP on the death of Mr. White. It is a great loss to all of us.

Willard W. Allen, sovereign grand commander, United Supreme Council, Scottish Rites of Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction:

I was deeply shocked to learn this morning of the passing of one of America's great citizens, Walter White. He was indeed a militant leader in the fight for equal rights of all citizens and he was able to see some of the fruits of his long labor. While his passing is deeply mourned yet he will ever be remembered by reason of his splendid contribution to the betterment of mankind and the fact that he had trained others to follow him in carrying forth the type of leadership which he unselfishly gave. My sympathy goes out to you in your bereavement.

Patrick Murphy Malin, executive director, American Civil Liberties Union:

The American Civil Liberties Union extends its condolences to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on the great loss it has sustained by the death of Walter White. An indefatigable fighter for the rights of man, Walter White led a crusade for equality which will be recorded in the pages of American history. His ability as a speaker and writer enabled him to stir the conscience of the country in the many campaigns for civil rights waged by the NAACP. The growth and importance of the NAACP today as the leading organization in America combating discrimination and segregation is a memorial to his leadership. The American Civil Liberties Union and other groups who join in the effort to achieve full equality for all Americans shall miss him, but we will be encouraged in our task by the achievements of his life. Will you please express our condolences to his family.

Lloyd Garrison:

Profoundly shocked by the news of Walter White's untimely death. The country has lost a great citizen, a magnificent fighter for liberty and freedom and a man of brilliant talents dedicated to the service of democracy. We will mourn him as a friend who was always warm and gay and delightful to be with and his name will be remembered as an inspiration to others long after we are gone. I deeply regret that absence in Boston will prevent my attending the funeral. Please convey my sincerest sympathy to his associates in NAACP.

Catholic Interracial Council:

The officers and directors of the Catholic Interracial Council were grieved to learn of the untimely death of a great American, Walter White. Certainly his vision and courage have inspired leaders in all walks of life to recognize the importance and necessity of securing equal social justice for all. Walter White's great contribution to America will continue to serve to awaken a greater interest in the task of perfecting our democracy.

Michael J. Quill, international president, Transport Workers Union, CIO:

We join with you and your fellow officers and members in grieving the tremendous loss suffered by all fighters for human freedom in the death of Walter White. He was a happy warrior with whom we were all proud to be associated in the never-ending struggle to achieve that full measure of democracy desired by all Americans. He was a partisan in the finest sense of the word. Unyielding in his dedication to the cause of human freedom and equality Walter White will be remembered long after the goals he had set for himself, his coworkers and the people, have been achieved in our country, and his vision and courage were inspiring to all of us who are joined in the same crusade for equality. A living memorial to the memory of Walter White shall be our dedication to his principles. To the end that segregation in all its ugly forms is wiped out and true democracy is established in America.

---

## Death of Walter White Is Mourned by World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are dedicated to the fight for the liberal cause and those peoples throughout the world who battle for freedom and equality among men have

suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of Walter White. His life and efforts, which have been a potent influence in promoting the cause of democracy within America and in promulgating to other countries the ideals basic in our philosophy, should serve as an inspiration to his own contemporaries and to all succeeding generations to brighten the torch of freedom, for the sake of all men, and to keep it fired always to its full flame.

In all the works which Mr. White accomplished, among my principal regrets is that he did not live long enough to witness the fruition of all his dreams, one of which will be represented in the 100th anniversary, in 1963, of the Emancipation Proclamation, when it is hoped that the more dramatic struggles of his people will be resolved.

## A Code of Peace Between Egypt and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on March 23 the Ambassador of Israel to the United States, His Excellency, Abba Eban, made a presentation before the Security Council of the United Nations, proposing a code of peace between Egypt and Israel. On the succeeding day, I made on the floor of the Senate some comments upon this Israeli proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask also that a condensation of Ambassador Eban's presentation before the Security Council be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

I hope Ambassador Eban's proposal will be carefully studied by our own State Department, and will be widely read by the general public.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE ISRAEL PEACE PROPOSALS

I have read, with appreciation and approval, of the proposal by the Government of Israel, through Ambassador Abba Eban in the Security Council, that Egypt join with Israel in a peace code for the Middle East.

I consider this to be the first constructive proposal I have heard in many months to deal frontally with the tragic tensions which now exist between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

The American people desire, above all, to see the Middle Eastern tensions allayed. They desire to see constructive steps taken in the direction of peace, understanding, and cooperation between Israel and her neighbors. We are as concerned with the welfare of the people of Egypt as we are with that of the inhabitants of Israel. The welfare of both peoples can best be served—can only be served—by settlements and understandings which will facilitate common and cooperative efforts to resolve the political and economic problems of the Middle East.

If the Egyptian Government would agree to give sober and sympathetic consideration to the Israeli proposals and enter into negotiations concerning them—as was envisioned in the Rhodes Agreements of 1949—the free world will have reason to rejoice.

I am convinced that the people of both Israel and Egypt desire an end to the tragic incidents of recent months, and the threat to world peace which those incidents—all of them collectively—continue to pose.

The Government of Egypt can assume its rightful role of leadership among the Arab peoples, by giving concrete evidence that Egypt accepts the existence of Israel within her present boundaries and is prepared to move forward to a normalization of relations between Egypt and Israel. Such a step would help, in my judgment, to break the unhappy stalemate which now exists in that area. It would, of course, bring an end to the violent incidents—to the raids and killings—which now occur almost daily along the Egyptian-Israeli border.

Thirty killings occurring over a period of weeks are no less tragic than a similar number occurring in one bloody clash.

Even while the Security Council is weighing Egyptian charges against Israel, the press reports a new condemnation of Egypt by the mixed armistice commission, on the basis of a violation of the Israeli borders by Egypt.

I include at this point in my remarks the following press report of the incident I have just referred to:

"EGYPT-ISRAEL RELATIONS

"(Condensation of statement by Ambassador Abba Eben, permanent representative of Israel to the United Nations, before the Security Council, on May 23, 1955)

"The tensions on the frontier between Egypt and Israel are revealed with deep gravity in the reports presented to the Security Council by General Burns. The armed clash on February 28 illustrates the dangers arising from those tensions. On that date a series of long-standing antagonisms and immediate provocations exploded into a conflict with regrettably serious loss of life.

"Such clashes do not spring from the empty air. They arise from morbid conditions of international relations. In this case, they show a profound weakness in the current operation of the armistice system which Egypt and Israel established 6 years ago, on the solemn understanding that they would move forward on its basis toward permanent peace.

* * * * *

"The whole of Israel is a frontier area, with practically no hinterland; for nowhere in the country can a man live and work many miles from the shadow of hostile Arab guns. But this fact, and the consequences that flow from it, are especially marked near Gaza where a frontier created by recent war divides two closely settled regions.

*"Egyptian Belligerency*

"Against this complex geographical background, the Security Council should recall the political relationships between the two states whose armed forces clashed at Gaza on February 28. The unusual character of these relationships has been revealed to the Security Council in its previous debates on disputes between Egypt and Israel. At the root of these tensions lie a theory and practice of belligerency. Egypt considers and proclaims that there is 'a state of war.' In the name of that 'state of war,' Egypt asserts a right to perform hostile acts of her choice against Israel. On the other hand, Egypt claims immunity from any hostile response emanating from Israel. This is the doctrine of unilateral belligerency; and it has no parallel or precedent in the jurisprudence of nations.

* * * * *

"It would be strictly and scientifically accurate to describe the essence of the Egyptian position in two sentences: Egypt may behave toward Israel as though there is war. Israel must behave toward Egypt as though there is peace.

*"Tensions of Past 6 Months*

"Now, this doctrine of a state of war is not a mere juridical theory. It is carried out in practice by relentless hostility on land and sea; by military incursions; by organized murder, sabotage, and theft; by maritime blockade; and by open threats against Israel's territory, integrity, and political independence. * * * At no time since the signature of the armistice has the pressure of Egyptian hostility been exerted upon Israel with such provocative intensity as during the past 6 months.

"The source of this hostility, the center from which the violence is organized and directed, is the Egyptian military headquarters in Gaza.

"The Egyptian representative has spoken as if the Gaza clash erupted suddenly out of a serene and peaceful background, without origin or cause. The situation now before the Council cannot be remotely understood, still less fairly judged, unless this misrepresentation is corrected. For its correction we have recourse, not to the subjective claims of interested parties, but to the records of the Mixed Armistice Commission and the reports of the United Nations Chief of Staff.

"The reports submitted by General Burns to the Security Council on November 16, 1954, and March 17, 1955, tabulate the complaints investigated by the Mixed Armistice Commission during the two periods of review. The final columns of these tables specify 14 decisions of the Mixed Armistice Commission condemning Egypt—more than twice the number of decisions recorded against Israel during those periods. This fact is impressive enough in itself. It becomes all the more significant when it is observed that the few violations ascribed to Israel arose mostly from immediate response to Egyptian firing. For in the application of the armistice agreement, differentiation between firing in aggression, and firing in response to aggression is not always possible.

* * * * *

"As it is, however, in the cases examined and adjudicated between August 1, 1954, and March 7, 1955, the Mixed Armistice Commission, under United Nations chairmanship, has found Egypt guilty of violating the armistice on no less than 40 occasions, including the 14 recorded in the 2 reports before the Security Council which cover incidents occurring between September 1, 1954, and March 1, 1955.

"But even there statistics do not give an adequately vivid picture of the murderous harassment launched from Gaza against Israel in the period leading up to February 28. I therefore invite the Security Council to examine the more serious Egyptian violations organized from Gaza during the past 6 months; and to do so with a clear perception of the effects created by this torrent of assault on the lives of pioneering men and women striving to establish and maintain their lives in the regions east of the Gaza zone.

*"Mixed armistice commission condemns Egyptian aggression*

"The list which I have read is surely sufficient to dispose of any extraordinary version which would assert that the period leading up to the Gaza clash was one of comparative quiet. The Egyptian objective was to create an inferno of suspense and insecurity in the northern Negev; to blow up farm homes when built and water pipes when laid; in short, to prevent the peaceful settlement and habitation of the northern Negev area.

"The records show how the Mixed Armistice Commission began to perceive that it was faced not merely by specific incidents, but by a consistent policy of harassment.

The resolutions began to express a mounting concern at a general tendency on the part of Egypt to replace her armistice obligations by open and unrestrained hostility.

* * * * *

"The Security Council is aware of the importance attached to the water system in Israel, especially in the arid area of the Negev. A sense of deep shock and indignation runs through our farming community—and, indeed, through the country—when large volumes of water are wasted through deliberate and purposeful sabotage.

"How little the Egyptian Government was influenced by authoritative appeals against its policy can be deduced from the text which the Mixed Armistice Commission had to adopt on October 28 when an armed and well-trained group again, in the Commission's words:

" 'blew up (water lines) by heavy charge of high explosives * * * resulting in very serious damage to the pipeline, installation and water supply.'

* * * * *

"The military character of the Egyptian attacks was clearly attested in the resolution of the Mixed Armistice Commission adopted on January 24, 1955.

* * * * *

"On January 27, 1955, the Commission again developed its condemnation of Egypt into a generalized criticism:

" 'Notes with grave concern the serious situation prevailing along the Gaza strip resulting from these repeated attacks;

" 'Notes once again with extremely grave concern that despite the obligation imposed on Egypt by the general armistice agreement and number of MAC resolutions these penetrations and killings of Isareli citizens have not been terminated.'

"The Security Council would do well to consider the language in which the Mixed Armistice Commission interpreted the situation on the days immediately preceding the Gaza clash. On March 7, 1955, the Commission adopted and published its resolution on the incidents which took place in the 3d week of February. This is surely the authoritative answer to the question which arises in many minds as to the situation and atmosphere out of which the Gaza clash developed.

* * * * *

*"Deep penetrations into Israel*

"In summarizing Egyptian violations I referred to the assault near Rehovot, where an Israeli citizen was killed by an Egyptian armed group within the heart of Israel, 24 miles from the Egyptian frontier. This came 2 days after the penetration of an Egyptian intelligence unit—probably the same unit which penetrated into Rishon le Zion, 29 miles within Israel.

"It is difficult for me to find words with which to portray the degree of horror and alarm which this attack evoked. A unit of the Egyptian headquarters at Gaza had penetrated 29 miles into Israel and spent 4 days indulging in espionage and murder at Rishon le Zion and Rehovot. Never since the armistice was signed had there been a penetration of such depth by an armed group of one party into the territory of another. It revealed an audacious quality of dynamic, purposeful hostility and of utter contempt for Israel's territorial integrity. Not a single citizen of Israel could fail, on reading of this event, to feel the cold wind of his own vulnerability. If the Rehovot episode could be repeated then no life in Israel was safe from a far-ranging Egyptian assault. When we think of the solemnity with which the Mixed Armistice Commission had urged Egypt to desist from these acts, and the contempt with which those decisions had been encountered; when we reflect that Egypt was known by everybody in Israel after the Bat Galim affair to have at least an equal contempt for the Security Council whose resolutions Egypt has declared to be nonbinding upon herself, it is not surprising that our people became permeated by the strong resolve to resist further assaults launched under the directing hand of Egyptian headquarters operating a few miles across the frontier.

* * * * *

*"The Egyptian record summarized*

"It is seriously possible for anyone in full knowledge of these denunciations of Egypt by the Mixed Armistice Commission to assert that the Egyptian military headquarters on February 28 was the innocent victim of an attack which it had done nothing to provoke? If the Mixed Armistice Commission is held to be an authority on the Gaza incident itself, we cannot ignore the authority of its voice when it speaks to us time and time again of Egyptian aggression before the Gaza incident.

"And what the Mixed Armistice Commission tells us is tragically clear. It tells us that the period immediately preceding the Gaza outbreak was marked by 'repeated firing from permanent Egyptian military positions on Israel patrols operating within Israel territory'; by 'continuous crossings from Egyptian controlled territory into Israel by infiltrators and their illegal actions in Israel'; by actions in which Egyptian armed groups 'crossed the line and penetrated to a great depth into Israel'; by 'repeated acts of aggression and hostility against Israel' which the Commission 'called upon Egypt' (on September 13, October 28, January 24, January 27, and March 7) 'to terminate finally and immediately.' We are also informed by the Commission at its most recent meeting on March 7 that 'despite the obligations imposed on Egypt by the general armistice agreement and many MAC decisions an end has not yet been put to the aggressive and hostile acts by Egypt against Israel.'

" 'The Security Council also has before it two reports from the Chief of Staff. The first refers to 'a recrudescence of incidents mostly in Israel-controlled territory [. e., from Egypt], some of them of a serious nature'. The second report, referring specifically to the Gaza incident, writes that 'infiltration from Egyptian controlled territory has not been the only cause of present tension, but has undoubtedly been one of its main causes.' The report conveys the astonishing assertion by Egyptian authorities that 'persons committing murders and sabotage [in Israel] were being inspired, paid and equipped by political elements in Egypt inimical to the Government and desirous of aggravating the border situation.' Whatever the truth of the explanation, the murders and sabotage thus candidly avowed emanated from Gaza headquarters, for whose activities the Egyptian Government is responsible. The report describes a remarkable intensity of activities in intelligence and sabotage, and states that, 'the Gaza incident could appear in this context as retaliation for the spying, sabotage, and murders for which the Egyptian military intelligence was said to be responsible.'

"The report advocates that the Egyptian authorities should take measures against infiltrators, since otherwise, 'the Israelis refuse to believe that a serious attempt is being made to prevent the depradations which eventually build up tension to a dangerous point.'

"With all this accumulated evidence of Egyptian aggression before us inscribed in the Mixed Armistice Commission Resolutions and in the Chief of Staff's reports, is it not incredible to hear an Egyptian suggestion that the Security Council should ignore everything that the Mixed Armistice Commission and the Chief of Staff have said about this persistent Egyptian responsibility, and should deplore or condemn only the response which these Egyptian violations elicited, after they had been patiently endured week by week and for month upon month?

"The Council will note that there is nothing in the records of the Mixed Armistice Commission in its consideration of Israel's attitude, to compare with its generalized crticism of Egypt for a constant and well sustained policy of military pressures against Israel. Indeed, the Egyptian representative himself was unable to make out any case against Israel for the tensions existing in the Gaza region before February 28. He therefore went shopping around all the other parts of the Middle East, reaching back 4 years in an effort to concoct a selection of Israeli actions which might balance the story of recent Egyptian provocations in the Gaza region. The Egyptian delegate would not have let his feet stray into the Huleh marshes in 1951 if he could have found any serious break in Israeli restraint on the Egyptian frontier in the period under review.

"Indeed, the one-sided character of Egyptian violations emerges clearly from an analysis of the 36 complaints listed in the Chief of Staff's Report of March 17.

* * * * *

"When we compare these complaints with the earnest, grave, far-reaching decisions against Egypt which I have quoted, the balance of responsibility for the tension preceding February 28 becomes amply clear. That the Gaza incident is a result and not a primary cause of tension is particularly well known to all who have followed these affairs from close at hand in recent weeks.

"In the official transcript of the meeting of the Special Committee of the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission held on March 11, 1955, we find the Chairman addressing the parties as follows:

" 'I think all of us realize that this did not arise out of a blue sky, and certainly no report or evidence before the Security Council by any responsible party would give that impression.'

* * * * *

"How serious the situation had become before February 28 is illustrated by the following facts:

"During the period August 1954 to March 1955:

"(a) The Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Egypt 40 times.

"(b) There were 9 cases of Egyptian sabotage and mine-laying.

"(c) There were 34 clashes with regular and irregular forces.

"(d) 1,006 cases of incursions and infiltrations from across the Egyptian border into Israel were recorded by the Israel police.

"(e) 106 marauders were arrested during this period by the Israeli police.

"A sinister feature of recent developments has been the emphasis by Egyptian headquarters at Gaza on intelligence sabotage operations. * * * These incidents gave rise to the Mixed Armistice Commission's expression of 'grave concern over the repeated acts of planned demolition in Israel by well-sustained, organized, and armed groups coming from Egyptian-controlled territory.'

*"Israel appeals to U. N. and powers*

"On many occasions during the latter months of 1954 and the early part of this year the Government of Israel sought remedy for this situation by diplomatic means. Our leaders and representatives constantly engaged the Chief of Staff in discussions of Egyptian aggression, and pointed out the impossibility of suffering these assaults indefinitely without response. We heard periodically from General Burns that he had duly transmitted our expressions of deep concern and his own desire to see armed marauding brought to an end.

"The Governments of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom also considered the problem serious enough to

warrant the use of their good offices within recent months; and the Government of Israel received information from each of those two governments, as well as from the Government of Turkey, during the period between October 1954 and February 1955 concerning the representations which they had made in Cairo in support of the appeals of the Mixed Armistice Commission calling for the cessation of assaults and sabotage against Israel from the Gaza strip.

"It is impossible for us to imagine that members of the Security Council, or the Security Council itself, can fail to include in their expressions of view a strong condemnation of this campaign of hostility organized in Gaza, to which Israel was subjected between the summer of 1954 and the end of February this year. For the connection between these events and the Gaza episode is nothing less than the direct and compelling relationship of cause and effect. But for the Egyptian aggressions which I have partially enumerated; but for the persistent rejection both of Mixed Armistice Commission resolutions and of the representations and warnings from the powers, there is not the remotest chance that any event would have occurred which would have brought the Security Council into session this week. Nor can the Security Council, which is charged by members of the United Nations with the duty to consider international 'situations' and 'disputes,' fail to evince an interest in the general context of relationships of which Gaza is a single reflection in a particular local facet. For scarcely less alarming than the acts of violence which leaped at Israel's throat from the Gaza frontier over the past 6 months have been the ominous words of direct menace which furnished the ideology and philosophy of these Egyptian attacks.

*"Egyptian threats*

"On January 28, 1955, Major Salem, Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, stated publicly:

"Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war. Even if Israel should fulfill all U. N. resolutions it will not sign a peace with her. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel-Aviv we shall never put up with that.'

"On October 15, 1954, the official mouthpiece of the Egyptian regime, El-Gomhouria, wrote:

" 'Egypt and the Arabs must turn in the name of humanity and culture to all nations of the world who will aid in wiping Israel off the face of the map because of its barbarism.'

"On November 16, 1954, the Saut el Arab (the Voice of the Arabs) the official broadcasting station, declared:

" 'Egypt sees Israel as a cancer endangering the Arab peoples. Egypt is the physican who can uproot this cancer. Egypt does not forget that it is her obligation to take revenge and she is mobilizing all her forces in anticipation of the hoped-for day.'

*"Egypt's expansionist claims revealed*

"A most important and conspicuous development took place only 3 days ago, on March 20, when Major Salem, a leading member of the Egyptian Government, revealed the underlying purpose of Egyptian harassment in the Negev. The object is to impede the development of the Negev in order to bring about its annexation to Egypt. This insolent territorial claim put forward by Major Salem in the clear light of day, is the ultimate source of tension on our southern frontier. Let me say that Egypt or any other Arab State will not get the Negev, nor is our territory available for bargaining in discussions of regional defense organizations. The only result of this aggressive Egyptian pronouncement will be to fortify the passion and tenacity with which the people of Israel will defend every inch of their territory in any arena in which it may be threatened. But is there a single precedent in contemporary international life for a state openly to assert a claim to half the territory of its smaller neighbor, to launch dozens of assaults upon it against severe international condemnation, and, on the first occasion when it provokes resistence, to run for protection to the very Security Council whose authority it had repudiated a few weeks before?

* * * * *

*Abandonment of belligerency*

"We are talking of two countries, Egypt and Israel, which have no objective causes for conflict between them, two countries whose cooperation should form the keystone of peace and progress throughout the Middle East. No advantage to either people is served by the sterile doctrines and practices of belligerency, hostility and nonrecognition which now prevail between them. Everybody knows that the answer to the problem before us lies in the replacement of hostility by normal relations based on mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state. It is therefore disquieting to observe the refusal of the Egyptian Government to apply those provisions of the General Armistice Agreement and of the Security Council Resolutions which call for an early transition from armistice to permanent peace. We were similarly disappointed when the Israel proposal for the conclusion of nonaggression pacts, made in full responsibility and formality last October from the rostrum of the United Nations, was summarily rejected by Egypt's representatives.

"Until such time as progress is made toward peace, it becomes increasingly urgent to correct the defects and imperfections of the armistice system. The main breach in this system is the proclamation of a state of belligerency and the application of that doctrine in acts of war by sea and land.

"My Government is prepared to give an assurance that if no hostile act is carried out by Egypt against Israel, then no hostile act of any kind will be carried out by Israel against Egypt. Indeed, this is our minimal plea to Egypt: Prevent your armed forces and armed groups from crossing our frontiers; stop firing on our patrols and villages; cease blowing up our water supplies; abolish these activities of sabotage, demolition, and murder; do not send people either into the heart of our country or into the border areas for the purpose of destruction and pillage; refrain from threatening our violent extinction or laying claim against our territory; renounce the blockade to which your right has been internationally denied; stop making the harassment and provocation of Israel a theme of your national policy. By such simple renunciation of a useless hostility, Egypt can insure on our part a profound, unvarying and universal respect for her peace and integrity.

*"Questions to Egypt*

"It is fitting, 6 years after the armistice, for Egypt and Israel themselves to define the basis of their relationship under the agreement by which they are bound. We therefore ask:

"Will the Egyptian Government agree to proclaim the abolition of a state of war and of all actions and measures carried out on the basis of the existence of a state of war?

"Will the Government of Egypt join with us in a declaration of readiness to carry out all the obligations under the armistice agreement and all decisions of the Security Council adopted in relation to those agreements?

"Will the Egyptian Government join us in declaring its fidelity to that provision of the armistice agreement which calls us to make a transition to permanent peace?

"Will the Government of Egypt join us in a declaration of fidelity to the provisions of the United Nations Charter calling upon us to settle all disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and political independence of any state?

"The acceptance of such a code of Egyptian-Israeli relationships would not take us beyond our existing commitments under the armistice agreement and the charter of the United Nations. These are all things that we have agreed to do already. But under the burden of belligerent doctrines the pacific obligations which we have undertaken have become lost to sight; and the insidious fallacy of a state of war has spread its contagion both in the theory and the practice of our relationships. If the Government of Egypt, through its delegation, is able at any stage to give affirmative answer to these questions, my Government would make wholehearted response.

"CONCLUSION

"The Security Council can do much to withstand the distortion of the Armistice Agreement by the doctrine of unilateral belligerency. It must be clear to everybody studying the reports and tables and the Mixed Armistice Commission resolutions which I have quoted here, that for the Council to confine its judgment or criticism to the Gaza incident alone would be gravely prejudicial and unequitable. It would certainly be an inappropriate commentary on official reports which show Egyptian violations to have been more numerous and more generalized than any Israeli reactions which followed them.

"My delegation feels justified in seeking a condemnation by the Security Council of the Egyptian incursions, murders, demolitions and sabotage activities described in General Burns' report as 'a main cause of present tension' and in the Mixed Armistice Commission resolutions as 'repeated aggressive acts by Egypt against Israel.'

"We seek confirmation of the Security Council's view that the claim or practice of active belligerency by land and sea is inconsistent with the Armistice Agreement and the Charter of the United Nations.

"We urge a reassertion by the parties of their obligations to each other in terms of nonbelligerency, pacific settlement and respect for political independence and territorial integrity; and we await the Egyptian reply to this proposal.

"We advocate, after 6 years of armistice, a serious effort to make a transition toward permanent peace.

"To any attempt at stabilization and pacification our Government will lend its full support."

We all recognize that there are many difficulties in the way of a settlement of all outstanding problems between Egypt and Israel. These difficulties must be surmounted, one by one. The separate points of tension and controversy need to be resolved, each on its own merits.

There is the problem of the refugees, many of whom are now quartered, inadequately and unhappily, in the Gaza strip in Egypt. There is the matter of the Suez Canal and the right of Israeli vessels to transit the canal without interruption.

These are but a few of the problems existing between Egypt and Israel.

Both Egypt and Israel must be willing to meet each other halfway, to negotiate and to reach agreements. I am sure Israel is so disposed. I hope that Egypt will be likewise disposed.

Surely all the nations of the free world, including the United States, would be ready to contribute to the resolution of as many of these problems as possible. It is to the essential interest of the free world that peace be established and maintained in the Middle East.

The United States Government, for its part, must and should give its full support to the Israeli proposal for a peace code. The United States Government should use all

its persuasive power upon Egypt to accept this proposal as a basis for negotiation.

Our Government can do a great deal which it is not now doing. Our Government should be moving with full force and vigor to rescue Israel from the isolation which now engulfs her in the Middle East. We should be pushing the excellent Johnson plan for the joint development and use of the Jordan River Basin. By bringing the nations—all the nations—in the Middle East together, by helping to establish a common front among them, to the maximum extent possible, we thereby advance the cause of Middle Eastern security, and, consequently, of free-world security.

The peace and security of the free world are, of course, the highest goals of American foreign policy. The accomplishment of these aims would be a great achievement of our diplomacy. We must exert our utmost efforts to bring peace and security to the troubled Middle East.

## A Tribute to the New Haven, Conn., Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, April 1955 is the 200th anniversary of the establishment of the New Haven, Conn., post office in my district of Connecticut. It was while Benjamin Franklin was Postmaster General that the first post office was set up in New Haven. According to historians the occasion for the establishment seems to have been caused by the French war, which emphasized the importance of postal communication between the soldiers and the loved ones they left behind, an occasion, incidentally, which is not overlooked in modern days with so many American boys away from home.

Since its original site on Long Wharf in New Haven, the post office has been moved eight times to larger and more accessible quarters to accommodate the quickly growing settlement of New Haven and the increasing dependence of her citizens upon the postal service. After 1860 the post office has been located on Church Street, one of New Haven's busiest thoroughfares, and in 1918 a Federal building was erected for the post office in its present location.

By 1879 New Haven had one of the 75 post offices scattered throughout the Thirteen Original States. The post rider could travel at the rate of 4 miles per hour if the weather was good. It was said that during the early days of postal service, it was customary for recipients of mail to pay the postage rather than those sending it. Even by today's standards, postal rates were exceedingly high and an early account relates the payment of 5 dozen eggs for postage on 1 letter. Someone said at that time it would cost a farmer 1 good milk cow to pay the postage on 32 letters he might receive.

With the modernization of postal service in New Haven and the erection of a new parcel-post terminal have gone the spirit and the pride of postal employees in that city. Throughout their years of loyal service, these couriers have brought assurances to the patrons of the area that neither rain nor snow, sleet nor hail will keep them from their appointed rounds.

Since the first journey of the post rider, the efficiency and the importance of America's postal service has become a part of our great heritage. Our commerce, our industry, and our economy are based in notable part on the skill and the dedication of hundreds of thousands of men and women throughout the country who handle the United States mails.

In 1825 New Haven post-office receipts were $1,510.22. In 1954 they totaled nearly $4½ million. So we can see as our towns and our cities, our farms, and our churches, and our schools were hewn out of the great wilderness of early pioneer America, the growth of our post-office system was evident and necessary and today it is an integral part of our everyday life in the United States.

I offer congratulations and best wishes to the New Haven Post Office on its 200th anniversary and to my many friends there who serve its needs and the needs of its patrons with such pride and distinction.

## The Skilled American Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a most interesting speech by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. James P. Mitchell, on March 22, on a subject of considerable general interest:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL TO THE RESEARCH COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 22, 1955

Thank you, Mr. Martin. It is a great pleasure and a privilege to come here to Chicago today to discuss with you one of our Nation's most serious problems. In choosing the topic for my speech, I was guided and inspired by the words from your preamble which I read on the back of the program. I see that you are an organization devoted to research into the factors lying behind economic security. It would follow that just as you seek to find answers to the problems of individual security so you must consider the security problems of all our country's individuals, or, in other words, our national security. So here today I will discuss a serious national problem which relates primarily to our national security, but also to the economic security of the individual citizen, for what is national security but collective individual security.

Our world abounds with sweeping new developments. The atom has been unleashed, causing concepts of war and peace different from any the world has ever known; and creating awesome problems which fill many with fears and doubts. Our scientists have devised new and remarkable machines for the defense of our country, and our industry is expanding constantly in new and different directions. The big and obvious problems which follow in the wake of these developments are receiving thoughtful attention of our people.

But beneath the surface lie other fundamental problems, less dramatic perhaps, less heralded, yet serious.

It is of such a problem that I speak to you tonight—an area of national concern which challenges for solution the farthest reaches of our national imagination and intellectual resource.

What is this problem? It can be stated briefly: It is the urgent need to raise the level of the skills of the American work force.

Whether we like it or not, we are now in a race with the Communist world for technological supremacy. The products of scientific research have obviously revolutionized warfare. Compare, for example, the defense guns which formerly protected our major cities and Nike, today's supersonic guided missile, which can seek out and destroy attacking aircraft. Where the harbor defense guns could be handled and maintained by a handful of trained men, Nike requires more than 100 highly skilled men. This new defense weapon with its complex control mechanism contains more than 1,500,000 individual parts. You can well imagine the skills and abilities required to manufacture, maintain, service, and fire such a weapon.

As we in America look back in our history, we realize that we have been complacent about our natural resources—our timber, our iron, our oil. Likewise, I think you will agree, we have been complacent about our need for scientists and technical experts.

Had it not been for Hitler's barbaric destruction of human beings, the Germans would probably have been the first nation in the world to develop the mighty power of the atom. Fortunately, General Groves and America's scientists had the assistance of a handful of scientists who came to America to escape Nazi- and Fascist-dominated Europe—Einstein from Germany, Fermi from Italy, Meitner from Germany, Szilard from Hungary, and Bohr from conquered Denmark.

In contrast, it is perhaps in the development of scientific and technical manpower that the Russians have shown their greatest resourcefulness. Ever since the days of Lenin the Russians have been trying to catch up with the West in the scientific fields. Today they are making a major effort to develop trained manpower.

The Russians obtain their scientific manpower by directive, but I believe the freedom and incentives of our system give us an enormous advantage in this regard. Nevertheless the Russian efforts to increase their technical and scientific manpower should give us pause.

We have indeed been entirely too slow to realize how closely our country's economic and military strength is tied not only to the exceptional contributions of the great scientists, but also to the everyday skills and abilities of our workers. No research laboratory could operate; no pilot models could be developed; no manufacturing plant could produce without the diversity of skills represented not only by our scientists and engineers, but also by the electronics technicians, the draftsmen, the setup men, the maintenance experts, the machinists, and a host of others.

And parenthetically let me just say here that likewise, we have been too slow in realizing how closely the worker's own individual economic security is tied to his skill ability. In many ways, from a worker's own selfish point of view, there is no law, no program, no protection as effective in promoting his own security as his skill.

What appears in our country to be solely a shortage of scientists is in reality a shortage of scientists and a shortage of skilled

workers and technicians needed to back up the scientists. If the engineer, the physicist or the designed, is short of aides, or if the plants which make his product are short of skilled mechanics and technicians, then his skill is wasted. In short, we have to look behind the top scientist to see the full story. And that is what I would like to do with you today.

There are 64 million workers in America and of these about 9 million are skilled. That means they have distinctive abilities and competence in work. This group cannot be increased overnight. They are the product of years of experience and training. Many semiskilled workers eventually move up the ladder to become skilled workers, many skilled workers move into the scientific and professional group; and also, as I have mentioned, the contribution that the scientist makes is of no practical value unless what he develops can be manufactured and used. This, in turn, depends on skilled workmen and technicians.

The largest skilled group are in the classic trades such as the craftsmen in the building trades, also maintenance and repair and metal machinery. Many skilled workers are in trades with long traditions—the glassblower, the carpenter, the machinist, the draftsman, the millwright, the typesetter, the baker, and the barber. Others are in comparatively new fields such as the aircraft mechanic, the electronics expert, the orthopedic technician and the X-ray technician. In many jobs the old name has acquired new and different meaning. The electrician, for example, has a job wholly different from his predecessor half a century ago.

This is not a complete picture, however, for this does not indicate the segments of our work force where we are wasting workers who could be used to answer the urgent call for skills from industry and the armed services.

For example, women are grossly underrepresented among the skilled workers except for a handful of dental and medical technicians and foremen in the garment industry. Also, there are relatively few skilled Negro workers. As I said at the outset, we just cannot afford these types of waste.

In seeking the reasons why these groups have not entered the skilled group, it is first necessary to find out exactly how workers acquire skills. We must start with the home for there is where the basic attitudes that a man or woman has toward work are formed. The skilled craftsman is no accident. He is a product of ambition, intelligence, purposeful drive, and opportunity.

He must have a firm background of basic knowledge about his trade and he must be able to develop his native talent to the utmost.

Schooling gives a worker the basic skills through which he can begin his development. Without the opportunity to acquire basic literacy, to master numbers, to be able to communicate, to learn self-discipline, he has no base on which to build the special competences needed to be a skilled worker or technician.

The Armed Forces are now an important training ground for a large number of young men. In present-day America, most men spend between 2 and 4 years in the armed services. Maybe they do not come out as completely polished skilled workers, but, nonetheless, anyone who spends 4 years in the Air Force, for example, on a first enlistment, will be one or two jumps up in the acquirement of skills. As we trace back the development of the skilled worker, we find that he frequently gets his initial stimulus and some advanced training in the Armed Forces.

There are four main additional sources through which a young person now gets his skill training. First, there are the vitally important formal apprenticeship training programs sponsored and promoted with industry and labor by the United States Department of Labor. Second, there is the relatively new development of the technical school or college. New York State has a large number of technical institutes as does California. Then, thirdly, industry has been moving toward different types of training programs which add to the skills and competence of workers and which definitely contribute to a man's being transformed from an unskilled to a semiskilled or skilled worker. I will discuss later how closely this training responsibility of management is related to a worker's economic security.

The last source of training, which accounts for most of the skill training today outside of the Armed Forces, is perhaps the most interesting of all and is not very well understood. In this category is the man who becomes skilled simply on his own initiative through experience, by changing from one job to a slightly better one, learning as he goes along from the fellow at his elbow.

This obviously is an admirable type of man and he should never be discouraged from his efforts to pull himself up. This type of skilled worker often lacks the versatility and training depth that the more formally trained worker has. But on the other hand, some of our best skilled workers are in this group, but many of them are good only at a specific job. In terms of our national security and in terms of meeting the demands of an ever-increasing mechanization in industry, versatility and mobility are becoming a necessity for the skilled worker.

It would be reasonable to inquire now: What is the exact nature of the shortages of skilled workers and technicians? The simplest way to do this is to examine the problem in terms of the military, since there we have the best facts and figures. This does not mean, however, that industry does not suffer from skill shortages in very much the same way the armed services do.

By the end of World War II, there were almost half a million people under the age of 30 fit for military service, but they were deferred because they had industrial skills needed to meet the procurement requirements of the armed services. To give you just a rough idea of the kinds of people we are talking about, it was the aircraft mechanic, the blast-furnace blower, the cable splicer, the electrician, the lineman, the molder, the precision lens grinder, the X-ray equipment serviceman, and the tool designer.

These shortages existed at a time when American industry was operating to maintain an armed force of over 11 million men 10 years ago. When you look at the technological changes that have taken place since World War II, can you picture the industrial skill shortages which would result from full mobilization specialists, highly trained electronic experts who can repair such an instrument as Nike, technicians who can handle the modern radar equipment which has changed so much since World War II days and a host of others too numerous to mention.

Today, the Armed Forces, with a strength of only 3 million men, are roughly 30 percent short on fully qualified skilled personnel needed to fill many thousands of critical military jobs. For example, there is a need for some 35,000 aircraft mechanics and electronics technicians; about 25,000 electronic-equipment operators; 18,000 communications-equipment mechanics, and so on. These shortages reflect similar shortages in private industry. For every 3 skilled persons or technicians that the armed services require, only 2 are currently available, and the individuals who are in these positions in large part have been pushed in without adequate training.

Further evidence of the impingement of the shortages in this area on the efficiency of the armed services can be illustrated by what happens at the end of the first term of enlistment. Who reenlists? It's the military police, food service people, to some degree the automotive-maintenance men, the infantry, and supply personnel. But in the more specialized and technical areas, only 1 percent of the electronics-maintenance personnel are willing to reenlist, which simply means that industry is bidding very high because these men are scarce. Your armed services are in a poor position to meet this competition, although if the Congress approves the new military-pay bill, the relative position of the armed services will be improved. More pay for the military, however, would tend to transfer military shortages to civilian industry, until a more extensive training program is undertaken.

In short, it appears that the more skill a soldier has, the less likely he is to reenlist, which, of course, throws a very heavy weight on the services in still another way. They have to take a large part of their budget and reinvest it in each 4-year or 2-year cycle to begin to train new people and as soon as they are partly trained, out they go again. This level of training in the Armed Forces undoubtedly has a direct relation to industry.

Perhaps the most important problem in connection with the expansion of skills is the relation of schooling to a man's capabilities. Schooling is the base from which workers move on to acquire special competence. To give some indication of the way in which poor schooling reduces the number of men able to take advanced training in the military or even in civilian life, here are some startling facts.

Out of the First Army area, the overwhelming majority of the young men who are examined have enough educational and mental equipment to be taken into the Armed Forces. Only something like 7 percent fail to pass the mental examination. And in the Fifth Army area, less than 5 percent of the population, really the mentally deficient group, fail to make the grade. But in the Third Army area, where there were sometimes lower educational standards, as many as 1 out of every 4 persons cannot pass the simple 4th grade test the Armed Forces gives as an absolute minimal requirement.

So you have a situation where the Third Army area has five times as many people rejected as the Fifth Army area, and this is a direct consequence of the accessibility of basic schooling. Fortunately this situation is definitely better now than it was a few years ago and is improving all the time as new schools are being constructed and the general standard of living is being improved in those areas which have previously lagged behind. As they accelerate their progress the whole Nation will gain in military and industrial strength.

As you know, the armed services divide their personnel into five broad categories based on mental test scores. I and II are good, III is average, IV is below average, and V they do not normally take.

Now, of the people whom the armed services take from the different regions of the country, we see here 1 out of every 2 from the Third Army area falls in group IV or below, which means that they are definitely not material for further training within the Armed Forces.

In contrast, the First and Sixth Army areas, only 1 out of 4 of those who are finally taken in would not be good material for further training.

There is a very strong relationship between the educational level of the population and the number of well-qualified people it can contribute to the skilled work force of the Nation both in and out of the armed services. In the First Army area more than 1 out of every 2 boys graduating from high school, and 40 percent of those who enter the Armed Forces are in the upper groups and definitely

trainable. In the Third Army area, where only 30 percent of the young men of military age are high-school graduates, only 16 percent of those entering the Armed Forces manage to qualify for the first or second group.

These proportions hold up throughout the country. Wherever you have more high-school graduates, you have the highest amount of good, qualified manpower. In the Far West, for example, 2 out of every 3 are high-school graduates and about 43 percent qualify for the upper groups.

We are all interested in low taxes, but we must realize that if low taxes mean poor schools, and poor schools mean lack of adequate skills, then our economic future and our national security may be jeopardized. In addition, industry must spend more to train those who have not had the basic education necessary to perform the work modern production requires.

Some areas of the Nation have had poor roads, isolated communities, inadequate natural resources, nonproductive land, and little industrial development. Such areas have lagged in providing satisfactory educational opportunities for their children. This has perpetuated the areas disadvantage from one generation to the next.

Fortunately, in recent years some of these areas are spending a great deal of their resources to narrow this educational gap and provide better training for their children. The beneficial results of this investment have not yet been seen because there is a time lag between the training of children and the production of workers. The dividends from this expenditure will, however, start being apparent in a few years.

Now, as I said in my opening remarks, this in a very real sense is a problem on individual economic security as well as one of national security, because a worker's ability to make a living and support his family is tied very closely to his skill. In many ways, perhaps, the most valuable thing that an employer can give his employees is skill training. This is true particularly today as mechanization grows and changing industrial processes demand increased versatility and ability. Without the versatility that comes from skill, a worker in a very real sense is handicapped. If, for example, the plant he is working in is shut down, or if his trade declines in usefulness, his one hope for real and permanent economic security lies in such skill as he may possess. After he has collected his unemployment-compensation benefits, this is all he has to help in continuing to sustain himself and his family. It is this—a worker's skill—that will give him the ability and confidence to seek and receive work.

If you look at the areas of our country which suffer from chronic unemployment, I think you will see that many of them are areas whose skilled workers know only one skill. And this, generally, is a skill for which employment opportunities are declining. Furthermore they are areas where, because of age, tradition, lack of education or lack of far-sighted industrial leadership there is a resistance to training and retraining.

There are some communities in the New England area, for example, which have for many years concentrated on one industry—textiles. To attract new industry into this area and to advance the economic security of its workers there must be provision made for widespread retraining.

The most serious underemployment in the country probably exists in the areas whose workers are either engaged in marginal farming or coal mining. There, practically the only skill that any workers know is coal mining. If new industry is to come into these areas, and if the economic security of the workers in these areas is to be improved, skill training is a prime necessity. And before even skill training can start there must be an improvement in ordinary basic education.

The more complex the industry of our country gets, the more important the skill of each individual American worker is going to be, both to him in terms of his economic security, and to his country in terms of national security.

I think you will agree with me that the United States faces a real problem here and that it is one of critical importance. The Communist-dominated world outnumbers us in terms of population. We, therefore, must make up in skill what we lack in numbers.

There is no simple or single way in which we can raise the level of work skills in our Nation, and surely no way that the Federal Government can or should do it alone. This is a challenge to every segment of our society, particularly to industry, labor, and the local community.

We cannot afford to waste our manpower as we are now doing.

We cannot afford discrimination which wastes the skills of more than 6 million Negroes.

We cannot afford the pitifully bad schools which plague many areas of this country.

We cannot afford the prejudice and shortsightedness which today are making it increasingly hard for workers over 45 to find a job.

We cannot afford not to make the most effective use of the 20 million women in our work force.

We cannot afford haphazard and ineffective training programs.

These are the areas where we all must strive for improvement. It is to the interest of you, the business leaders of America, to lead the way in this effort. We in the Department of Labor and the rest of Government can help. We can promote training and provide the facts and figures, but, in the last analysis, it is up to you to do the job.

It is the skill, ingenuity, and know-how in the brains and hands of American workmen that have built the sinews of a mighty America. This, together with our spiritual heritage, has made us a great Nation. It is my considered opinion that the level of work skills among our working people today has deteriorated dangerously and could perhaps imperil our survival as a nation. Furthermore, it could imperil the individual economic security of our workers. We are all greatly concerned with the preservation and development of our human resources in terms of work skills is an even greater and more pressing concern and is worthy of the attention of every thinking person in the country. For upon the depth, breadth, and scope of the skills of American artisans may depend the hope of the free world. These critical resources must be cultivated with direction and perspective, and we must begin now.

---

## Federal Aid to States To Assist in Construction of Schools

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 30, 1955*

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following transcript of excerpts of proceedings of the Committee on Education and Labor March 16, 1955, containing my statement in support of Federal aid for school-building construction:

Mr. PERKINS. The committee will come to order. It looks as though several members of the committee are absent this morning, but we will commence the hearings anyway.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was to appear this morning, but due to her illness she will not appear. She will appear at a later date.

Our first witness is the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, who was present all day yesterday, but did not get to testify, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS. We will hear from him at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. BROOKS HAYS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. May I have permission, Mr. Chairman, to include a synopsis of the bill that I am introducing for your consideration, H. R. 5112?

Mr. PERKINS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document referred to follows:)

*"Analysis of the chief provisions of the school-construction bill 5112, introduced by Representative Brooks Hays, of Arkansas*

"1. The purpose of the bill is to assist the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary schools.

"2. The amount to be authorized per annum shall be $250 million.

"3. The funds are apportioned through an objective formula based on two factors, (a) school-age population, and (b) each State's average per capita income payments.

"4. The period of aid is to cover 5 fiscal years, starting July 1, 1955.

"5. Use of funds is limited to the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities. The term "school facilities" is defined to mean classrooms and related facilities, and initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes. It does not include (a) interests in land, (b) off-site improvements, (c) athletic stadiums, or (d) structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public or structures to be used exclusively as single-purpose auditoriums or gymnasiums.

"6. On the Federal level the program will be administered by the United States Office of Education, and in the States by the regularly established State educational authorities.

"7. States wishing to share the benefits of the act submit State plans to the United States Commissioner of Education. The location and approval of projects are left to the States as well as the actual supervision of construction. The States are required to audit receipts and expenditures and to make such reasonable reports to the United States Commissioner as are necessary to assure that expenditures have been made in accord with the purpose of the legislation.

"8. Funds will be paid by the United States Treasurer, upon certification by the United States Commissioner, to the State treasurer who will make transfers to local boards of education upon requisition of the State educational authority.

"9. The matching of funds within a State, by local school districts, is left for State determination. The Federal share of a State's authorized school construction program may not exceed 40 percent in the State having the highest per capita income. In the State having the lowest per capita income, the Federal share may be 60 percent.

"10. Any State which finds itself aggrieved over the administration of the act may bring action in the appropriate United States Court.

"11. Federal interference in the schools is prohibited by the following words of section 10 of the bill:

"'SEC. 10. In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system of any school agency.'

"12. Under an appropriation of $250 million the allocation under this bill will range from approximately $6 per pupil in New York to $9 per pupil in Mississippi; an average of about $7.50 per child."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, No pending legislation before any of the committees of the Congress is as important or more important certainly than the bill which this committee is considering.

I feel that the time has come for the Federal Government to clarify its policy with reference to Federal aid for education.

It is not accurate to say that we have no policy, because actually over the years we have been evolving a policy with reference to the Federal Government's relation to its public schools.

When I speak of clarification, I mean clarification by recognizing some responsibilities for secondary and elementary education.

Of course, it is known that we participated in higher education as early as 1862 and even earlier, but that was the most dramatic and most notable participation by the Federal Government, because in the land-grant college legislation the Government's concern for education was recognized in a substantial way.

And even earlier, our leaders knew that there was a national responsibility for the schools of this Nation.

I was struck, for example, by the words in George Washington's Farewell Address, a message that has been regarded as emphasizing other policies. You will recall that he said, "promote those institutions that make for diffusion of knowledge."

James Madison in the same period, forecasting the future of this experiment in free government, said that without popular education it will be either a tragedy or a farce.

So we are not talking about something that is new. We are simply recognizing the changes that have come about in the patterns of our economic, political, and social life since the Constitution was written.

Foreseeing that the foundations upon which popular government rests should be strong and firm, there was this responsibility for education which our forefathers recognized. But the changes I refer to create new demands.

I have the honor of being a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, generally referred to as the Kestnbaum Commission. I had hoped that our work would be completed before I appeared before this committee, that out of its studies I would have some facts that would be helpful to the committee, but as the committee knows, its work has not been completed and I am not free to discuss the tentative conclusions that have been recommended by the members of that important Presidential Commission studying the whole range of interrelationships of Government—Federal, State, and local.

Mr. PERKINS. May I interrupt you to state that I just wish all the membership of the committee were present to hear this presentation, because so many of the members on this committee want to speak of Federal aid to school construction as being a new proposition.

I am hopeful that before you get through other members will come in to hear your views this morning, Mr. HAYS.

Go ahead.

Mr. HAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly do not speak as an authority in this field. Of course, I have had vast experience as an educator. I was the 1916 summer-session teacher at the Sunny Point School, District No. 7, Illinois Township, Pope County, Ark., but since 1916 I have had no professional experience with the school problems.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe also you may have a little influence on the gentleman from Georgia today, Mr. HAYS.

Mr. LANDRUM. Well, the gentleman has also had influence on me if we happened to be in the same line of thought. I respect his position. I love him as a Christian gentleman. He has influenced me greatly.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to assume that the gentleman's thinking conflicts with mine. I am only going to try to fortify him in the view that the people of rural Georgia are entitled to the help that a mighty Nation can give them, and without the help that this Government can give I know that the future of some of the schools of the South is bleak. Not that we propose to relieve the States of their responsibility or to ease the burdens or the pressures on them, but merely to supplement what the States are doing under proper criteria, the Federal Government to establish and define those criteria as they lay out a plan for school-building construction.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman from Arkansas, before he quits the stand, will give us another one of those good stories from Pope County that have made him famous in the Congress.

I hope, too, that the gentleman from Arkansas will not skirt around that Kestnbaum report that is not yet out. The little leak that we got indicated that that report was going to be against, or, in fact, the professional report that is now on file was against the point of view that you have, of the functions of the Federal Government; namely, that the function of the local community was to take care of education in the States and in the school districts.

You might tell us whether or not your suspicion is that that is the nature of the report.

Mr. HAYS. My beloved friend from New York is very effective and I find myself struggling here with the decision that he poses, that is, whether to praise this Commission as I would like to do sincerely, because I think its overall performance is good, and then be extremely embarrassed by finding what he says is true, or to say that the Commission, great as it is, can make mistakes and feel easier about having differed with them officially at the time I want to differ with them.

So I leave that unresolved, and I leave your question unanswered, because it would not be proper for me to say anything about its tentative conclusions on the question of aid for schools.

But I have pleaded with that Commission—this certainly would not be improper for me to say, and you would suspect it if I did not admit it—I have pleaded with them to recognize the realities of the situation and whether or not I have influenced a lot of them with the help I have had from others with like points of view, remains a question.

I think the proper thing to do is to wait until its conclusions are reached and made public.

I am grateful to my friend for his comment and since he has referred to Pope County I recall one story which fits the comment of the chairman.

My father was a census enumerator back in 1900 up in the Ozark country. He said to one old man standing in front of his cabin: "I am a census enumerator, sir, I need some information. What is your name?"

"Hearn, Randall J. Hearn."

"How do you spell it?"

He said, "Spell it yourself, stranger, I am a nonscholar."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I think this morning instead of having anything about school construction, you and Brooks should just start in telling stories.

Mr. GWINN. It would be a great relief to me.

Chairman BARDEN. I have seen times in this committee room when there was less fun.

I want to apologize for being late. Mrs. Hobby's assistant called yesterday afternoon. I told her I would check with the office today and see what arrangements we could make.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, you have not missed very much. I would like to repeat one point I made, however, because it is the basis for some conclusions. I know that it has been often stated to the committee that this is not a new idea and I think that there is precedent in our national life for a recognition, a monetary recognition of the responsibility that the Federal Government has for its public-school system.

That is a vital point that cannot be evaded. It should be, I think, the basis of all of our thinking in this field.

The point being that as we defend Federal aid for education we defend it not as an innovation, but as a modification of an old policy, a recognition of altered economic and social patterns. That is the principal point that I tried to make at the beginning.

Yet I recognize that at this stage, since our aid has been heretofore limited largely to higher education and specialized fields, such as vocational aid and the school-lunch program, we should approach it with tentative reservations about the final form that it should take. The best programs evolve, they are not written with complete wisdom at the beginning.

For that reason, if I had the power just to order this legislation into existence, I would inaugurate it on a conservative basis. I would not provide $500 million which I think may be justified in the light of our national income. I would make it $250 million. I would not make it indefinite. I would limit it to 5 years. I would take another look at it in a 5-year period after a program of that modest proportion had been tested and tried.

We should inaugurate it on a modest basis, considering the severity of our Federal budget problem and the fact that we will profit by experience as we go into a program that does have terrific implications in terms of the relationship of the States to the Federal Government, which is now under my concept a partner in the business of educating the children of this country.

Now, when I speak of altered patterns of social and economic life, I have in mind comparing it with the period in which George Washington spoke, of promoting the institutions which make for the diffusion of knowledge.

I have in mind the simple life which found almost each State enjoying self-containment, self-sufficiency, but now with the commerical life of the Nation regarding State lines as of no consequence whatever, you have two factors that enter into the equation, one, the mobility of people, and I come from a State which has felt its impact.

Second, the mobility of wealth, its tendency to flow out of States that rest their economy basically on agriculture to States that have a different structure.

That does not carry frightening implications at all, though if we succumb to an equalitarian philosophy of an extreme type, we might find them dangerous.

I do not want to be guilty of any false reasoning on that score. I would not have the Federal Government undertake by some magic formula to equalize the incomes of people or of schools.

But I would take into account in devising a national policy the wide extremes in per

capita incomes and the fact, strangely enough, that where the incomes are lowest the children are most plentiful. That is a fact that I am sure this committee is aware of. "The stork and the wolf always did pal around together."

For that reason, the poorer States should be helped by the States that are in a position to supply some of the wealth to carry the educational burdens of this country.

I spoke of the mobility of people. They are moving out of areas like mine. I do not want to press the point that I am speaking for a special situation this morning, Arkansas, which, of course, has prior claim upon me. I would not apologize for speaking of its peculiar and urgent problems, but I hope that I can rest my case upon the national situation.

But the picture in Arkansas belongs in this composite and people have spent money to rear children that are giving their adult and taxpaying years to other States. Why should not the Federal Government tax the wealth of California where our people live in their taxpaying period to educate the children of the State in the succeeding generation that has supplied some of the manpower of the State of California?

Yet under the formula that I would suggest to this commission which has only a modest equalization factor, I would provide California money to deal with the problem that Arkansas, by sending children there, has helped create.

As an illustration of the fact that it costs the poorer States something, my friend Howard Dawson quotes these figures:

In a 10-year period it cost the South $2 billion to rear and educate the children that went into other States outside the South in the 10-year period between 1930 and 1940.

I speak guardedly on this point because I do not believe that you should overdo the equalization factor.

I only ask the committee take it into account. The synopsis that I will give you of the bill which I believe will be acceptable on that point would range from 6 to 9 dollars per child. It would be 46, a one to one and a half range.

I would suggest that the committee give careful consideration to the equalization factor in order to take care of the States that have a higher proportion of children and at the same time suffer this disparity of income.

I am resting this not only upon the movement of people out of States, but also the draining off of some of the wealth of those States. This is said without envy of the richer States, or without blindness to the problems that they have, because I have been in New England and I know that the agricultural areas of New England suffer from the same disparities within the region, and that wealth tends to get out of the rural areas into the cities.

But even within urban areas there are disparities that can be corrected, I think, only by some recognition by the Federal Government so that we supplement the States that are harassed by problems of revenues.

Now, I have tried in other words, Mr. Chairman, to get a balanced view of this problem of getting the States and the Federal Government together on a partnership basis.

When my friend, Mr. GWINN, asked me, in my appearance for a bill that had general aid in mind as its purpose years ago, about that, why we should give the wealthier States anything at all, I replied that even as a symbol it would have value because to withhold from the richer States some help for its problem would imply that we think there are no problems in the States that have large incomes.

It is not true. In the State of my friend, Mr. KEARNS, I have seen evidence in the interior of Pennsylvania of the problem and in spite of the exertions of Pennsylvania, which are impressive, there is work to be done.

I would trust the State of Pennsylvania to put that money where it is intended by the Federal Government to be spent.

Once we imply in any kind of legislative provision that we distrust the States, that we must write out the formula with meticulousness, when we destroy that reciprocity that should exist between the States, then we would, I think, meet frustration.

We have to proceed on the basis of maximum faith in the States to do their job and to determine the favored and the unfavored areas within their own borders.

One of the best speeches I ever heard made for Federal aid to education was by a Pennsylvanian. He went back to the fact I spoke of a moment ago, the movement of people from Arkansas into Pennsylvania. He said, "It would cost my State under the general aid for education about $10 million. We maybe would put in $20 million, but we would get back $10 million. But it would be worth $10 million to the State of Pennsylvania to have the Arkansans come better equipped to work on the assembly line, better trained as vocational school products.

As a taxpayer, Pennsylvania knows that the Federal Government spent through the Defense Department millions of dollars to give simple elementary instruction to enlisted men that should have been done in the schools of the United States.

Now, that is to impress the committee with my conviction that this is a national responsibility. Can we say that we are going to leave it to the States to struggle alone with the problem?

At the same time I hope that the committee will see to it that a criterion is written into the law. The principle of faith in the States does not call upon you to do otherwise than to say you shall not participate unless you meet your responsibilities, too.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from Arkansas a formula in his mind that would work this thing out? That has been one of our difficulties. If you are going to spread this $250 million all around among the 48 States, Arkansas is going to have no relief comparable to its needs at all.

Mr. HAYS. Yes, we would get $4,218,000. California would get $14 million.

Mr. KEARNS. Under which formula?

Mr. HAYS. Under the formula 1 to 1½, 40 to 60. Nine dollars per child approximately for the poorest State, $6 per child for the richest State.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Which bill is that?

Mr. HAYS. I am going to put my bill in tomorrow. I hope it will help the committee. I have no pride of authorship. I only hope you might find in what I am saying, something that appeals to you and can find in the material that I am going to put in the record, some figures and facts that will be a help.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am a little bit puzzled as to your philosophy. I understood you to say you believe in giving to the rich as well as to the poor States, but you make a distinction when you say give to the poorer State more than to the richer State.

Mr. HAYS. Per child.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Why do you follow such a procedure? Why not start with the procedure of what you are going to give to the poorer State and not give anything to the richer States at all? They just send it back down to get it back again with a big brokerage fee taken out of it.

Mr. HAYS. If you left the richer States out you would deny the basis of any legislation at all; namely, that it is a matter of national interest; this would deny that the Federal Government is concerned with the school problems of New York and Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I do not see the logic to that. I do not know why you say that. Why does the Federal Government have to give anything to Pennsylvania if we have our own money which we send down and we get it back again with quite a bit taken out of it?

Why not keep what we start with and give to the poorer States then? I would not have made this statement if you said to give to all States, but you said you gave more to the poorer States than you do to the richer. Therefore, you are making a distinction in your thinking.

Mr. HAYS. I am recognizing the disparity of wealth in the distribution of Federal funds just as in the State of Arkansas in the distribution of our revenues to the districts, we take into account the disparity of wealth between districts.

I think exactly the same principle should apply.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I accept that philosophy then. Therefore, why give anything to the rich States and give a certain amount to the poor States, if you once accept that philosophy that the poorer States should get more than the richer. Then you are in a position that it is just a matter of how you work it out.

Mr. HAYS. I do not want to pursue that. I still believe that there is some value in what I call the symbol of national interest. I think it would be very unfortunate if in adopting the equalization idea we did not say as a matter of national concern that what takes place in the richer State is important.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You say there is a national responsibility in the field. You say also that there must be, as I recall it, a minimum exertion or responsibility on the part of the State before they can qualify for Federal funds.

But as Mr. GWINN has pointed out, there is where our trouble lies. To what extent do you think it is necessary that, for instance, a State or a school district show that there is a need and show that they are incapable of meeting that need themselves? Do you think it is essential that they go through a qualifications test such as that, a means test of some kind?

Mr. HAYS. I think it would be impossible for the Federal Government to determine that on a district basis. Now, I realize that puts me against one of the administration proposals and I have such respect for the position of the administration, I mean in its overall purposes and approach, that I hope the gentleman will not attach too much importance to my differences with the administration on that point.

But if I am right as to the principle of trusting the States to deal with the problem of low income and district impoverishment, then you must avoid bypassing the States in our eagerness to get to the local difficulty.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hope the gentleman does not think that the administration approach bypasses the States.

Mr. HAYS. It provides, does it not, that the Federal Government shall determine by formula which districts within the States might qualify? It goes to the district situation even though they do not bypass the State. Even though they take into account the State's judgment as to a district's impoverishment, the net result would be that you would encourage the tendency of the States to put off its own equalization plans, and it would bolster unwise districting.

What would you do to a State like North Carolina that has virtually a State district, one unit?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hate to disagree. I think the basic administration approach is just the opposite, that is that it is an attempt to encourage the State to solve its own problems, the State and local community combined, definitely not any attempt to bypass the States as one of those

agencies responsible for the solution of its problems.

Mr. HAYS. As I say, I have great respect for much of the content of the administration's proposal also. It would certainly be better than making no beginning at all, but I was under the impression that the administration proposal simply took into account a condition of insolvency by districts within the States to be determined by the State and then the Federal Government would come to the rescue of that particular district instead of leaving it to the State with some aid in a measure like this to equalize, and, of course, when I say equalize, I am not speaking in terms of the absolute.

Now, if I am wrong about that, then, of course, you can disregard that comment.

What we really want to do is to help the States. The State is the key to this problem.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But to what extent is it necessary to set up the means test in the allocation of Federal funds? That is my original question.

Mr. HAYS. All right, let us get to that. I think you have a good example in Mr. Taft's approach.

As I recall it, what I have in my bill is the same requirement as in Mr. Taft's bill. It requires that 2½ percent of the total income of the State be devoted to school purposes. It will be impossible to get an altogether perfect criterion. You are going to have difficulty with that.

But I do suggest to the committee that they consider Mr. Taft's formula.

As I recall it, it was based upon an expenditure for education of 2½ percent of the State's income, not the State government's income, but 2½ percent of the income of the people.

Now, it seems to me that you need some criterion to determine the exertions of the State. I would not object, as it is applied to my own State, which on the whole does a good job. You can hardly do it percentagewise in an altogether acceptable way for this reason: A State with a low per capita income—and my State has only 40 percent of the per capita income of New York, for example, in other words, for every dollar the Arkansan has, the New Yorker has two and a half dollars.

If we gave as much percentagewise we still have so much less per child.

Mr. GWINN. I must rise to the defense there——

Mr. HAYS. It is not a criticism. I would praise New York for its industry, for its high income.

Mr. GWINN. I think one of our difficulties lies in the fact that if after a long, agonizing period, we come to a formula, by the time we get to adopt a formula down here, our whole factual basis has changed.

Now, your Commission, the Kestnbaum Commission, found a state of facts that apparently is surprising on this per capita capacity to respond, and one of the reasons that I believe they are going to hold that it is a local matter is because the Federal Government just cannot adjust itself to all the differing 63,000 school districts in these United States.

Here is a factor, for example, that they found. Your Southern States are increasing in their per capita income nearly three times faster than we are in New York State, in the Northern States. For example, the rise in per capita income in constant dollars from 1940 to 1953 in the 12 Northern States, is 38 percent.

In the 13 Southern States it was 95 percent. That is how this movement of population is benefiting you in Arkansas in terms of a rising per capita income and a rising capacity to meet your own needs.

Therefore, when we try to find a formula in 1955 that suits, by the time 1960 comes around we are clear out of joint.

Mr. HAYS. I think what the gentleman says certainly must be given weight by the Commission. It fortifies my point that a 5-year cutoff, or maybe even shorter, would be good, because you may be in danger of building schoolhouses where the children are now, but will not be 5 years from now.

I recognize that and it is an important point, but I have this comment to make to the point that you suggest: That we are increasing disproportionately. Of course, you increase in high proportions, sir, when your income is so low.

When Arkansas went from a per capita income of $250—and I remember struggling with some economic problems down there when that was all we had—up to $900, we did pretty well.

Still New York is two and a half times our per capita income. I say that with no implications as to taking from New York and giving it to Arkansas to equalize wealth. I want to be understood on that point.

Mr. GWINN. Again referring to the facts in your own commission which I think is doing a tremendous job on this, it shows that disposable income for education in the Northern States is $1,490 and in the 13 Southern States it is $1,017.

Mr. HAYS. Now, what index are you using?

Mr. GWINN. This is the per capita income as Federal taxes of the Northern, Central, the West, and the Southern States. It is a very interesting change that has taken place.

Mr. HAYS. I apologize for using the money index if it is to be assumed that I think that conditions are measured altogether by money terms.

But I do not see how you can consider the national problem of disparity if you do not pick out certain States to make comparisons.

Mr. GWINN. We have been thinking of New York as a certain status as we have gone along. We have forgotten what the inroads have been in the last few years.

Mr. HAYS. Certainly I realize as I know the gentleman will remember my stating that New York has its problems. Of course, if we gave to everybody, just returned to the States on the basis of population without reference to higher ratio of children, if we just made any kind of distribution, you get a degree of equalization because you are taking from a high income State a larger amount than they would get proportionately. So there is an element of equalization in any grant-in-aid program.

Now, this is arguing, perhaps, against one of the points I made, but it is something to keep in mind that a family with one child having the same income as a family with four children will have double the per capita income.

So those things may be deceptive, I realize, where calculations are made without reference to a family situation.

But I still insist, Mr. GWINN, and we are talking now about dollar income, that there is a great disparity within States and within the country.

Now, I would be just as eager to put proper pressure upon the States that are poor to carry their equivalent share, maybe more. And I think it is possible for Federal aid to have that effect.

I do not think there is the least danger of the Federal Government getting under a burden that Arkansas ought to carry if Arkansas gets only $4 million in Federal funds for school-building construction when Arkansas in 1953–54 had a capital outlay of $14 million, a capital outlay in the present year of $13½ million, and when the legislature was asked this year by the Governor to find new revenues for $12 million.

I do not think if you eased Arkansas' burden to that extent that you are in any danger whatever of encouraging a lag on the part of the poorer States.

I cannot see that that is a consequence that you need to fear, but, at the same time, the necessity for getting maximum exertions by the State should cause you to take a conservative approach.

Now, sometimes you hear those who carry heavy tax burdens say, "How can we carry more? Arkansas has every tax you can find," and we do. We devote a higher percentage to schools than the State of California, if I might use California as an example. We devote more, percentagewise, in spite of our lower per capita income to our schools than the great State of California.

But the taxpayer says, "I am paying all I can in State taxes."

I thought this was rather interesting, a conversation between two men on their way to the Cotton Bowl game in Dallas to see the Arkansas football team play. And, incidentally, I hope none of you will say that I can hardly contend Arkansas is a poor State when we had the best football team in that part of the country. I pause to say that because I can just see a question in the chairman's eye, but we did not get that football team with money. These Arkansas boys running up and down the hills have better muscles than the level-ground boys and that is the reason for it.

On their way to the bowl this conversation took place. One Arkansas taxpayer said, "I cannot afford to pay any more taxes."

And the man who believed in more revenues for schools in Arkansas said, "Well, I am begging my friends in the Arkansas Legislature to vote new tax burdens on me that will mean another $200 out of my pocket.

You ought to see it the same way. You are spending a hundred dollars to come to this football game."

So, I say that the States can find more money for schools if they see this in the right proportions which is that we are facing an emergency.

I know I do not need to belabor that point. What I am trying to say is that it is inconceivable that we will do anything to lessen the pressures on the States to exert themselves to the fullest.

Now, the committee is well aware of the fact that there are three grounds for participation by the Federal Government in State functions. One is to support a service which the Federal Government has the responsibility for.

Another is to stimulate a service which we think ultimately should be borne by the States, but which we think needs to be stimulated.

The other is to equalize. That would call for some continuation.

It seems to me that on all three bases there is justification for a modest, conservative, soundly conceived Federal program of this kind.

It deals with a physical program in the first place and is important because you are not involved in any way in the problems of selection of teachers or curricula. You are dealing exclusively with the problem that escapes the delicate, troublesome questions that caused such concern to the committee in the years when you considered general Federal aid for education.

Mr. LANDRUM. You have raised a point which has given me quite a bit of concern. We come to the Federal Government now because of a crisis existing in our construction, in our plant setup, capital outlay for schools. We are coming to the Federal Government for help.

In my own State, for example, during the last 10 years we have increased the number of teachers and increased considerably the average salary of teachers.

But just 2 weeks ago our State auditor announced down there that the State was now facing a financial crisis.

Because of that crisis and because of the fact that we have, for the last several years,

devoted more than 50 percent of our income to education, we have to raise more money to pay these new teachers.

His statement headlined in the papers was this: Georgia will either raise more revenue or take off the payrolls about 3,500 schoolteachers.

Now, if such a crisis as that facing us in Georgia today develops nationwide, are we not going to also come to the Federal Government seeking aid to employ teachers?

I raise that question because of the statement you made that you are not concerned with the selection of teachers or the establishment of curricula. You are concerned only now with the building of our plants in which we house these educational instructors.

Mr. HAYS. Let me explain what I mean when I say it does not involve us in the local questions. I felt that general aid for education did not involve us to the extent that it was charged. Certainly this does not involve us in criteria for the selection of teachers.

Mr. LANDRUM. I certainly follow the gentleman. I appreciate his remarks. I recognize it is not now a problem, but based on history and our experience in coming to the Government and particularly the history that we have established over the last 20 or 25 years, is it not true that the more our crises develop at home, the greater the tendency to come to a beneficient Federal bureaucracy. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, that is a fact of life that has to be confronted.

But if I am right, that this is justice, if it rests on that concept of justice to the less favored States, then you cannot refrain from doing now what ought to be done in the interest of justice because it makes more difficult a decision that the Congress might have to make 5 years from now.

We can never afford to make an easy decision because of a complication that might lie ahead.

I have no case whatever, unless the committee agrees with me that the Federal Government has a stake in education.

How can it be said that the Federal Government has no responsibility or no moral obligation? We take the lad when he is 18 years of age, we have not provided in the Nation an adequate minimum standard school system that enables him to understand the manual of arms.

Mr. LANDRUM. I agree with you that the Federal Government has something at stake, has an interest there. There is no belaboring that point. We all agree on that. We all agree that we come now to a crisis in building.

But I am assuming that the gentleman, and I have the same feeling that we want maximum control on the local level. We want a minimum amount of control on the Federal level, none if we can get it.

Mr. HAYS. That is right.

Mr. LANDRUM. But my question was raised. as we come more and more to these other problems that are beginning to confront us, and will confront us 5 years from now, as the gentleman suggests, are we not going to gradually turn over our entire local responsibility to the Federal Government? Are we not facing that danger?

Mr. HAYS. I know the gentleman is entitled to an answer from me. It has forced, and I want to meet it squarely, I certainly could not deny that the extension of Federal aid even to this milder extent, of $250 million a year. I could not deny that it would have its impact on related programs within the State.

Of course it does. As you ease the pressures from the revenue standpoint, you release funds for raising teachers' salaries, of course, and other purposes.

But I would not be afraid of that. You are still holding the Federal Government to participation in a fiscal program.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would the gentleman say, then, why in the early stages of your remarks you suggested that maybe we would limit this to 5 years, this experiment of $250 million a year?

Mr. HAYS. It gives us an opportunity to experiment.

Mr. LANDRUM. Where do we go at the end of 5 years if we find it not satisfactory

Mr. HAYS. In all honesty, I would not want what I say in support of it to seal my lips to come back and say 5 years from now, "Give us further help."

But I would point out to the opponents of the program that their arguments against Federal aid of a general character do not apply to this bill. I would plead for a chance to see what experience produces on the question my friend from Georgia raises.

Mr. LANDRUM. I am not yet ready to let the gentleman or any other catalog me as an antagonist of the program.

Mr. HAYS. Good.

Mr. LANDRUM. I just simply want to recognize that these problems are confronting us. I want to hear the gentleman's discussion of it.

Now, while I have the gentleman's ear, may I ask one question?

You are familiar with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. SCRIVNER] on the 22d of February?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I am.

Mr. LANDRUM. Would you care to comment on the provisions of that?

Mr. HAYS. I am not well informed on it, but I did take time to look over the scale. Of course, it completely disregards this element which I have emphasized, of recognizing the children, the ratio of children, and differences in incomes.

For that reason it should not be considered if we believe in the equalization principle. The mere fact that you might save a little money in the handling in funds is not related to the purpose and the goal of this program.

Releasing Federal funds through subtracting a simple percentage would release funds that are not needed.

The disparity is terrific between the wealthier States and the poorer States. Under his bill, as I remember it, Arkansas would get $1 million.

Mr. LANDRUM. One million eight hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HAYS. I forget what California would get, but at any rate, you would not correct this disparity between California and Arkansas.

I use that just as an illustration.

Mr. GWINN. I hate to interrupt so distinguished a member and so good a friend, but we are talking about the real nub of this thing right now.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; we are.

Mr. GWINN. We are struggling with this idea of how the national interest is better served by letting the parents and the local teachers, the school boards, be responsible. We are talking about responsibility. We are anxious about the Federal Government taking responsibility.

Can you imagine any better device for stimulating local responsibility and aid to the children in your State than the reduction of taxation which we gave Arkansas last year?

You are talking about a measly little $4 million of aid to education for Arkansas by this $250-million appropriation which must come out of more taxes.

Last year when we reduced the tax burden generally, Arkansas got back in 1 year $47 million. That is the year 1954, and you spent on your whole public-school program $46 million.

So you got back a million dollars more, which is available to the State, than you actually spent on your entire school program.

Now, that is the way to help the folks back home, take this incredible burden off from Washington, then you have local responsibility. Then you do not have the problem of Federal aid, of Federal control and influence and waste and costs.

Mr. HAYS. Well, the gentleman is very kind in his reference to me and I am sure he knows how I feel toward him. He and I have discussed these things in the spirit of warm friendship which we have enjoyed since he first came here. I am grateful to him.

Mr. GWINN. I thank you for that remark.

Mr. HAYES. That is one thing I always delight to say about my friend from New York. Our differences, of course, are fundamental on this point. But he would let me say this, surely: The Federal Government would not say that because of the grace of the Congress in extending tax relief and helping the taxpayer to that extent that we will be indifferent to these appeals for the schools. It just seems to me that that would be the wrong response. I believe that we helped the economic life of Arkansas greatly by that tax reduction. It stimulated it.

Further, I have given every indication that I do not defend all of my State's policies, or feel that they are to be relieved of burdens.

Now, the gentleman is interested in family life, in social conditions in the less-favored areas, and I have supported those things which would keep my State with a balanced industrial life.

When I say balanced, I mean to keep those fine elements of its agrarian life that tend to be lost when industry overtakes it.

I do not want to say that this is related to that problem, but I do think that a nation which disregards, shall I say, moral values, that inhere in its rural life, that that nation will encounter trouble.

Let me give these figures:

In 1950 the urban areas of the 9 most favored States—they happened to be in the Northeast—had 22 percent of the Nation's children and 30 percent of the Nation's income.

The less-favored area, which was the rural section of the South, of 12 Southern States, had 8.6 of the children and 1.6 of the income.

Now, you find, in other words, that in that favored area there was 19 times the income, and 2½ times the children.

So the favored area gets an advantage of seven and a half times per child over the least favored region. But again I would not withhold from the favored region some help from the Federal Government so that they would deal with their less-favored districts because, while as a group it was favored, as I indicated to Mr. Kearns, I know that there were islands of distress within the favored areas.

Chairman BARDEN. Are there any further questions?

I would like to drop this, Mr. HAYS. That is, the constant and increasing invasion of the State's stores of taxes by the Federal Government has brought us to this rather distressing hour. I see no tendency on the part of the Government to either relax or give any consideration to relief to the State.

I expect last year we spent more in Europe on the field of education than the final bill, if one comes out of this committee, will carry.

Now, I do not know by what process of reasoning people arrive at that illogical conclusion, but we certainly cannot keep on doing things that force the Government to further invade the sources of revenue of the States and expect to relieve the situation in the next 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years.

The gloomy side of this picture to me, in addition to the fact that our schools are in great need—I say that and we must work out some way to help—is that unless this Federal Government begins to take stock a little bit the States will be in worse shape 5 years from now than they are on this very day.

I do not know about the State of Arkansas, but the State of North Carolina has been bled pretty nearly white and we have every form of taxation that anybody could think of and at the present moment the legislature is wrestling with the problem of trying to raise about $26 million additional revenue.

Now, to these folks that just go along and vote for every big appropriation on the theory that we can spend ourselves rich, then they had better turn their light on their own backyards and the States and see where we are going to wind up.

Your State has not any more loose revenue running around in it than mine. The Federal Government took out of the State of Arkansas last year the modest little sum of $148 million in income tax alone.

So I do not know. I join with you in hoping that we can put a limitation on this bill for a certain number of years, but we have the solution of this problem right here in the Congress, and we have the problem right in our laps.

But instead of helping solve it by giving the States some consideration, we talk about, well, we do not want any Federal control over the State.

No, I don't want any; we have too much as it is now.

But let me tell you this: When you are taking all the money from the State that the State needs to run its government, somebody eventually will have to take over and run it because the State will not have the sources of revenue.

I just felt like saying that and that is the sermon I preach often without the slightest provocation.

Mr. HAYS. I always profit by hearing you issue a warning because I know how you feel.

Chairman BARDEN. Well, we have brought about this condition, have we not?

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Chairman BARDEN. And we are going to further aggravate it this year because we are just going right along and everybody is requesting a bigger budget and a bigger appropriation and here comes the foreign bill that will take all the rest of it and create a bigger overdraft.

But we still wrestle with it. I say we are going to have to do something with the schools.

Mr. HAYS. May I make one comment on that? You have been very patient.

Chairman BARDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYS. I feel that sometime, Mr. Chairman, we tend to deplore this centralization in Washington because it is in sharp contrast to the old Jeffersonian patterns. We say the Government is away from the people and we are incapable of making these decisions as responsible servants because of its hugeness.

I think maybe we underestimate our capacity to meet these changes in our society. But you and I are as close to the people down there in our townships as the governor in the State capitol used to be.

We can act with as much sensitivity to local needs as the State government. My feeling is that when a bill is brought out, and I trust that this committee will recommend some form of aid, there is going to be glory in it for all of us, but I actually wish I could be a member of this committee to look back on what is going to be one of the significant events of 1955. I do hope that as it is done we can say that we have not done it with indifference to the dangers that the chairman wisely mentioned, but that we regard ourselves as still equal to that challenge.

For that reason I hope that the committee will defend what it does and will feel that it is something that is historic.

Chairman BARDEN. That is a very fine statement and I think we can meet the challenge, but here is the problem: It is much easier for us to cast a ballot than it is for folks down there to dig up some more money. That is what disturbs me. We passed a resolution out of this committee unanimously that went to the floor of the House and was passed by the House and then went to the Senate and for some reason it died a slow death, requiring this Federal Government to have some central point whereby we could find what this Federal Government is spending in the field of education, and yet, no, apparently somebody has not the nerve to even look at the picture because the best investigation this committee could make from the best research that we put on it, we found that this Federal Government in the field of education is spending more money that it cost to run the entire public-school system of the United States.

That is an appalling fact, yet we apparently have not the nerve to just look at the result of our acts.

So I get very much confused when I see apparently the carelessness with which we continue to invade the State sources of revenue, and I know and you know they are on their knees so far as sources of revenue are concerned.

It disturbs me greatly. Thank you so much.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate your patience with me.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold A. Wisner, First Presbyterian Church, Galesville, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, sometimes Thou doth speak in moments of quiet; at other times Thou dost speak through the work of men's minds and actions. Speak this day, individually, through both these methods. Increase, in the spirits of these now bowed before Thee, a keen sense of their responsibility to 160 million Americans and over 2 billion human beings with divine rights.

Continue building, O God, some of the old wastes, and continue repairing some of the desolations of other generations that this land may be made glad with Thy laws. Establish every work done here that is established on truth and equity so that the hopes and desires of people may be fulfilled.

This day, be pleased to direct and prosper the consultations of this august body.

Forgive, O God, those national sins which do so easily beset us and which issue because of the human element.

Inspire now these representatives of the people who have a noble task to do on this day.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4941. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4951. An act directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn Monday, April 4, 1955, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 13, 1955.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1436. An act to preserve the tobacco acreage history of farms which voluntarily withdraw from the production of tobacco, and to provide that the benefits of future increases in tobacco acreage allotments shall first be extended to farms on which there have been decreases in such allotments.

## THE CAPITOL PAGES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I take these few moments to lay emphasis on a matter which, I know, has not escaped the attention of my colleagues. I believe this year, in this session of the Congress, we have had the finest group of pages I have known in my entire service in this body. They have been courteous, helpful, and friendly. They are a wonderful group of youngsters who genuinely are trying to assist us in every way they can. I feel we should pay tribute to them for their helpfulness and, of course, I include the very fine work of Turner N. Robertson, our chief page, who directs their activities, and without whom I do not know how this great deliberative body would function.

## PARCEL POST

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 3062, a letter from a constituent of mine in which he called attention to some of the silly regulations which have been prevailing for the last 2 years relative to the mailing of parcel-post packages. That incident brought forth many comments from many sections of the country. From one of my postmasters, he mentions:

The elimination of the burdensome law which restricts acceptance of parcel-post matter for first-class offices will be appreciated, I am sure, by all of your constituents. Every day we have to turn packages down. Also our local factory in order