March played "an important and difficult role" during World War I and that "his contribution to that conflict and studious development of plans for demobilization were of great significance."

Born in Easton, Pa., December 27, 1864, March graduated from the United States Military Academy June 11, 1888. Before he became Army Chief of Staff on May 29, 1918, he had served in France as artillery commander of the AEF.

MADE GENERAL IN 1918

March first saw active service in the Philippine Islands in 1898 when he participated in the assault and the capture of Manila. Later, he was detailed to Tokyo, in March, 1904, as military attaché on duty in the field with Japanese troops in the Russo-Japanese war.

When the United States entered World War I, he was a colonel on duty with the Second Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. He sailed for France in May of that year. The following year May 25, 1918, he was elevated to full general.

At his Wyoming Avenue apartment, which was studded with maps and files, March was an assiduous reader and had retained remarkable mental as well as physical agility.

His entire family was together with him last on December 27, where the rail-thin, goateed general observed his birthday with a quiet family party.

Beside his wife, he is survived by 2 daughters, both married to retired generals— Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Immigration Service Director, 3055 Foxhall Road NW., and Maj. Gen. John Millikin, 5915 Ramsgate Road, Woodacres, Md. Three grandchildren also survive.

Funeral arrangements were not completed last night.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 19, 1955]

ONE-MILE CORTEGE AT MARCH FUNERAL

Gen. Peyton Conway March, America's oldest general, was buried yesterday in Arlington Cemetery amid pomp and circumstance reserved only for the Nation's greatest military heroes.

The World War I Army Chief of Staff died Wednesday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90.

Top military, civilian, and foreign dignitaries headed a mile-long funeral cortege bearing the body from downtown Washington.

Included in the special honor guard following the caisson were Vice President Richard Nixon, Bernard Baruch, Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Army Gen. John E. Hull, Army Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, and Representative Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri.

Baruch was chairman of the World War I War Industries Board while General March was Chief of Staff.

A 400-man cadet battalion from the United States Military Academy, the United States Army Band, and the Third (Old Guard) Infantry Regiment led units of all the armed services in the hour-long march from 15th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

Tanks from the Third Armored Cavalry, Fort Meade, Md., and an airborne field artillery battery from Fort Bragg, N. C., made up part of the procession down Constitution Avenue NW., across Memorial Bridge to the memorial entrance to the cemetery.

The general's body, borne in state on a caisson drawn by six white horses, was followed by a riderless black horse with stirrups turned backward in the traditional military service.

On a hilltop overlooking the Potomac, Brig. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Army Deputy Chief of Chaplains, conducted Presbyterian graveside services.

The service, in a grove of maple trees under a cold, gray sky, began as the band sounded Ruffles and Flourishes, then broke into a medley of hymns. General Tobey read the service and led in prayer as soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen held the American flag taut over the coffin.

The flag was folded and presented to General March's widow, who stood with Lieutenant Gen. Stanley Embick and other comrades of the late general near the coffin.

The military units presented arms and a 17-gun salute from one of eight 105-millimeter howitzers in the cortege echoed over the hills.

General March was born in Easton, Pa., and was graduated from the military academy in 1888. He saw action in the assault and capture of Manila in 1898. He became Chief of Staff in 1918 after organizing the movement and supply of the American Expeditionary Force in Europe. He retired in 1921.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 16, 1955]

GENERAL MARCH

Gen. Peyton C. March was the beau ideal professional soldier. His whole life—90 years of it—added up to make a great military career. An honor graduate of West Point, he commanded the Astor Battery in the Philippines in 1898 and returned to the islands to work under Arthur MacArthur in the guerrilla campaigns which resulted in the capture of Aguinaldo in 1901. With the Japanese he saw the Russians beaten at Yalu and Liaoyang in 1904—terrible battles which taught him the importance, in war, of "force, force to the utmost."

This was the philosophy General March put into practice in World War I. The first of his missions in that struggle was to organize the artillery in France. Secretary of War Newton Baker called him home to be Chief of Staff and to weld the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the National Army into a single fighting power. The story of how 2 million men were carried over the Atlantic to smash the Kaiser's mailed-fist defenses and compel his surrender and abdication has been told repeatedly. It may be summarized in the words which General March himself used: "We did it."

But the principal architect of the institutional side of the victory was not the rough, tough, hard, sharp, sarcastic, provocative mechanician some critics supposed. Washingtonians who were his neighbors found him, instead, a courteous, kindly, friendly, modestly chivalrous person. He had his own ideas, his own fashion of getting things accomplished, and he did not like to be crossed. Yet it also was true that he could pull in harness, was a skilled cooperator, and in hundreds of instances a faithful friend of fellow officers. Above all, General March was a patriot. He loved his country and its people.

PSALM 91

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

2. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in Him will I trust.

3. Surely He shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

4. He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust; His truth shall be thy shield and buckler.

5. Thou shall not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

6. Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

7. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and 10,000 at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

8. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

9. Because thou has made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation;

10. There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

11. For He shall give His Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

13. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

14. Because He hath set His love upon me, therefore will I deliver Him: I will set Him on high, because He hath known my name.

15. He shall call upon me, and I will answer Him: I will be with Him in trouble, I will deliver Him, and honor Him.

16. With long life will I satisfy Him, and shew Him my salvation.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1955)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou from whom to be turned away is to fall, to whom to be turned is to rise, and in whom to abide is to stand fast forever: We look to Thee knowing that Thou wilt give us in all our duties Thy help, in all our perplexities Thy guidance, and in all our weakness Thy strength.

We stand poised on the edge of this new day aware of its tremendous opportunities. As we launch out into its depths, may we be conscious of the wisdom in the investment of our time, our talents, and our lives for the betterment of our people and all the people who dwell upon the earth.

Let the zeal for right and truth burn within us and through us, and may there be an indelible mark of goodness upon our time. To this end we dedicate this day of service. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 947. An act for the relief of Carl E. Edwards;

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1002. An act for the relief of L. S. Goedeke;

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen You-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Solomon Wiesel;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of John Jordan;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1202. An act for the relief of Robert H. Merritt;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch;

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1296. An act for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1333. An act for the relief of Ebolya Wolf;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 1338. An act for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Maria Nizzia Costantino;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of David R. Click;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.;

H. R. 1655. An act for the relief of the Wojcik family;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni;

H. R. 1922. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Ingrid Samson;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra;

H. R. 2052. An act for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of William F. Friedman;

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Pietro Murgia;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Daze;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3022. An act for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.;

H. R. 3036. An act for the relief of George P. Provencal;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Eleanor Ramos;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3180. An act for the relief of William Frederick Werner;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Raymond George Palmer;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta);

H. R. 3958. An act for the relief of Louis Elterman;

H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of the Rev. Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop;

H. R. 4418. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon;

H. R. 4454. An act for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran;

H. R. 4506. An act for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4637. An act for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham;

H. R. 4714. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; and

H. R. 5196. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval; and

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 947. An act for the relief of Carl E. Edwards;

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1002. An act for the relief of L. S. Goedeke;

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen You-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1111. An act for the relief of Philip Mack;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Solomon Wiesel;

H. R. 1156. An act for the relief of John Jordan;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1202. An act for the relief of Robert H. Merritt;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1247. An act for the relief of Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst);

H. R. 1255. An act for the relief of Ferenc Babothy;

H. R. 1281. An act for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto;

H. R. 1283. An act for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea;

H. R. 1287. An act for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger;

H. R. 1296. An act for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1333. An act for the relief of Ebolya Wolf;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 1338. An act for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein;

H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Maria Nizzia Costantino;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of Chin York Gay;

H. R. 1393. An act for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.;

H. R. 1400. An act for the relief of David R. Click;

H. R. 1417. An act for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz;

H. R. 1467. An act for the relief of Stijepo Buich;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor;

H. R. 1472. An act for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca;

H. R. 1473. An act for the relief of Eleanore Hauser;

H. R. 1474. An act for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg;

H. R. 1475. An act for the relief of Wing Chong Chan;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Rosa Maria Phillips;

H. R. 1525. An act for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.;

H. R. 1655. An act for the relief of the Wojcik family;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.;

H. R. 1751. An act for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni;

H. R. 1922. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of Ingrid Samson;

H. R. 1974. An act for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra;

H. R. 2052. An act for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.;

H. R. 2068. An act for the relief of William F. Friedman;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Pietro Murgia;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of T. C. Elliott;

H. R. 2893. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corp. of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio;

H. R. 2904. An act for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle;

H. R. 2924. An act for the relief of David J. Daze;

H. R. 2933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh;

H. R. 3022. An act for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.;

H. R. 3036. An act for the relief of George P. Provencal;

H. R. 3066. An act for the relief of Robert V. Biednyh;

H. R. 3069. An act for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina;

H. R. 3070. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Eleanor Ramos;

H. R. 3074. An act for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson);

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3180. An act for the relief of William Frederick Werner;

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Raymond George Palmer;

H. R. 3852. An act for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas;

H. R. 3853. An act for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta);

H. R. 3958. An act for the relief of Louis Elterman;

H. R. 3975. An act for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.;

H. R. 4245. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriquez de Uribe;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop;

H. R. 4418. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon;

H. R. 4454. An act for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran;

H. R. 4506. An act for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.;

H. R. 4536. An act for the relief of John J. Cowin;

H. R. 4637. An act for the relief of Mr. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham;

H. R. 4714. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Harris;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson;

H. R. 5078. An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein; and

H. R. 5196. An act for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch; and

H. R. 2225. An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; placed on the calendar.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Ambasador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Vietnam.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER—MYRTLE BEACH, S. C.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Floyd C. Hammond to be postmaster at Myrtle Beach, S. C., which had been reported adversely.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate for 11 years. This is the fifth year I have been chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This is the first postmaster from my State whose nomination I have reported adversely, and for that reason I ask that the Senate do not advise and consent to the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination, which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported adversely.

The nomination was rejected.

OTHER POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read nominations of sundry postmasters which had been reported favorably.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills,

and the transaction of other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, TO PROVIDE SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RENTAL OF INADEQUATE QUARTERS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WITHOUT LOSS OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military, naval and Air Force installations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR CERTAIN RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL, CARVILLE, LA.

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Veterans' Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Memorial 1

"Whereas it has been stated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture that it is the policy of the present administration to administer our agricultural stabilization and conservation programs with the farmers themselves being given a voice in the supervision and control of such programs; and

"Whereas the State agricultural stabilization committee presided over by Murray C. Colbert as chairman has discharged 3 elected committeemen, suspended 4 elected committeemen, and forced 1 elected committeeman to resign in Texas County, Mo., with just the broad charge of certain irregularities without any specification of what particular irregularities; and

"Whereas at a hearing held by the State committee in February of 1954 on the proposed discharge of certain elected committeemen in Texas County, Mo., one William Young McCaskill, a qualified dealer under the emergency drought feed program and also a special correspondent for a metropolitan newspaper of this State was denied access as a member of the press to such hearing by Murray C. Colbert after the said Murray C. Colbert was requested by the committeemen of the local ASC committee to hold a public hearing; and

"Whereas William Young McCaskill was suspended on February 3, 1955, for alleged irregularities in drought feed certificates and on April 6, 1955, was reinstated after an investigation of the alleged irregularities by the Commodity and Investigation Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service, and on April 7, 1955, the said Murray C. Colbert again suspended William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co., alleging that William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. had made an agreement to circumvent the first suspension; and

"Whereas it has been charged that the State ASC committee presided over by Murray C. Colbert is not operating the ASC committee on an impartial basis free from personalities and pressures; and

"Whereas numerous counties in the State of Missouri have experienced similar wholesale dismissals and suspensions since Mr. Colbert assumed the office of State ASC chairman; and

"Whereas the farmers of Texas County and the State of Missouri are greatly disturbed by the aforementioned actions of the State ASC committee which is definitely hindering the successful operations of such ASC program; and

"Whereas a suspension of a dealer under the emergency drought feed program practically destroys the business of such suspended dealer and does great damage to the reputation of such dealer: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of Missouri*, That the Secretary of Agriculture be memorialized to investigate the activities of the State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen throughout the State of Missouri and the suspension of the said William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers for the purpose of bringing the true state of facts to light and of ascertaining whether the declared policy of the present administration of giving the farmers themselves a voice in the administration of the ASC program is being carried out in Missouri; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 7

"*To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the house of representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in extraordinary session of the 22d legislature assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, on the recommendation of the President, did in 1954 create a Federal Unemployment Fund for the purpose of assisting the States and Territories in meeting unemployment insurance obligations; and

"Whereas in mid-1954 it became apparent that the unemployment benefit fund of the Territory of Alaska would, by early 1955, be exhausted and that its supplementation from said Federal loan fund would be necessary for continued payment of benefits; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Labor, as early as October 4, 1954, and repeatedly thereafter, urged the Alaska Employment Security Commission and the Governor of Alaska to apply for an advance of funds from said Federal Unemployment Account in contemplation of early exhaustion of Alaska's benefit payment fund, which total depletion has now occurred, together with the discontinuance of payments; and

"Whereas in January 1955 the Alaska Employment Security Commission was reported to have requested the Honorable Governor B. Frank Heintzleman to seek such an advance in order to avoid interruption in payment of Alaskan unemployment insurance claims; and

"Whereas by law, application for such Federal loan may be made only by the Governors of the several States and Territories; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Territorial Legislature did in the 22d session regularly assembled urge the Governor of Alaska by resolution adopted on the 28th day of January 1955 that he make immediate formal application for such Federal loan; and

"Whereas it had long been abundantly obvious that absentee controlled financial interests which operate in Alaska and which were opposed to employment security were adamant in their opposition to such an advance and to the continued payment of unemployment benefits; and

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska chose to disregard said house resolution and the need of Alaska's unemployed and destitute citizens, supporting thereby the aforementioned financial interests; and

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska has sought at the expense of Alaska's unemployed to encroach upon the authority of an elected legislature and has for political advantage attempted to embarrass the Legislature and has by coercion, delay, and deliberate direction sought to exert his will upon the elected Alaska Legislature; and

"Whereas the Governor did on the 26th day of March 1955 call a special session of the Territorial Legislature and did therein, in contravention of an opinion of the Territorial Attorney General, attempt to limit the deliberations of the legislators as to both subject matter and time; and

"Whereas on March 28, 1955, the Governor did advise the legislature that he would not seek a loan from the United States unless and until he was given control of the Alaska employment security program by power of appointment of the administrative board thereof and until $1 million was advanced from the Territorial general fund to the employment security commission fund; and

"Whereas, the Attorney General of Alaska in an opinion dated January 8, 1955, had held that in establishing the Federal Unemployment Account the Congress of the United States had clearly intended its use and availability to Alaska, and that there was no legal obstacle to the Governor's making application for such loan; and

"Whereas the Governor, in disregard of said opinion of the Attorney General of Alaska, 2½ months ago sought and has since obtained an opinion from the Attorney General of the United States and did advise the legislature on March 31, 1955, that under such opinion the Territory could not obtain a loan from the United States with which to meet unemployment benefit claims; and

"Whereas the failure of the Attorney General of the United States to render an opinion throughout the period the legislature was in regular session make it clear that his course of action was politically motivated and calculated to support the Governor in his attempt to intimidate the Alaska Legislature, and to force it to enact an employment security program which would deprive the Territory of the program's customary economic support; and

"Whereas in the interim the legislature has passed and sent to the Governor, a prospectively workable and sound Employment Security Act designed to meet the needs of Alaska's unemployed and to restore the Employment Security Fund; and

"Whereas the Governor stated in a message read to the legislature on April 6, 1955, that he 'will now complete the request for the loan,' yet in reliance on the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, suggested that such application would be ineffective without further legislation by the Congress; and

"Whereas it is clear to the legislature that only a Governor who is not answerable to the people may for political purposes so completely disregard the people's welfare.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the house of representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in extraordinary session of the 22d legislature assembled, earnestly petitions the Congress of the United States to make clear to the Attorney General of the United States, by special enactment, its already known intent that Alaska, like other jurisdictions, is entitled to make application for, and to receive the benefits of, Title XII of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"In full confidence that the Congress will so make clear to the Attorney General of the United States that Alaska was intended to participate in said title XII, along with the rest of the United States, the territorial legislature has authorized a temporary advance of $2 million from its general fund to meet immediate need for payments to those of Alaska's workers who are now unemployed.

"And it is further requested that the facts above recited be examined by the Congress in terms of their bearing on statehood for Alaska and the right of a free citizenry to elect a Governor who will be responsible to their needs, interests, wishes, and welfare.

"And it is further requested that the Congress investigate the flagrant abuse of the power and prestige of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Governor of Alaska for deliberate political purposes at the expense of Alaska's people and economy, to accommodate absentee-controlled interests, and to intimidate and harass elected representatives of resident Alaskans.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house, April 7, 1955.

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

"Attest:

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

A letter in the nature of a petition from William H. Banck, of Washington, D. C., relating to the election of successors to the Congress for Members who have died or resigned from office, and the establishment, under the Comptroller General, of an office to receive suggestions from the people on national affairs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Grass Valley (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, Inc., approving the development of hydroelectric power on the Trinity River, Calif., by local enterprise; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the air pollution control board of the air pollution control district of the county of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds to complete the study now in progress by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, concerning identification of atmospheric contaminants; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Frank A. Hourihan, of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to commend by joint resolution the purposes of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation in establishing a national living memorial to the American Indian in the State of New Mexico

"Whereas there is at the present time no national living memorial to the American Indian commensurate with the great debt our Nation owes to the first inhabitants of this great Nation; and

"Whereas there has been chartered by the State of Michigan a nonprofit corporation named the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for the purposes of constructing such a memorial as conceived by sculptor E. Harlan Daniels; and

"Whereas the memorial, so conceived, shall forever acknowledge the contribution made to our Nation by these first American citizens, shall enlighten the American people on a civilization that is basic to our American heritage, and shall foster the collection and preservation of relics, artifacts, and documented knowledge of the Indian race in America; and

"Whereas the board of trustees of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation has by resolution dedicated the foundation to the placement of the memorial in the State of New Mexico and has received assurances of support from various prominent citizens and civic organizations in said State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to enact a joint resolution commending the purposes of the memorial to the American Indian Foundation in the furtherance of this great project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.

"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 16th day of March 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A STRONG AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—RESOLUTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution in support of a strong American merchant marine, which was adopted by the 29th Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held here in Washington, on January 13, 14, and 15, 1955.

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

RESOLUTION 26—SUPPORT OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Whereas disturbed world conditions of the moment, resulting from the aggressive ideologies of international communism, make it imperative that our Nation take all possible steps to safeguard its security and to strengthen its position as the ultimate bastion of world freedoms; and

Whereas in the building and maintenance of a Military Establishment adequate to defend the United States from any and all aggression, cognizance must be taken of the strategic part our privately owned merchant fleet has played in two world wars and during the hostilities in Korea, and must inevitably play in any future wars; and

Whereas the increasing competition of low-cost foreign shipping in this sphere of world transportation focuses attention upon the difficulties faced by American-flag shipping in its efforts to serve the foreign-commerce needs of our people in peacetime, and to strengthen its position so as to be ready to meet any national emergency demands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegation to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., in convention assembled, put themselves on record formally as recognizing the urgent need for public and congressional support of the American merchant marine and ship-construction and repair industries, to the end that proper and sufficient Government participation be forthcoming to insure a long-range program of ship construction, vitally needed to keep the American merchant fleet modern and competitive in peacetime and adequate to serve national security requirements.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1516. A bill to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 205).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 998. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla. (Rept. No. 212);

H. R. 2839. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 213); and

H. R. 4356. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history (Rept. No. 214).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H. R. 4647. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 211).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1079. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests (Rept. No. 207).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1372. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen (Rept. No. 208).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 153. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; with an amendment (Rept. No. 209); and

H. R. 1573. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 210).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1628. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; with amendments (Rept. No. 206).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1737. A bill to amend section 7 of article I of title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, relating to inheritance taxes;

S. 1738. A bill to amend section 2 of article I of title V of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, relating to inheritance taxes;

S. 1739. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix rates of compensation of members of certain examining and licensing boards and commissions, and for other purposes;

S. 1740. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; and

S. 1741. 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. BUTLER:

S. 1742. A bill to incorporate the American Association of Firemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1743. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benjamin Jacob Massouda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1744. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and thus to further assist educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1745. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Nellie Ohlerking Archambeau Moran; and

S. 1746. A bill continuing the Indian Claims Commission to April 10, 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MURRAY) (by request):

S. 1747. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 1748. A bill to authorize the appointment of Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1749. A bill adopting and authorizing the improvement of Rockland Harbor, Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KILGORE (by request):

S. 1751. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

S. 1752. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of bailiffs in the district courts;

S. 1753. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; and

S. 1754. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1755. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1756. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to permit the making of payments to farmers for certain water-conservation practices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1757. A bill to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946;

S. 1758. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans; and

S. 1759. 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 and Forestry.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1760. A bill to require compliance with the National Labor Relations Act as a condition of receiving Government contracts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1761. A bill to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to members of the Capitol guide force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1762. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1763. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1764. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

S. 1765. A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1766. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 to make loans available to certain junior colleges to provide housing for students and faculties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1767. A bill providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1768. A bill to extend to persons entitled to receive medical care by or through the Veterans' Administration the right to elect to receive chiropractic treatment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1769. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the South Carolina coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of protecting human lives and property from hurricane winds and tides; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1770. A bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of wheat marketing certificates; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO HOUSING FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and thus to further assist educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining its provisions, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1744) to amend title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and thus to further assist educational institutions in providing housing and other essential facilities for their students and faculties, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. (a) To assist educational institutions in providing housing and other educational facilities for their students and faculties the Administrator may make loans of funds to such institutions for the construction of such facilities: *Provided*, That (1) no such loan shall be made unless the educational institution shows that it is unable to secure the necessary funds for such construction from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title, and (2) no such loan shall be made unless the Administrator finds that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner, and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

"(b) Any educational institution which, prior to the date of enactment of this act, has contracted for housing or other educational facilities may, in connection therewith, receive loans authorized under this title, as the Administrator may determine: *Provided*, That no such loan shall be made for any housing or other educational facilities, the construction of which was begun prior to the effective date of this act.

"(c) A loan to an educational institution may be in an amount not exceeding the total development cost of the construction, as determined by the Administrator; shall be secured in such manner and be repaid within such period, not exceeding 50 years, as may be determined by him; and with respect to loan contracts entered into after the date of enactment of the College Housing Amendments of 1955 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Administrator which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2¾ percent per annum, or (2) the total of ¼ of 1 percent per annum added to the rate of interest paid by the Administrator on funds obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (e) of this section.

"(d) To obtain funds for loans under this title, the Administrator may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $500 million: *Provided*, That the amount outstanding for other educational facilities, as defined herein, shall not exceed $100 million.

"(e) Notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations issued to obtain funds for loan contracts entered into after the effective date of the college housing amendments of 1955 shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not more than the higher of (1) 2½ percent per annum, or (2) the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the issuance by the Administrator and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as may be necessary, together with loan principal and interest payments made by educational institutions assisted hereunder, for payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this section."

SEC. 2. That subsection (c) of section 404 of title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Development cost' means costs of the construction of the housing or other educational facilities and the land on which it is located, including necessary site improvements to permit its use for housing or other educational facilities."

SEC. 3. That section 404 of title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection (h):

"(h) 'Other educational facilities' means (1) new structures of a self-liquidating nature suitable for use as cafeterias or dining halls, student centers or student unions, infirmaries or other inpatient or outpatient health facilities, and for other essential service facilities, and (2) structures of a self-liquidating nature suitable for the above uses provided by rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing structures which are otherwise inadequate for such uses."

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "College Housing Amendments of 1955."

The statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

In 1950, upon the initiative of my friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Congress recognized the critical housing need of students and teachers in colleges and universities all over the country. To help meet this need, the Housing Act of 1950 inaugurated a program of long-term loans at low interest rates to provide funds for the construction of dormitories and residences at rentals which college students and teachers could afford to pay. Because of the war in Korea, the program did not become effective until 1953. A complete summary of the program, as it has operated to date, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 4, 1955, by our colleague from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

I have studied this summary and have studied data expressing the continuing critical housing situation facing our colleges and universities, and am convinced that the college housing program should be strengthened. Here are some of the factors which lead me to such a conclusion:

1. Increasing enrollment: In the fall of 1954 enrollment in our higher educational institutions reached approximately 2.5 million—an all-time high. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this enrollment will rise steadily. By 1960, enrollment will reach 3 million—an increase of about 20 percent over 1954. By 1965, it will reach about 4 million—an increase of about 60 percent over 1954. This increase of prospective students is inevitable, and is attributable to our normal population growth accentuated by the high birth rate of the 1940's.

2. Present inadequacy of college housing: Not only is present housing inadequate to meet the need for future enrollment—it is inadequate for enrollment in 1955. Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, reports that old barracks and other temporary structures pressed into use in the late 1940's are deteriorating beyond use. He says that, "Many of these must now be removed because they are fire hazards, uneconomical to maintain, and because the special permits under which they were erected have expired."

In March of this year the Tenth National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by a department of the National Education Association declared that present housing facilities are entirely inadequate for present and anticipated enrollments. The conference further declared an equally critical need for buildings to house other self-liquidating services such as cafeterias and dining halls. At the close of my remarks I will introduce the complete text of resolutions adopted by the conference.

(See exhibit A.)

Further evidence on this point is revealed by a recent survey of the financial status of colleges and universities of the United States. This survey was made by the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., and was released on April 3, 1955. The council is a nonprofit organization established by leading businessmen to encourage greater financial support of higher education in this country.

The council surveyed roughly two-thirds of the Nation's degree-granting institutions—including all of the best known colleges and universities. The purpose of the survey was to assemble information which would help business concerns decide the amounts and types of contributions to make to colleges and universities in need of financial assistance—not loans, but outright gifts. Consequently the findings cover all phases of income and expenditures of these institutions. While I will not repeat the council's report in its entirety, I will call attention to some of their more alarming findings:

(a) At least one-half of the Nation's colleges and universities are operating in the red—average annual deficits range from $30,000 to $194,000.

(b) These deficits cannot be cured by raising charges to students—to do so would deny higher education to too many worthy students.

(c) Scholarships are financed primarily from general revenues—not from gifts and endowments.

(d) Average annual salaries of undergraduate teachers in the nine categories of institutions surveyed range from $3,737 to a high average of $5,462. Teachers in graduate schools average a little higher—ranging from

$5,112 to $6,371. On the whole, teachers in tax-supported institutions receive higher pay than those in independent schools.

(e) The 753 institutions surveyed were asked to express their need for funds in terms of preferred usage, i. e., buildings, endowment, salary increases, scholarships, new equipment—all but one category of institution placed capital funds for buildings at the top of this list.

(f) Six hundred and thirty institutions reported their need over the next 10 years for buildings, improvements, equipment, and maintenance to be over $2½ billion—or an average of over $4 million per institution.

The total impact of this survey reveals a need for funds for all purposes—but the greatest need is for buildings. These operating deficits, the ridiculously low salaries for teachers, and the shortage of buildings of all kinds exist right now.

3. Prospects for meeting this need: Enrollment is rising, present buildings are inadequate, and new buildings must be provided. New buildings cost money and there are only two sources for this money—gifts or loans. Gifts and grants can be made and are being made—by individuals and by both private and public corporate bodies. But these gifts and grants have not been sufficient in the past, are not sufficient now, and will not be sufficient in the future. This means that a significant portion of the necessary money must be obtained by loans.

Borrowed money cannot serve its full purpose in this program unless it can be repaid from the income of the buildings so provided. The record clearly shows that private loans are not available in sufficient quantity and at terms and interest rates necessary for self-liquidation of these buildings. Consequently, the only solution I can see is for the Congress to strengthen and liberalize the college housing program. The bill I will offer proposes necessary changes in this program.

BILL TO EXPAND AND LIBERALIZE THE COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

In approaching this matter of college housing, I have mentioned some of the general problems facing our educational institutions. My bill is not designed to solve all of these problems, but deals with only one small phase—what we might call the buildings for necessary services to students and faculties without which the institutions could not function. The Housing Act of 1950, as amended, established a program under which colleges and universities can borrow money from the Federal Government to construct dormitories and residences for students and faculty members. The loans can be for as long as 40 years and are subject to an interest rate determined by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The total of all loans cannot exceed $300 million and no more than 10 percent of the money may be borrowed by institutions in any single State.

The bill which I introduce makes the following changes in the present law:

1. It expands the purposes for which loans may be made to include cafeterias, dining halls, infirmaries, student unions or student centers, and other essential "service" buildings, all of which are capable of self-liquidation;

2. It increases the maximum term of the loans to 50 years;

3. It fixes the interest charge to the colleges at a reasonable rate, but at a rate lower than that available under the present law;

4. It fixes the interest charge to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator at a fair return to the Treasury, but at a lower rate than he is now forced to pay;

5. It fixes the conditions under which Federal loans may be denied on grounds that comparable private loans are available; and

6. It increases the overall ceiling on loans to $500 million.

Each of these changes is necessary and can be justified.

The first change recognizes that cafeterias, dining halls, and infirmaries are just as essential to the college campus as classrooms and dormitories. Such buildings must be financed by private or public gifts or grants, by general college revenue, or by income from the services which the buildings provide. There is no other way. Gifts and grants are apparently not forthcoming in sufficient quantity and general revenues cannot be spread to cover the cost of these buildings—which leaves self-liquidation as the only reasonable alternative. These buildings can be substantially self-liquidating if they are financed by long term loans at low interest rates.

The second change lengthens the maximum term to 50 years. This is not to say that all loans shall be for 50 years, but where such a term is required, it should be available. Permanent buildings, soundly constructed, and conscientiously maintained, can endure far beyond 50 years. I will present a table later in this statement to show the real advantage that accrues to students and faculty, from the standpoint of monthly charges, by increasing the term of a loan.

The third change is perhaps the most important—the interest rate to be paid by the colleges. Under the original law, this interest rate was fixed as ¼ of 1 percent above the interest rate in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or more. Under this policy, effective until the law was changed in 1953, the interest rate averaged at approximately 2.88 percent.

Then came the so-called hard money policy. The law was changed in the 83d Congress to give discretion to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in this matter of interest. I am sure you can imagine what happened—the interest rate went up. This same law in 1953 also gave the Secretary of the Treasury discretion regarding the amount he could charge the HHFA—which also had an upward effect on the interest charge to colleges. As a result, since mid-1953 the interest rate has averaged at approximately 3.26 percent. This rise is made even more significant in view of the fact that, because of the Korean emergency, the program was deferred and most of the loans have been made at the higher rates.

The following table, prepared in the HHFA, illustrates the effect which higher interest rates has on charges to students. The table also shows the effects of short term as opposed to long term loans:

Annual rental (9 months) required per student for self-liquidating residence hall at various rates of interest and terms of years

(Assumptions: Cost per bed, $3,000; maintenance and operation, $100 per student; vacancy ratio, 10 percent; coverage 1.35 times)

[Computed on basis of no principal payments for first 2 years of loan]

	2 percent	2¼ percent	2½ percent	2¾ percent	3 percent	3¼ percent	3½ percent	3¾ percent	4 percent	4¼ percent	4½ percent
20 years	$412	$418	$425	$431	$438	$446	$452	$460	$467	$474	$481
25 years	358	363	371	378	384	392	399	407	414	421	429
30 years	322	330	337	343	351	359	366	373	381	389	397
35 years	298	306	313	320	328	335	343	351	359	368	376
40 years	281	289	296	303	311	319	327	336	343	352	360
45 years	268	276	283	291	299	307	315	323	332	341	350
50 years	258	266	273	281	289	296	306	314	323	332	341

This table shows that money borrowed at 2¾ percent interest for 50 years will provide shelter at approximately $31 per month. Loans for 40 years at 3½ percent interest (the present private loan rate which, if available, will cause the HHFA to refuse a loan) will provide shelter for approximately $36 per month. Five dollars per month savings for shelter alone is significant in determining whether a young man or woman can afford to go to college.

I believe that the public interest justifies loans at the lowest possible interest rate. Based upon the average cost of borrowed money to the Government during recent years, the interest rate on these loans can be fixed at a maximum of approximately 2¾ percent and still cover the cost of money obtained from the Treasury and the cost of administering the program. Two and three-fourths percent should be a maximum rate and I can see no reason for establishing a statutory rate which varies from month to month or which is subject to periodic revision by administrators of the program.

I agree wholeheartedly with a statement on this matter of term and interest rate in a recent article by Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Cole said: "Even with the 40-year maximum amortization and the current 3¼ percent interest rate provided under the College Housing Program, it is almost impossible to work out projects which are completely self-liquidating from the moderate rentals which are economically feasible for college students today. Nearly every college housing loan requires additional revenues from other debt-free buildings, student fees or other sources. Thus, each institution must work out its own individual solution to a financial problem whose principal components are the construction cost per bed and monthly rent per student." But I cannot agree with the solution which he advocates to relieve this impossible situation. He urges borrowing from private lenders at 3½ percent interest and at terms up to 40 years. Such a solution places an even greater burden on additional revenues to supplement income from the buildings themselves. A more reasonable, and the only practical, solution is to reduce the interest rate and increase the maximum term. By these means it is possible to achieve self-liquidation, which is the goal our colleges and universities are seeking.

The fourth change is concerned with the interest rate which the Treasury charges the HHFA. Prior to the "hard money policy" this rate was as low as 2 percent. I understand that the present charge to the HHFA is 3 percent. With money costing the HHFA as much as 3 percent, it is forced to set its discretionary interest rate to the colleges at some higher amount—and at the present time it is 3¼ percent. Thus the rate to the colleges is a full one-half of 1 percent higher than it was in 1950 when the program started. This rise is largely attributable to the manner by which the Treasury has exercised its discretion under the law.

For this reason I propose that this discretion be removed and that the statute fix a fair charge for money made available to HHFA. I think that 2½ percent is a fair charge. This exceeds the average cost of money obtained by the Treasury. If by any

chance this cost should rise above 2½ percent, the bill provides that the charge to HHFA and the charge to the colleges will rise correspondingly.

If the HHFA can obtain money from the Treasury at 2½ percent and lend to colleges at 2¾ percent, the return of one-fourth of 1 percent should be sufficient to offset the costs of administration.

The fifth change is to correct what I think has been an unwise use of discretion granted under existing law. As now written, the law requires the HHFA Administrator to turn down any loan application if the applicant can obtain a private loan upon "comparable terms and conditions." This concept of "comparability" is not defined in the law and is left to the discretion of the Administrator.

Up until July 1954, this discretion was exercised by a decision to deny any application if a private loan was available at not more than one-tenth of 1 percent above the rate being charged by the Administrator. In July 1954, however, this policy was changed and the private interest rate is determined to be "comparable" if it is not more than one-fourth of 1 percent higher than the rate being charged by the Administrator.

The Administrator's rate is now 3¼ percent, and this "comparability" policy means that the Administrator will not make a loan if a private lender offers money at 3½ percent. To my mind, this does not represent "comparable terms and conditions." Consequently, I propose a change in law to require that private loans be judged comparable only if their terms and conditions are equal to or better than the terms and conditions provided herein for Federal loans. If colleges need long-term loans at 2¾ percent interest, and I believe they do, then I think private lenders should meet this need or stand aside for the Federal loan.

The sixth change proposes to increase the statutory ceiling on funds available for these loans from $300 million to $500 million. This increase is essential and is but a small percentage of the total funds required for construction of residential and other service buildings on our college campuses over the next few years. These funds are not for gifts or grants—but are for loans at reasonable interest rates.

I am aware of the recent report of the Hoover Commission which recommends that this program be discontinued. But I believe that the Commission must have misunderstood the intent of the Congress when it started this program in 1950. On March 14, the Hoover Commission transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives a 126-page Report on Lending, Guaranteeing, and Insurance Activities of the Federal Government. On page 42 of this report there appears the following statement:

"In its consideration of the Housing Act of 1950, Congress was aware of the influx of GI students, though no reference to them is made in the act. Since then, any GI emergency has passed and this lending activity is only one of general aid to colleges and universities. The demonstrated ability of colleges to secure such loans elsewhere compels us to conclude that this program is no longer necessary. Recommendation No. 15—That the program of loans for college housing be terminated."

The Commission states that although the Housing Act of 1950 did not mention the need to house college students who are GI's, the Congress was aware of the housing needs of such students. The argument goes on to say that since the GI student emergency has passed, the college housing program is nothing more than general aid to colleges and universities. The obvious implication is that this program was for the GI emergency need only and that, therefore, the program is no longer necessary. Such an implication does not convey my understanding of the situation.

I have carefully reviewed the initial bills, the hearings, the reports, and the debates leading to the enactment of that portion of the Housing Act of 1950, known as the college housing program. This research makes it perfectly clear that the legislation was in no way predicated upon the enrollment of students receiving assistance under the GI bill. The only significant references to GI enrollment made the following points:

1. That enrollments would continue to rise in spite of the predicted and inevitable decline of GI enrollment;

2. That the emergency shacks utilized to meet the large influx of GI students in 1946, 1947, and 1948, were rapidly approaching dilapidation;

3. That although the housing need was not predicated upon GI enrollment, their needs did contribute to the urgency of the program; and

4. That far from being a GI housing program, the legislation was in fact the first peacetime Federal aid to higher education.

Furthermore, according to statistics of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, the ratio of GI enrollment to total college enrollment was at its peak in 1946—4 years before the Housing Act of 1950. This ratio has steadily declined since 1946. In 1946 the ratio was a little over 52 percent. By 1950 it had declined to 25 percent. By 1954, the peak year of total college enrollment, the GI ratio was down to 15 percent—and this includes Korean veterans. If limited to World War II veterans, which is what the word "GI" meant in 1950, the ratio was only 3 percent in 1954. (At this point in my remarks I would like to insert a table based upon information supplied by the Federal Security Agency.)

Fall enrollment—1939–60

[In thousands]

Year	World War II veterans	Korean veterans	Nonveterans	Total
1939			1,365	1,365
1941			1,180	1,180
1943			733	733
1945			1,074	1,074
1946	1,081		997	2,078
1947	1,122		1,216	2,338
1948	1,011		1,397	2,408
1949	860		1,597	2,457
1950	574		1,723	2,297
1951	389		1,727	2,116
1952	233		1,915	2,148
1953	143	145	1,962	2,250
1954	80	290	2,130	2,500
1955 [1]				2,591
1956 [1]				2,692
1957 [1]				2,776
1958 [1]				2,847
1959 [1]				2,940
1960 [1]				3,057

[1] Estimates.

The expansion of the facilities of our colleges and universities is central to the continued freedom and prosperity of our Nation. The programs of these institutions must be available to ever-increasing numbers of students and at prices they can afford to pay. The public interest demands that this expansion occur. The Federal Government can assist by outright gift, by subsidizing students, or by lending at low interest rates. This lending is the very least we can do, and I think that it must be done. I hope I can count on every Member of the Senate to support this necessary legislation.

EXHIBIT A

TENTH NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION SPONSORED BY ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 2, 1955

CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

College and university housing

Whereas the present housing facilities on college and university campuses are entirely inadequate for present and anticipated enrollments despite the welcome assistance already given by the college housing program, title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.); and

Whereas, the regulations under which title IV of the Housing Act, 1950, now operates prevent the program from being fully practical for self-liquidating projects: Be it

Resolved, That the 10th National Conference on Higher Education recommend a modification of the regulations governing the use of the funds by providing for the lowest interest rates consistent with the original act; reducing the reserve fund requirement to the lowest reasonable level; and by making available as soon as possible the full amount of the funds provided under the act; and

Whereas the 1953 amendment to title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 gives discretionary power to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to change the interest rate, thus introducing further elements of uncertainty for the colleges in the effective operation of the law: Be it

Resolved, That the 10th National Conference on Higher Education recommend that title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, be further amended to withdraw the discretionary power of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to change the interest rate.

College and university facilities for auxiliary services other than housing

Whereas the existing facilities for auxiliary services other than housing on college and university campuses fall far short of meeting the needs of present and anticipated enrollments; and

Whereas facilities for auxiliary enterprises of colleges and universities may be of a self-liquidating nature: Be it

Resolved, That the 10th National Conference on Higher Education urge amendment of title IV of the Housing Act, 1950, to include financing the construction and equipment of facilities for auxiliary services other than housing on college and university campuses.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO WHEAT MARKETING PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the past few months, I have received many letters from wheat growers in Kansas and other sections of the Nation expressing concern over the possible defeat of the wheat quotas or the extension of the wheat marketing program, on which the wheat growers will ballot next June.

I believe everyone must agree that a substantial reduction in the parity loan price for wheat would have serious repercussions. These repercussions would be felt not only in the wheat-producing sections of the Nation but would have a disturbing effect on our entire economic structure. Such a reduction would most certainly endanger the entire farm program.

Under these circumstances, I think it is incumbent on the Congress to give serious consideration to some program that would be available in case this situation should develop.

I am today introducing a domestic parity plan, or what is sometimes called a two-price plan or a certificate plan for wheat.

Under the domestic parity plan the grower would receive parity prices for

wheat used in domestic human consumption and the remainder of the crop would seek its own price level in the market for feed, export, and industrial uses.

In the case of wheat the present supply situation presents problems, which cannot be avoided regardless of what kind of a program is in effect. It is essential that in the case of wheat, we have a strategic reserve, which in my opinion should be at least 500 million bushels.

On July 1 it is estimated we will have a carryover of approximately 900 million bushels of wheat. This would mean that our problem would be to distribute 400 million bushels of wheat, plus whatever increase over the reserve we accumulate with the 1955 crop.

Regardless of what program may be in effect, we will have this surplus to contend with until we have been able to reduce it to sizable proportions.

I do not contend that the bill I am presenting is flawless and I have no doubt that full hearings and a complete and searching study will suggest changes in the legislation I have proposed.

On the other hand, I firmly believe that the principle embodied in this bill merits the fullest consideration by everyone interested in the future of the wheat grower and agriculture as a whole.

It seems to me that the greatest single advantage of the program is that it would take the Government out of the business of buying wheat. There would again be an open market for wheat, where the price—whether for domestic use or for export—would be determined by buyers and sellers with reference to the demand and supply of the various kinds and qualities of wheat.

It seems to me this is far superior to the present system of support purchases by the Government which has led to the expensive and wasteful accumulation of huge supplies of wheat in Government storage.

The domestic parity certificate plan would protect the parity relationship between the cost of things the farmer buys and the price he receives for the products he sells for consumption in the domestic market, without the Government itself having to provide the market for wheat.

The provisions of this bill would not result in dumping wheat on the domestic feed market. The provisions in this bill for a floor under surplus wheat prices would protect the feed grain producer from undue competition. I doubt that wheat moving into feed uses under this proposal would exceed by more than from 3 to 5 percent the total feed grain supply.

Increased exports and expansion of markets are the only hope for the wheat producer, unless we are prepared to cut back production and continue heavy export subsidies.

A sound program must enable the producers to gain access to these expanded outlets without sacrificing a fair return for wheat used and consumed domestically.

The domestic parity or certificate plan is one that I feel should have the immediate consideration of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement in regard to the advantages of this program be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1750) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, 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 2, title III, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: "Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates"; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: "Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Provisions and Appropriations"; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C a new subtitle D, as follows:

"SUBTITLE D—WHEAT MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS

"SEC. 380a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"SEC. 380b. Not later than July 1 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"APPORTIONMENT OF DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTA

"SEC. 380c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of wheat in each State during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 percent thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the 5 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for adverse weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of the normal yield of the acreage planted to wheat during such 3-year period. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"MARKETING CERTIFICATES

"SEC. 380d. (a) The Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 380c of this act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates in such quantities as may be required to persons processing wheat into food products. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 380b of this act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price and the estimated farm price for wheat, and (2) the value of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of the marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of June immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and

importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"MARKETING RESTRICTIONS

"SEC. 380e. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issue pursuant to section 380 of this act have been acquired by such person.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act have been acquired by such person.

"(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"(e) As used in section 380e of this title, the term 'marketing' means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat.

"CONVERSION FACTORS

"SEC. 380f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"CIVIL PENALTIES

"SEC. 380g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 380e of this act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"ADJUSTMENTS IN DOMESTIC FOOD QUOTAS

"SEC. 380h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 380d of this act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 380d of this act.

"REPORTS AND RECORDS

"SEC. 380i. (a) The provisions of section 373 of this act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"REFERENDUM

"SEC. 380j. In the referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1956 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than one-half of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and a marketing certificate program shall be in effect for the 1956 and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle and marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall not be in effect for wheat under subtitle B.

"PRICE SUPPORT

"SEC. 380k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat-exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices (excluding marketing quotas) may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates."

The statement presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ADVANTAGES OF WHEAT-MARKETING PROPOSAL

The income-certificate plan has many advantages not inherent to other programs:

1. It would be self-supporting financially, not requiring congressional appropriations, nor parity payments. It is questionable how long we can expect Congress to continue to put up money to support farm commodities at high levels, and this plan should receive support for the above reason, from the taxpaying public.

2. Part of the wheat crop being available for feed, export and industrial uses should result in increased consumption, thereby minimizing the need for production controls. Each farmer would in effect establish his own allotment according to this own situation and conditions. Some would divert acreage to other crops when it could be done profitably. Some would probably continue to raise wheat in excess of their certificate allotment in areas where other crops could not be used. Some would no doubt prefer to use a part of their acreage for conservation practices rather than raise wheat to sell in excess of the certificate allotment. In other words, farmers would voluntarily make whatever adjustments were practical in their individual setups.

3. Certificates would be issued to farmers ahead of the harvest expense season, thereby helping to finance operations during the high expense season.

4. Farmers would receive their allotted number of certificates regardless of their actual yield for that year, thereby serving to some extent as an income-insurance plan.

5. Millers and other users of wheat would buy their supplies in the open market, through regular trade channels, thus eliminating the need to buy from a Government agency as has been the case much of the time in the past. This plan would not put the Government in the grain business. Since market prices would be at competitive levels, and since millers would not have to put up the money for certificates until first sales are reported, this plan would require less money tied up in wheat stocks by millers.

6. Under this plan millers would again be able to compete in the export market.

7. This plan recognizes the fact that high prices per bushel do not insure adequate income, particularly when compulsory crop reduction is necessary in order to maintain high prices; rather, total income, is the important thing and might be greater with a lower price per bushel, but more bushels to sell, as long as these bushels can be produced economically.

8. Any program that limits production has a very detrimental effect on our whole economy, as it results in less jobs, less services reuqired etc., while the certificate plan would have the opposite effect, creating jobs, wealth, etc., through production.

9. This plan would not increase the cost to the consumer of processed items. The cost of the raw material in grain products is so small that price to the farmer does not have much to do with the retail price to the consumer. At present, retail prices are based on about parity prices to producer and under this plan they would continue in about the same relation to parity, fluctuating as parity changes from year to year.

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, four bills which have been submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Administrative Office of

the United States Courts, and the Secretary of the Army. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the Secretary of the Army.

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

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

S. 1751. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1751 is as follows:)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill entitled "For the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney."

These three men are employees of this Department, employed in the helium activity, Bureau of Mines, at Amarillo, Tex. The purpose of the proposed bill is to relieve these employees of the necessity of refunding to the Government the amounts of $466.57, $923.47, and $66.90, respectively. These sums have been earned by these employees pursuant to promotions given to them on November 8, 1951 (effective November 11, 1951) which the Civil Service Commission subsequently held were in violation of the second Whitten rider set forth in subparagraph (c) of section 1310, act of November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 758). The latter provision required service in grade for 1 year before the employee could be given a 1-grade promotion, or in some instances, a 2-grade promotion. Since the promotions of these three employees were held to contravene the Whitten rider, the employees would be required to refund the excess salaries received during the period that the promotions were in effect. This was so held by the Comptroller General in decision B-119468, of May 5, 1954.

There have been three versions of the Whitten rider. The first Whitten rider was contained in section 1302 of the act of September 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 1066) and was effective from September 1, 1950 until October 31, 1951. It contained no specific provision requiring any time-in-grade before promotion to a higher grade. Accordingly, the three employees mentioned above could have been promoted before November 1, 1951, upon prior approval of the Civil Service Commission. Their promotions, in fact, had been proposed prior to November 1, 1951. Two of these promotions were approved by the Civil Service Commission on October 29, 1951, and the other was approved by the Civil Service Commission on November 1, 1951. The normal administrative processing of the papers resulted in the approval of the promotions by the authorized officer of the Bureau of Mines on November 8, 1951.

Although the second Whitten rider was enacted on November 1, 1951, information concerning it was not received by the appointing officer of the Bureau of Mines at Amarillo, Tex., until November 6, 1951. That office assumed that the approval of the Civil Service Commission constituted approval for the promotions. These promotions were effected by the Bureau and received by the employees in good faith. They have fulfilled the duties of their positions in an excellent manner, and are in no way responsible for the administrative errors made. To call upon them for financial reimbursement at this late date would impose a personal and undue hardship upon them.

Enclosed are copies of this Department's letter of January 4, 1954, to the Comptroller General, and the Comptroller General's Decision (B-119468) of May 5, 1954.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
FELIX E. WORMSER,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

S. 1752. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation and powers of bailiffs in the district courts.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1752 is as follows:)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 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 provide that the baliffs furnished for the assistance of the criers in maintaining order in the district courts shall be appointed by the respective district courts which they serve instead of by the United States marshals of the districts as at present. The present law found in the second and third paragraphs of section 755 of title 28 of the United States Code is as follows:

"Each United States marshal may employ, with the approval of the judge, not exceeding four bailiffs as the district judge may determine, to attend the court, maintain order, wait upon the grand and petit juries, and perform such other necessary duties as the judge or marshal may direct.

"Each bailiff shall be allowed for his services $6 a day to be paid only for actual attendance on days when the court is in session or the judge or jury is present."

Continuous attendance upon a district judge is furnished by a crier appointed by him who, the first paragraph of the section provides, "shall perform also the duties of bailiff and messenger." But there are frequently times when the crier needs to be reenforced in maintaining order in the courtroom, as when there are grand or petit juries to be served, or large numbers of persons are in the courtroom to listen to cases of great public interest. The provisions of the statute above quoted are designed to meet these situations. They provide that the United States marshal may employ with the approval of the district judge the number of bailiffs that the district judge may determine, not more than four, to perform duties of the kind specified. They provide that a bailiff so appointed shall be paid $6 a day for the days of his actual attendance in the court.

There are two objections to the provision. First, inasmuch as the services are rendered to the court of which a district judge is in charge, the bailiffs should logically be appointed by the judge who is responsible for the conduct of the court. Second, the per diem fee now prescribed of $6 is obviously inadequate under present conditions. Furthermore it would seem unwise to prescribe rigidly in the statute the amount of the fee which plainly would be affected by the conditions of the time and better to leave it to administrative discretion, subject to review by the Congress from time to time in connection with the appropriations.

Accordingly the principal changes made by the bill which is recommended are (1) that the power to employ the additional bailiffs would be placed in each district judge presiding over a district court, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Court; and (2) that the rate of compensation of the bailiffs to be paid only for their days of actual service, would be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts under the supervision and direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pursuant to paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 604 of title 28 of the United States Code, as he presently fixes the compensation of other officers of the courts referred to in that paragraph. In order to assure both to the crier and the bailiff the authority of a deputy marshal, the bill provides in the last sentence that "Each crier and bailiff in the performance of his duties may exercise the powers of a deputy marshal" under section 549 of title 28 of the United States Code. That section gives to a United States marshal and his deputies in executing the laws of the United States within a State the same powers which a sheriff may exercise in executing the laws of the State.

Prior to consideration of the matter by the Judicial Conference, it was considered by the Committee of the Conference on Supporting Personnel and the committee submitted the bill which the Judicial Conference recommended and which is enclosed. The bill is believed to provide for a more logical and effective method of providing for the necessary services requisite for maintaining order in the district courts. I trust therefore that it may meet the approval of the Congress and in due course be enacted.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY P. CHANDLER.

S. 1753. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1753 is as follows:)

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington D. C., April 11, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: At the instruction of the Judicial Conference of the United States I inclose herewith a draft of a bill to amend United States Code, title 28, section 2254, relating to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. This legislation has the approval of the Judicial Conference of the United States which considered it at its meeting on March 24, 1955 and directed that it be transmitted to the Congress with a request that it be enacted at the earliest possible time.

As you will see, the bill provides that an application for writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person imprisoned under the judgment of a State court may be entertained by a Federal judge or justice only if it presents a substantial, Federal constitutional question and then only if it has met three conditions prescribed by the subsection: (1) That the question must be one which was not theretofore raised and determined; (2) if it has not been theretofore raised and determined, that the prisoner has not had a fair and adequate opportunity to raise and have it determined; and (3) if the question has not been raised and determined and the prisoner has not had a fair and adequate opportunity to have it determined, that it is a question that cannot thereafter be raised or determined in a State court by an order or

judgment subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari.

The final paragraph of the proposed amendment requires that when a writ of habeas corpus to review a State court criminal judgment is denied by a district court, it may be reviewed only on a writ of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States on petition filed within 30 days of the entry of the order of denial.

The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate the delays and interference with the State criminal law and the consequent resentment on the part of judges of the several States which have arisen through the review by habeas corpus in the lower Federal courts of the judgments of State courts. This problem was called to the attention of the Judicial Conference by the Attorney General of the United States at the instance of the Conference of Chief Justices of the States and the National Association of Attorneys General. The legislation was developed by a committee of the Judicial Conference under the chairmanship of Chief Judge John J. Parker of the Fourth Judicial Circuit with Chief Judge Orie L. Phillips, Circuit Judge Albert Lee Stephens, and District Judges Frank A. Hooper, Edgar S. Vaught, and Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., as members.

In developing the legislation the committee had the assistance of a committee of the Conference of State Chief Justices and of representatives from the National Association of Attorneys General, both of which have approved the proposed legislation and urge its prompt enactment.

For the information of Congress in considering the proposal I am attaching hereto the following reports of Judge Parker's committee which explain in detail the reasons for its urgency: Report to the Judicial Conference dated July 16, 1954, supplemental report, dated September 16, 1954—both considered by the conference at its September 1954 session—and the final report of the committee, submitted to the Judicial Conference at its March 1955 meeting where it received the approval of the conference.

The Administrative Office and members of the Judiciary will be glad to assist any committees of Congress in considering the proposal. We hope that it may have the consideration of the Congress at an early date.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER,
Director.

S. 1754. A bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1754 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1955.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a bill for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr. The submission of this proposed legislation is in accordance with procedures approved by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to reimburse this Reserve officer for the loss sustained by him as the result of damages to his household goods. The loss occurred while the officer was on active duty in the Army of the United States and the household goods were bailed to an agent of the United States incident to transportation in connection with orders releasing Captain Boyer from active duty.

Records of the Department of the Army show that John L. Boyer, Jr., was born at Maumee, Ohio, on August 14, 1921; that after commencing active duty as an enlisted man in the United States Navy on October 7, 1942, he attended the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., and the School of Medicine, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, under the V-12 program; that he was married on February 24, 1945, released from active duty in the Navy on February 4, 1946, and appointed an ensign in the United States Naval Reserve on July 10, 1946; that he received a degree of doctor of medicine from the School of Medicine, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, in June of 1949; that after receiving an honorable discharge from the United States Naval Reserve, he was selected for participation in the Army civilian intern program and appointed a first lieutenant, Medical Corps, Army of the United States on May 26, 1950; and that he commenced active duty in the Army in that grade on June 22, 1950, and, after serving a 1-year period of internship at the University Hospital, of Cleveland, Ohio, he remained on active duty, receiving a temporary promotion in the grade of captain, Army of the United States, on July 13, 1951.

On May 19, 1953, while Captain Boyer was stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., he received orders directing him to proceed to his home of record in San Diego, Calif., on June 28, 1953, and releasing him from active duty effective July 1, 1953. Pursuant thereto, and on orders of the transportation officer, at Fort Bliss, Tex., his household goods were stored in the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer & Storage Co., located at 2301 Mills Street, El Paso, Tex., on May 26, 1953. During the night of June 3, 1953, a fire broke out in this warehouse resulting in extensive damage to and destruction of various property stored therein, including the household goods belonging to Captain Boyer.

Captain Boyer subsequently was released from active duty and, on September 21, 1954, he filed a claim with the Department of the Army under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225; 31 U. S. C. 222c), as amended, for reimbursement of his loss in the amount of $4,075.83. The claim was processed within the Department of the Army under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra. After giving effect to depreciation of the items involved in the claim, it was determined by this Department that the claim was meritorious in the amount of $2,996.89. However, the act of July 3, 1952 (Public Law 439, 82d Cong.; 66 Stat. 322), placed a maximum limitation of $2,500 on the amount which could be paid administratively under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, which was the only statute under which the claim could be considered. Accordingly, Captain Boyer's claim has been allowed administratively in the amount of $2,500, and a check in that amount has been sent to him. After the making of said payment there remains a balance of damages sustained by the claimant in the sum of $496.89, for which he has not been compensated. There is no method by which he may be reimbursed for the remaining portion of this loss except through the enactment by the Congress of private legislation.

All of the household goods, for the damage to which this claim has been determined to be meritorious, were reasonable, useful, necessary or proper for the claimant to have owned and had in his possession under the attendant circumstances. The loss occurred incident to the service while the household goods were bailed to an agent of the United States and without any fault or neglect on the part of Captain Boyer.

On May 26, 1953, when Captain Boyer's household goods were delivered to the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer and Storage Co., in El Paso, Tex., that company, representing United Van Lines, Inc., issued to him a document which apparently insured against all risks of physical loss or damage to the property while it was stored and in transit to San Diego, Calif. However, after the loss was incurred, all liability therefor was denied completely by the Buckner company, both on the theory of lack of negligence and under the purported insurance. Paragraph 13, Army Regulations 25-100, dated August 20, 1953, implementing the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, supra, provides as follows:

"Transfer of rights against carrier or insurer.—Whenever a carrier or insurer denies liability or fails to satisfy such liability and a claim for the property in relation to which the claim is made is approved under these regulations without deduction of the amount for which the carrier or insurer is deemed liable, the claimant by the acceptance of payment of such claim under these regulations will be deemed to have assigned to the United States to the extent of his right, title, and interest in and to any claim he may have against the carrier or insurer and to have agreed that he will, upon request, execute and deliver to the United States a written assignment thereof, together with the original or a copy of the bill of lading or contract, insurance policy, and all other papers which may be required to enable the United States to press the claim against the carrier or insurer. Upon settlement of his claim by the United States, the claimant will be considered to have agreed to refund to the Government the amount of any subsequent recovery from the carrier or insurer."

Inasmuch as the Department of Justice has under consideration the possibility of instituting action against the carrier or insurer, and in order not to risk placing in jeopardy any right, title, and interest in and to any claim which the United States has as a result of this fire, a proviso to that effect has been inserted in this proposed legislation.

The Congress, from time to time, has considered favorably claims of members of the Armed Forces for loss of personal property in excess of $2,500 limitation placed upon administrative payments under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945. Recent cases are Private Law 494, for the relief of Paul G. Kendall (H. R. 5025); Private Law 497, for the relief of Walter Carl Sander (H. R. 685); and Private Law 933, for the relief of Staff Sergeant Frank C. Maxwell (H. R. 7835), all enacted by the 83d Congress. An additional case, S. 3515, for the relief of John B. Gibbons, Jr., was under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, at the close of the second session of the 83d Congress, but it was not acted upon.

The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be $496.89.

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

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACTS TO MEMBERS OF CAPITOL GUIDE FORCE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to members of the Capitol guide force. I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate by the captain of the Capitol guide force relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1761) to extend the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to members of the Capitol guide force, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The letter presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

CAPITOL GUIDE FORCE,
March 11, 1955.

JOSEPH C. DUKE,
Sergeant at Arms,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. DUKE: The Capitol guide force has been trying for some years to settle the problem of its retirement status, we would like to ask you to take up with the proper officials the matter of legislation to bring us under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

As you know, the Capitol guides are governed by regulations of the Capitol Police Board, which require that a minimum of 10 guides and not more than 12 shall be maintained by both the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House. The guides are appointed by the Sergeant at Arms and required to take the oath of office prescribed for Government employees. They are required to wear a prescribed uniform, to report at a certain hour each day and work a prescribed number of hours, and to conduct parties around the Capitol as assigned. A daily attendance record is kept, and the guides are permitted a certain amount of annual leave and sick leave. The attendance sheets, which are transmitted to the Sergeant at Arms of both Houses, serve to record satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress, and the guides are subject to suspension and dismissal by the Sergeant at Arms who appoints them.

The Treasury Department ruled in 1943 that the guides are employees of the United States Government and therefore subject to withholding tax, moreover, the Department, in 1954, ruled that the Capitol guide force was not subject to the penalty provisions of the law because such provisions do not apply to agencies of the Federal Government.

The rulings of the Federal Security Agency with respect to social-security coverage do not in any way aid in determining whether the guides are Federal employees in the legislative branch of the Government, or whether they are self-employed. Heretofore requests have been made to the Federal Security Agency for a determination as to their status. Conflicting decisions have been made. Some of the decisions are to the effect that since the guides are attached to the legislative branch of the Government, and under the Social Security Act of 1950, as amended, only Congress can determine whether or not they are Federal employees. In another decision rendered by the Federal Security Agency, apparently on incomplete set of facts, it was determined that the guides were licensees and were engaged in a trade or business; therefore, they would be considered as self-employed. This has resulted in some of the guides considering themselves under social security, while others do not. Some are paying social-security tax; some are not paying it. In other instances guides have paid the social-security tax, but the monies have been refunded because they are not self-employed. The question of whether or not the guides are covered under social security has in the past and is now confusing.

Apparently the one element of our employment which has caused the Civil Service Commission to consider that we are not covered by the Civil Service Retirement System is the method by which we are paid. This method arises from the manner in which the guide force was established. According to information in the hearings on the legislative establishment appropriation bill, 1926, the Philadelphia Centennial in 1876 caused throngs of people to visit Washington who had not been in this part of the country before. A few persons made a business of showing parties around the Capitol and other parts of the city for a fee. Eventually many complaints arose because of the character and practices of some persons who got into this business, and for the protection of visitors to the Capitol the Capitol Police Board (the Sergeant at Arms of each House and the Architect of the Capitol) decided to appoint special guides for the Capitol. In order to have funds for payment of the guides, the Board directed that a fee of 25 cents be collected from each sightseer, which was to be turned over to the captain of the guides. He was charged with keeping an accounting of the money received and distributing it equally among the guides in payment for their services. That method of payment has been continued ever since, the fee collected being still 25 cents per person, except that 15 cents per person is charged for school organizations. Some years ago the Board put into effect a system of numbered tickets with stubs in order to insure an accurate accounting, and at intervals it has the accounts audited by a certified public accountant.

Our understanding is that the Civil Service Commission does not regard the guides as permanent employees, solely because they do not receive a per annum salary, stating that the Capitol guide force is excluded by section 3 (c) of the Retirement Act which says: "The provisions of this act shall not apply to employees of the Senate or the House of Representatives whose employment is temporary or of uncertain duration unless such employees are appointed at an annual rate of salary." However, while we may not be technically within the Commission's definition of permanent employees, we believe the facts show that our employment is no more temporary or of uncertain duration than many employees who are under the Retirement Act. One guide has spent 40 years on the job, 1 27 years, 1 26 years, and 1 15 years, the average length of service at this time being about 10 years. The amount of salary on which deductions and retirement should be based should not be difficult to determine, since careful records are kept showing the amount actually paid each month to each guide.

The view of the Commission that we are not permanent employees likewise denies us the protection of the Federal Employees' Life Insurance Act of 1954. We believe that the same facts which justify our being considered under the Retirement Act also justify our coverage under the Insurance Act.

If the proper officials are willing to consider legislation to establish that we are under the Retirement Act and the Insurance Act, we believe that a simple bill like the following would do it:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the members of the United States Capitol guide force shall be recognized as employees in the legislative branch of the Government for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; all service on the guide force shall be creditable as service under the act; and the act shall apply to them to the same extent as it applies to employees in the legislative branch who are appointed at an annual rate of salary.

"SEC. 2. The members of the United States Capitol guide force shall be recognized as employees in the legislative branch of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954. The annual compensation for this purpose for each calendar year shall be determined by averaging the amount actually received for the previous calendar year by guides who worked the full regular tour of duty for that year."

Respectfully,

FLOYD KIRBY,
Captain, United States Capitol Guides.

EMERGENCY FARM LOANS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, in connection with the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1764) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum, introduced by Mr. Thurmond, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. THURMOND is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

According to the present law, the Secretary has the authority to determine the interest rates on emergency loans.

It was revealed in the press a few days ago that the Department of Agriculture has raised the interest rates on these loans from 3 to 5 percent. This change comes at a time when thousands of farmers in my State and in other States across the Nation have suffered millions of dollars in crop losses due to recent disasters. The only Government aid available to them is this emergency Government loan program.

No segment of our economy has suffered more severe losses in recent years than our farmers. I strongly feel that those who have been hardest hit by these setbacks should continue to receive these loans at an interest rate of 3 percent annually. They should be given every consideration.

It is contended that by raising these rates by 2 percent, many well-to-do farmers would not be attracted to apply for these Government loans, which, they, in fact, could not qualify for under the law. As I understand the provisions concerning these loans, however, only those farmers who cannot receive aid from private lending agencies are eligible to qualify for Government assistance. Thus, I cannot see the necessity of raising these Government rates to make the loans less attractive to those who are not in need of emergency assistance. I believe this change in interest rates at this time of crisis is an unwise action.

CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

This bill is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department explaining the purpose of the bill.

I ask that the letter of transmittal be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the listing of "Bills introduced."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1765) to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter of transmittal referred to is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1955.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military, naval and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that this legislation is in accord with the program of the President. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would authorize the construction of additional military public works that are urgently needed by the military departments at this time and the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency. Appropriations for construction will be requested at a future date.

Included in this proposal is authorization totaling $254,983,300 for the construction of approximately 17,000 units of family housing that are urgently needed for our military personnel and their dependents. This proposal also requests an adidtional $75 million for family housing to be acquired through the surplus agricultural commodities program. The housing units covered by this proposal, together with the housing authorized by Public Law 765, 83d Congress, constitute the initial stage of what is intended to be a long range housing program which should be a major factor in raising the morale of our military personnel. Moreover, the cost of providing such family housing will be more than offset in the future by savings in appropriations for quarters allowances.

This proposal would also repeal the authorizations for all military public works, with certain exceptions, that are contained in laws enacted prior to October 1, 1951. Such a repeal would eliminate those projects which are no longer deemed to be of sufficient importance to be retained in the military construction program and place that program on a more current basis. It will be a significant step in the development of a realistic military construction program and enable the Department of Defense to clarify its presentations of that program to the Congress. A report to the Congress pursuant to section 408 (b) of Public Law 564, 81st Congress, as to those construction projects which have been authorized by the Congress but which have not been financed is being submitted separately.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

The total cost of the construction, exclusive of the construction of family housing totaling $75 million through the surplus agricultural commodities program, that is to be authorized by this proposal is $2,354,352,300. Of that amount $543,365,000 is for the Department of the Army, $581,197,300 is for the Department of the Navy, $1,173,790,000 is for the Department of the Air Force, and $56 million is for the Central Intelligence Agency. Increases in estimates for construction work previously authorized will call for additional appropriations totaling $91,051,000, including $75 million for family housing to be acquired through the surplus agricultural commodities program.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. BUDDEKE,
Director, Legislative Programs.

ISSUANCE OF WHEAT-MARKETING CERTIFICATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] introduced a bill to amend title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the issuance of wheat-marketing certificates. On behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce a bill on the same subject, but not identical in all particulars.

I shall make an explanatory statement of the bill and an argument in support of it at the next meeting of the Senate.

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

The bill (S. 1770) to amend title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide for the issuance of wheat marketing certificates, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOTIFICATION TO INDIAN TRIBES PRIOR TO CONSIDERATION OF INDIAN LEGISLATION

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore enacted laws and resolutions affecting the social, political, and economic life of the American Indians and the natives of Alaska, including some laws affecting Executive orders, and treaties and agreements between the United States and Indian tribes; and

Whereas said Indian tribes have not in all cases been notified of the pendency of such legislation or accorded full opportunity to be heard prior to its enactment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that no bill or resolution directly affecting the rights, privileges, or property of any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians, particularly rights and privileges guaranteed by Executive orders, treaties, or agreements, should be considered in either House unless such tribe, band, or group has been given notice of the pendency of such bill or resolution and afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard thereon by the committee to which it was referred.

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

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

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

Address entitled "Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom," delivered by him before the second international congress of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, in New York City, on April 17, 1955.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Address delivered by Senator GOLDWATER at commissioning of the U. S. S. *Hassayampa* at Philadelphia, Pa., on April 19, 1955.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by the Chief Justice of the United States at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone commemoration ceremonies, at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Statement by former President Truman before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial with reference to price support and Wisconsin dairyman, published in the Sharon (Wis.) Reporter.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial published in the Oregon Journal for April 12, 1955, concerning the immediate need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska.

INTEGRATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of a report entitled "Integration in the Armed Services," prepared by James C. Evans, civilian aid to the Secretary of Defense. The armed services have made great strides with respect to the elimination of discrimination and segregation within the services, and I feel that this record should be brought to the attention of the Congress and the public.

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

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF JAMES C. EVANS, CIVILIAN AID TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The Negro citizen in the Armed Forces is now utilized on the basis of individual merit and proficiency in meeting the needs of the services.

Throughout the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, fully integrated units have replaced the all-Negro units which, until recent years, formed the only channel of military service for Negro enlistees and draftees since colonial times.

Thorough evaluation of the battle-tested results to date indicates a marked increase in overall combat effectiveness through integration.

Economies in manpower, material, and money have resulted from the elimination of racially duplicated facilities and operations.

The program has advanced more rapidly than had been considered possible in some quarters, and there have been no untoward incidents.

The implementation of policies providing for opportunity among civilian employees lags far behind as compared with Armed Forces integration.

The ROTC, the National Guard, and other civilian components pose complex problems involving some major factors which are beyond military control.

Community relations as regard race are greatly improved, but much remains to be done to harmoniously effect equality of treatment for Negro service personnel.

The military community as such has added new and valuable dimensions to such concepts as neighborhood and brotherhood.

The Armed Forces, within their own sphere, have developed notable examples of racial coordination and integration in housing, transportation, religious worship, schooling, recreation, and other aspects of community life for service personnel and their families.

Segregation has been eliminated in facilities for civilian employees.

PROPOSED STUDY OF EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Wednesday I submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) favoring United States participation in a scientific commission within the United Nations to study certain effects of nuclear explosions and asked that it lie on the table until today to afford other Senators an opportunity to become cosponsors.

Twenty-one Senators have expressed their desire to cosponsor this resolution, which would request the President to work to establish within the United Nations a scientific commission to study the immediate and long-range effects of nuclear explosions on all living things on the earth.

Members of the Senate who are cosponsoring this resolution are: the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

In addition, the resolution has received the full endorsement of the Federation of American Scientists, a nationwide organization of more than 2,000 scientists and engineers devoted to promoting a stable world peace and the proper utilization of science for the general welfare.

The resolution, Mr. President, offers one small step toward world peace. It recognizes that possibly great danger may face all peoples of the world, and calls on the President of the United States to initiate action to look into the matter. Perhaps this is the place where the nations of the world can put aside their differences and; facing a common peril, work together for the good of all.

In offering the resolution I do not mean to imply that harm has yet been done. No one knows. But there is enough concern on the part of reputable scientists to warrant an international study. Nor do I mean to say that we should curtail our testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons. But I do say that we should not be afraid of the facts which may be developed by an international commission. Discovering the facts would, after all, be as beneficial to us as to everyone else in the world.

If adopted, Mr. President, this resolution would help to shift the spotlight from the threat of war and the atomic armaments race to the more hopeful area of human morality. It would serve as a telling blow to Soviet propaganda. It would show to the peoples of the world the true face of America, a warm and friendly face, interested in peace and the general welfare of mankind.

We must face up to our responsibilities by taking the lead in this matter, which is of the deepest concern to all nations. The resolution is a logical follow-up to the President's atoms-for-peace plan. That plan has done more good for America than millions of empty propaganda words.

This resolution could, Mr. President, be of equal benefit to us and to the other peoples of the world.

PURPOSE AND MEANING OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today we hear and read a great deal about the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Unfortunately, much of what is said and printed is based on a misconception of the purpose of this constitutional privilege, or on a distorted adherence to the principle of individual rights, as opposed to the rights of all our people.

An editorial by David Lawrence, published in a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report, puts the whole matter in such correct perspective that it should be required reading for every loyal American who is concerned about the question. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the U. S. News & World Report of April 15, 1955]

THE RIGHT TO SURVIVE

(By David Lawrence)

Much has been said in recent months about the right of the individual under the fifth amendment of the Constitution to decline, for reasons of his own, to testify in formal proceedings.

Very little has been said about the right of the State to protect itself against infiltration by enemy agents seeking to undermine our own Government.

Does the Constitution really grant rights to the individual that are superior to those reserved to the people as a whole? Must a traitor in our midst go scot-free because someone who knows of his whereabouts, or about his plotting, refuses to testify on the ground that on the witness stand he might say something damaging to himself and hence be prosecuted?

Congress wisely met that dilemma by passing a law in 1954 which specifically grants immunity from prosecution to any citizen who is willing to tell all he knows about a suspected crime.

Already a test case has arisen, in which the individual, notwithstanding an offer of immunity, has invoked the fifth amendment and refuses to give to our Government the information he possesses about Communist infiltration. Last week that case was decided unanimously by the United States circuit court of appeals in New York, and the defendant was ordered to tell what he knows. Unless the Supreme Court now reverses this order, the judgment will stand.

For a long time there has been a controversy about the scope of the fifth amendment. It has been rightly argued that under its protection nobody should be required to give testimony that might incriminate him alone. But it has been difficult to understand why anyone should be protected who declines to divulge what he knows about other persons.

If a child is killed by a taxicab, does the driver of another taxicab who saw the accident have the right to say he will not testify because it might give him undue publicity or injure him in the chances of retaining employment from the same taxicab company, especially if it is to be sued for damages on the basis of his prospective testimony? Not at all. He can be summoned to court and required to testify as to what he saw. He cannot evade a subpena.

But, under the peculiar reasoning which has been publicized by some of the leftwing lawyers, a man who knows about a plot to assassinate a high official or to destroy our Government, can remain silent and claim immunity under our Constitution. This would mean that the right of an individual supersedes the right of the state to provide for its own survival.

If perchance the Supreme Court should accept this distorted reasoning, the American people would promptly approve a constitutional amendment to make clear that the state has a right of survival which transcends the refusal of an individual to give up the knowledge he has of someone else's guilt.

Congress gave careful consideration to the immunity law before passing it. There was not the slightest intention to compel anyone to testify against himself. There was every intention to remove the last excuse that Communist sympathizers have for evading an obligation to their own Government. They claim its protection for their own convenience, but are unwilling to recognize their duty to assist in the protection of all the people against a common enemy. Judge Samuel H. Hofstadter, of the supreme court of New York State, wrote recently an article on immunity laws in which he said in part:

"To meet the problem presented by the criminally implicated witness, the practice of granting pardons in advance of the testimony was adopted as early as 1742 in England. The first immunity law was adopted by Congress almost 100 years ago in January, 1857. Since then, immunity has been made available to witnesses testifying to violations of almost every regulatory Federal statute and there are immunity statutes in probably every State of the Union."

We sometimes hear it argued that it is better that 10 guilty individuals should be permitted to escape rather than that 1 individual who is innocent shall carry a stigma of accusation. If so, shall grand juries be deprived hereafter of the power to hand down indictments just because the publicity of a trial may be harmful to a defendant who is later acquitted?

Should a man who steals atomic secrets be allowed to furnish them to another government—which can use them to destroy us—rather than let the authorities risk drawing in some allegedly innocent persons?

It is debatable what the word innocent means. Individuals who have made bad mistakes in judgment by joining organizations later classed as Communists fronts are not disloyal, and they can be forgiven their error. But because of possible inconvenience and the publicity they may suffer—due to their own indiscretions—are they entitled to more consideration than should be given to the safety of all the people?

Clearly the right to survive, especially in a nuclear age, is the paramount right.

EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAXES OF 2,400,000 LOW-INCOME TAXPAYERS IN GREAT BRITAIN—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have noticed a very interesting item in this morning's issue of the New York Times, and I desire to ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD, because it seems to me that the progressive approach of the British Conservative Party to the question of tax reduction contrasts strongly with the approach of the present national administration in the United States.

The British Conservative Party, now headed by Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden, is giving 2,400,000 British taxpayers in the lowest income brackets complete exemption from the payment of income taxes. Yet, Mr. President, when it was suggested here, some weeks ago, that the United States taxpayers in the lowest income brackets be relieved from the payment of income taxes, the suggestion was denounced by the Secretary of the Treasury and by other administration leaders as being totally irresponsible.

The action of the British Government seems to me to be quite significant, and the American people should realize how much more progressive and enlightened is the approach of the new Conservative Prime Minister of the British Empire, to the question of taxation and to the needs of lower-income groups, than is that of the present national administration in the United States.

Prime Minister Eden, who is known throughout the world as a Conservative—in fact, he is even called a Tory by his opponents—is not afraid to remove 2,400,000 low-income British citizens from the tax rolls, because those persons need every penny they can scrape together for food, clothing, shelter, and the other necessities of life. Yet, Mr. President, when a similar proposal was made in the United States, some weeks ago, we were told how irresponsible it was.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, the article from the New York Times of April 20, describing the action of the British Conservative Party in taking this enlightened and progressive step with respect to taxation in Britain.

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

BRITAIN CUTS TAX ON LOW INCOMES; 2,400,000 EXEMPT—PREELECTION BUDGET TRIMS PURCHASE LEVY ON TEXTILES—ALLOWANCES INCREASED

(By Thomas P. Ronan)

LONDON, April 19.—Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler announced sweeping tax concessions today. These will remove 2,400,000 persons from the tax rolls, cut basic rates, and increase personal and child allowances.

At the close of his budget speech in the House of Commons Mr. Butler estimated that these proposals and a cut in the purchase tax on textiles would cost the Government $375,200,000 during the current fiscal year. The cost next year will be $58,800,000 higher.

Even at that, he said, the Government should have a revenue surplus of $414,400,000 this year. This would compare with a surplus of more than $1,200,000,000 during the fiscal year ended March 31, a much higher figure than Mr. Butler anticipated a year ago.

In reaching the figure for the 1955–56 surplus, Mr. Butler estimated total revenue at $13,188,000,000 and total expenditures at $12,773,600,000. Defense expenditures were estimated at $4,304,000,000, including United States aid of $120,400,000.

Because of the imminence of the general election, the speech had been awaited with intense interest and the House was crowded.

AID EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS

Some tax concessions had been predicted, but those announced were broader than most Britons expected. The most important was a proposed cut in the basic rate of income tax from 9s. ($1.26) to 8s. 6d. ($1.19) in the pound ($2.80). This reduces the basic rate of income tax from 45 to 42½ percent. This rate of tax applies to all taxable annual income above $1,400, whether reported by an individual or by a business.

For those with taxable incomes of less than $1,400, Mr. Butler cut the present graduated scales of 98 cents, 70 cents and 35 cents in the pound by 3½ cents. Thus each of the lower scales is reduced by 1¼ percent. These reduced rates do not apply to businesses. The Chancellor estimated that these cuts would cost the Government $285,600,000 this year and an additional $39,200,000 next year.

He also proposed to increase the tax-free allowance for a single person from $336 to $392, that for a married couple from $588 to $672 and the allowance for a child from $238 to $280.

In reducing the 50 percent purchase tax on a wide variety of textiles to 25 percent, Mr. Butler disappointed many in the textile industry, who had been hoping to see this tax wiped out. The tax is paid by the retailer or middleman to the manufacturer and then passed on to the consumer. Because of competition from Japan, India and other nations, the Lancashire textile industry is showing signs of economic distress. Unemployment has been increasing and mill operations have been reduced.

Boxing and other sports promoters were unhappy because the Chancellor had not cut the entertainment tax and there was some criticism of his failure to reduce the levy on gasoline. But the reaction of most industrial, business and taxpayers, groups were extremely favorably.

PRODUCTIVITY TO BE SPURRED

In reviewing Britain's economic situation, Mr. Butler said the country was highly prosperous, but that its balance-of-payments position had deteriorated. To increase production, productivity and exports, it is necessary to give fresh incentive to the forces of growth and expansion, he declared.

He regarded the cut in the basic tax rate as "the most positive and heartening encouragement to all, employers and workers alike, who can contribute energy and enterprise to the development of the economy." To industry this would offer a prospect of tax relief amounting to more than $112,000,000," which should give fresh encouragement to expansion and a keener edge to our competitive power," he said.

"To the individual it offers relief on existing income at all levels of tax liability; and it lightens the burden of tax on any extra income which he may earn by greater personal effort," he continued.

In addition to the usual allowances, British taxpayers are permitted a tax-free allowance of two-ninths of their earned income up to a total deduction of $1,260.

Under the proposed scale a single person earning $4,200 a year with no dependent would pay a tax of $1,053.73 after deducting his personal allowance and the earned-income relief. A married couple with two children in comparable circumstances would pay $696.73.

In the United States the comparable figures would be $665 and $281 for persons using Form 1040 and the tax table instead of itemizing their deductions.

In addition to the basic tax, there is a surtax here that applies to total (not just taxable) incomes above $5,600. This surtax, which Mr. Butler did not touch, is graduated from 28 cents to $1.40 on the pound on all incomes above $56,000.

The tax on incomes over $5,600 would thus take all but 21 cents of the $2.80 in each pound.

CRACKING DOWN ON COMMUNISTS' TAX RETURNS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested for some time in making sure that the fullest investigative scrutiny of the United States Internal Revenue Service is directed at the Communist conspiracy in our Nation.

In my judgment, the tax investigation power offers a vital weapon which should not be ignored or underused in the all-out battle against the law-breaking Communist network in our land.

I send to the desk a statement and attachments on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"Will the United States Government use its fullest powers to investigate tax returns in combating communism in our midst?"

This is a question which I have raised on several occasions with the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and with various other Federal authorities, in both the legislative and executive branches.

In my judgment, the answer to that question must be "Yes."

I believe it is absurd not to use this tax probe weapon, on a group which, from all evidence, is violating our tax laws, just as it has been violating so many other laws.

I believe we could strike the Communist conspiracy where it would hurt the most,

namely, in its financial artery, by turning the fullest light of investigation on Red financial trickery. This is more than a matter of definitely denying tax exemption to Red-front groups; it is a matter of an all-out tax investigation blitz on the Red conspiracy.

Commissioner Andrews in his responses has commented on his organization's prompt followup in denying tax exemption to subversive groups.

He has, however, raised the overall question as to the extent to which the Internal Revenue Service could depart from its regular tax review purpose for an auxiliary objective of assisting in investigating subversive forces financial operations, as such. The question as to just what should be the policy role of the Tax Bureau is in my judgment a very proper one to raise.

However, in my view, the Internal Revenue Service can definitely find it administratively and legally feasible to do what I am asking. It can comply with both the letter and spirit of the law in making the type of comprehensive investigation which I am recommending.

I recognize, of course, that the Tax Service has a job already on its hands with 50 million law-abiding Americans tax returns.

So, I believe, that, if necessary, it should seek additional staff for the purpose which I am recommending today, cracking down on Red lawbreakers. I believe further, that such an investigation could produce very fruitful results, in cooperation with those Federal sources, notably the great Federal Bureau of Investigation, which are necessarily the most expert in meeting the subversive problem, as such.

In raising and reiterating this overall question, on which the Revenue Service has failed thus far to come to agreement with me, I should like to emphasize that I am not, of course, reflecting in any way on the stalwart anticommunism of Commissioner Andrews. He has been vigorously opposed to communism long before most folks were apparently even aware of this menace in our midst.

I should like to say, moreover, that Commissioner Andrews has done a tremendous job in reorganizing and strengthening the Internal Revenue Service, and the Nation appreciates his efforts along this line. I understand that further improvements of tax machinery are in the works.

I believe, however, that the antisubversive recommendation such as I am making today could add further credit both to his service and the Eisenhower administration as a whole.

There follow excerpts from a few of my messages to him. They are preceded by an International News Service dispatch which appeared in, among many other papers, the April 10 Sunday Mirror of New York City. The dispatch is by Rose McKee, and is based upon my contact with Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, along this same line.

As the initial item, I am reprinting important excerpts from the book Men Without Faces, written by Louis Francis Budenz and published by Harper & Bros. in 1948. These excerpts underline the importance of my efforts in exposing Red finances.

MEN WITHOUT FACES

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

The finances of the party were a complete mystery to most of the national committee members. Reports on finances were sometimes given and sometimes not; but it made little difference. As they were presented, very few people could make them out anyway. It was quite clear that a much larger payroll was being met than the party dues and collections could account for. With the complication of district and section financing, for which separate books were kept, the whole thing became completely confounded.

The party always discreetly kept its financial records private until the Hitler-Stalin pact period. Their publication then meant little since they did not include the big secret fund under Robert William Weiner's control. However, that there were huge sums of money in the conspiratorial fund handled by Weiner and the secret committee cooperating with him, I know to be a fact. At times Weiner had deposits amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in various banks. On occasion, William Browder also deposited amounts up to a million dollars, sometimes in his own name. The source of funds was frequently a mystery, further increased by the practice of conveying thousands of dollars in cash back and forth between Weiner and the various unions and other organizations under Red control. These transactions never appeared on the books of any organization since they were so arranged that the money appeared to be in the cash fund of the union or other body making the loan to Weiner.

A basic source of these mysterious funds is from abroad, flowing into Weiner's hands from Moscow. The late Joseph Brodsky was one of the connecting links in this transmission. But the Red international apparatus insists that every fifth column must stand on its own feet whenever possible. What Soviet financial aid does is to make the Communist group a going concern, always sure of capitalization. Whenever a fifth column in any country is in dire need, it receives the assistance it requires. On that foundation, it is supposed to hustle for itself and, by influence with Hollywood stars of a Red tinge, tired businessmen who want a thrill, and wealthy young people who have inherited huge sums, to raise as much money as it can.

In the big Daily Worker drives for the subsidy of $200,000 needed each year, there were large sums of money given to sections and reported as their donation whose original source was vague. In 1944, business manager William Browder reported to me that we had $50,000 in the Daily Worker drive which we did not know how to handle. Weiner had delayed giving it over to us for fear of possible inquiry, which would be embarrassing. For weeks the money was on hand, but the fund-drive reports could not show it publicly. It finally got on the Daily Worker books by allocating it to various local groups.

Week after week Bill Browder as business manager and I as president of the corporation had to work out various ways of getting money for the paper. It was a trying experience, when we knew that $50,000 which could relieve us of most of our effort and worry was lying in the till.

The secret fund was used for a number of purposes. It financed the beginnings of Communist-created front organizations, setting them on their feet and giving them an initial financial advantage over any genuinely American competitor. It was also used to supplement the regular salaries of leading comrades with cash gifts for personal emergencies. Vacation trips, special visits to health resorts, extraordinary medical care, and similar items were paid for in cash by Weiner from this fund. Some comrades bought houses with this assistance; automobiles were also purchased the same way. But a more important use of this huge cash account was to finance the secret and illegal trips of the leading Reds to other countries. It was with the aid of this fund that Eisler, Browder, Dennis, Stachel, and all the others moved into Asia and Europe and back with forged passports. Since the expenses of these trips were laid out in cash and never accounted for, they did not appear on the books of the party. In this particular illegal financial work, Weiner often used the name of "Blake."

Active in the administration of the secret fund with the alien Weiner was a native American whose wealthy family was connected with Wall Street brokerage interests. He was Lement U. Harris, who has long lived in an exclusive section of Westchester County near Chappaqua. From him I learned that this fund helped initiate a number of enterprises, including Barney Josephson's Cafe Society Uptown. The purpose was to make that night club a rendezvous for artists and entertainers and people of wealth, with whom Communists could there establish acquaintance.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 10, 1955]

WILEY PUSHES DRIVE FOR TAX CRACKDOWN ON REDS

(By Rose McKee)

WASHINGTON, April 9 (INS).—WILEY (R.-Wis.), invited the House Un-American Activities Committee today to join with him in pressing for a tax crackdown on Reds and Communist-front organizations.

WILEY, in a letter to House Committee Chairman WALTER (D.-Pa.), said he believes the Internal Revenue Service has the legal right to make such an investigation.

WILEY told WALTER he has had "considerable correspondence" with Tax Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews on the subject.

He said Andrews "has questioned whether his agency can depart from its traditional effort to secure tax revenue for an auxiliary purpose of helping to crack down on the Communist conspiracy."

TELLS OF METHODS

The Senator said former Communists such as Louis Budenz have said that front organizations have collected millions of dollars for one cause or another, frequently transferring the money from one group to another to escape accountability.

He said he had in mind a "blitz type" of investigation that would "hit the Reds where it hurts—in the purse."

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 29, 1954.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you with regard to a very important phase of the anti-Communist effort. I refer to the checking of tax returns of the great number of key individuals, organizations and businesses within the Communist orbit in the United States.

As you know, the Reds have hatched all sorts of enterprises—companies and fronts, have repeatedly transferred funds back and forth between them, and have otherwise juggled their books, according to strong evidence given to the FBI and to congressional investigative groups by ex-Communists.

It seems to me that we could sever the financial arteries of the Communist Party if a special effort were made to investigate the books of at least the major Red groups. In so doing, we could probably interfere with Red espionage in this country, which is dependent on disguised expenditures, of course. While they have probably covered their tracks carefully, an all-out probe would no doubt prove very fruitful.

I realize that this tax probe would be a very considerable undertaking, and that it would require a great deal of personnel. However, it seems to me that for too long, the Communists have been getting away with financial trickery, and that they should be held to account taxwise, as well as in every other way.

I strongly believe that they have broken tax laws in handling the books of their fronts and of their key functionaries, just as they have broken other types of laws, in all their nefarious activities.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible, as to your reaction to this suggestion for an intensified effort in investigating their tax returns.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 25, 1955.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: * * * Since the Internal Revenue Service is necessarily not the most expert source on antisubversion but must necessarily rely on other Federal agencies, I hope that it will actively seek out what I know will be the ready cooperation of these other agencies rather than to sit back and wait for pertinent information to come to it.

As an example of the pressing need for interagency cooperation, I point out that a New York State Joint Legislative Committee has just indicated that three subversive groups—the Civil Rights Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—raised alone, a total of $3½ million, but spent most of it apparently for subversive purposes. What about the National Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg case, and similar well-financed ventures, I ask?

I am glad that action is being taken to deny tax exempt status to such subversive groups, but my feeling is that there is usually such a considerable time lag before these groups can be so officially designated that a great deal of money in the meanwhile pours into the Communist fronts.

I realize, of course, that there is a strict limitation on your available manpower, but I earnestly feel that if such manpower as might be available could be assigned to this task now, our country would reap significant dividends in terms of its security.

Moreover, if necessary, I believe that a request to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees for additional manpower to handle the task might be well received by the Congress.

I am enclosing herewith some remarks which I am making in my State this coming Sunday night, in which I urge an all-out effort.

In summary, I do think that if an investigative "blitz" could be launched on your own initiative against these Communist fronts, we could set the Communist conspiracy back on its heels for quite some time.

* * * * *

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

ATOMIC BOMBS TO U-BOMBS IN 10 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, few subjects are of greater importance to the Nation and, for that matter, to the world, than the rapid development of the destructive power of atomic weapons. A great deal of information on this subject has been published in the press both in this country and abroad. Yet we do not have this information collected in a form that brings home to those of us who are not specialists the full impact of developments in this field.

We need not approach the subject of atomic weapons with fear. On the other hand, we cannot pass it off as just another innovation in military science. Either of these approaches, it seems to me, can lead us into very serious errors of foreign policy.

What we require are the facts on the potentialities of atomic weapons development. We require them, moreover, in a perspective which will enable us to understand the life and death issues that are involved. Then, perhaps, we may have a chance of devising effective policies for dealing with the enormous forces which scientific knowledge is setting loose in the world.

As a step in my own education on this subject I have compiled a study of developments in atomic weapons, as reported in the public press and it is the information so obtained that I wish to make available to the Senate.

I reiterate that the material for this study has been drawn solely from public sources. Enough has been published, however, to make clear that there is an urgent need for a most penetrating study by the Senate as well as the executive branch of the implications of atomic weapons developments for our foreign policy. The time of decision on the question of the survival of civilization, if not human life itself, appears to be drawing uncomfortably close.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this study of developments in atomic weapons be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ATOMIC BOMBS TO U-BOMBS IN 10 YEARS

It is almost 10 years since the first atomic-fission bomb killed 70,000 people and destroyed 2 square miles of the city of Hiroshima in Japan. Since that fateful day the scientists of the free world and those of the Communist world have made astounding advances in the physical sciences. Advances in this Atomic Age have been so great that it is predicted that it is now possible to build one bomb equivalent to 60 million tons of TNT. This prediction was made by Val Peterson, Civil Defense Administrator, in a speech in Chicago on January 25, 1955.

Nine years after the bombing of Hiroshima, on March 1, 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission task group detonated a thermonuclear device of monstrous size. In its widest implications that explosion has not yet ceased to reverberate. A long chain of incidents, ranging from the curious to the tragic, has made it clear that peacetime nuclear explosions may be a possible threat to our well-being. Storm signals from earlier atomic tests such as fogged photographic fields and radioactive rain have given way to the storm—which has already resulted in the radioactive poisoning of several hundred people, according to news releases. The March 1, 1954, explosion also blasted the lid of secrecy from the AEC's thermonuclear experiments, giving the public its first real look behind the "uranium curtain"; thus it is now known that the AEC touched off three prior explosions, the third of which was detonated in November 1952. Likewise, we have been told that the Russians have set off three more atomic explosions since August of last year.

The March 1, 1954, bomb was expected to explode with a force of 4 to 6 megatons or, from 4 to 6 million tons of TNT. Instead, according to Joseph and Stewart Alsop, New York Herald Tribune, April 7, 1954, the force of the explosion was 14 megatons. It left scientific measuring instruments unable to record its full effects. The magnitude of this test can best be illustrated by comparison with previous explosions. The earlier hydrogen blast set off at Eniwetok equaled at least 1 megaton, or 1 million tons of TNT. The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima equaled about 20,000 tons of TNT. The largest blockbuster of World War II equaled 10 tons of TNT. Today, according to Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times, March 17, 1955, "our least powerful atomic weapon has an explosive force equivalent to about 3,000 tons of TNT." Sound waves from the March 1, 1954, blast were detected in London, and an American astronomer said the flash could have been seen from Mars. President Eisenhower admitted that the explosion astonished and surprised the scientists, but the AEC called it a routine atomic test, and clamped on the tight lid of secrecy. Then word leaked out that there were some inhabitants of the Pacific islands who were unexpectedly exposed to radiation.

On March 13, 1954, a grave new consequence of the routine atomic test was reported. The Japanese fishing trawler *Fukuryu Maru* docked in Yaezu, Japan, with its 23 crew members showing symptoms of acute radiation exposure. They told how on March 1, 1954, they were some 80 to 90 miles from Bikini, when at 4 a. m. they fancied they saw the sun rising prematurely in a strange manner. Six or seven minutes later they heard a roar, and 2 hours later they were showered with a white ash, which continued to fall for several hours. The ash was fallout from the explosion, consisting mainly of irradiated coral dust. Only after they had become quite ill did they suspect that they had been rained with "ashes of death" and headed for port. They had on board 40 tons of freshly caught tuna and shark, which according to the New York Times exhibited radioactivity "sufficient to be fatal to any person who remained for 8 hours within 30 yards of the fish." Two of them were in worse condition than the rest, having eaten some of the fish. The crewmen were hospitalized, the trawler was ordered burned at sea and sunk, and the fish buried but not before several thousand pounds of the contaminated fish had been unloaded and shipped to market. A "hot fish" panic ensued in Japan, and police, in a frantic effort to track it all down, ordered a thousand tons of other fish destroyed.

Soon after the mishap, Dr. John Morton, head of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission (ABCC) at Hiroshima, reported concerning the 23 fishermen, "they will recover completely within a month." But by the 23d of March 1954, 5 of the fishermen were reported in serious condition.

About March 25, 1954 it was reported that the United States Navy tanker *Patapsco*, operating with the H-bomb task force group, had received "light but not dangerous contamination by radioactive fall-out."

On March 27, 1954, two more "atom-dusted" Japanese trawlers came into port and were quarantined. One had been operating about 780 miles from the test site and the other 200 miles away. There were numerous other ramifications, of varying degrees of gravity, from the first March explosion.

On March 29, 1954, Newsweek magazine wrote:

"The subject isn't discussed openly around the AEC but scientists are worried about the whereabouts of the radioactive 'mushroom cloud' generated by the March 1st H-bomb explosion. * * * Within a few days after all previous tests, laboratories around the United States have reported detecting traces of radiation in the atmosphere. So far no traces have been spotted from the March 1 bomb, which shot its mushroom an unprecedented 20 miles into the air."

Against this turbulent background, the AEC detonated an even larger H-bomb on March 26, 1954. The March 26th bomb was intended to have been dropped by parachute

from a B-36 superbomber, according to reports, but for reasons of caution this plan was abandoned. This was probably for the best since the bomb, expected to develop 3 megatons, exploded instead with about 17 (according to the Alsops). And Newsweek later reported on April 12, 1954 that "Air Force officials refuse to talk about it, but a giant B-36 superbomber observing the March 26th H-bomb explosion was flipped completely over by the blast." The AEC had by now taken many new precautions, such as extending the "restricted zone" to an area 450 miles wide, covering several hundred thousand square miles. It had searched the area carefully, to make sure no ships were there. Nevertheless two Japanese fishing boats came into port April 8, 1954, with cargoes of radioactive tuna.

The guarded secrets and facts about the H-bomb were gradually coming out and, as we know, a vast clamor rose about the tests around the world. It seems that the test model we now have is a far cry from the H-bomb ordered by President Truman in 1950. Thus, we now have a sketchy résumé of the highlights following the March hydrogen bomb tests.

Strange incidents continued to show up in the newspapers but each received less notice than the last, until it was practically forgotten. Then, on September 23, 1954, Aikichi Kuboyama, a humble Japanese fisherman, died—the world's first fatality from a hydrogen bomb blast. He died in Tokyo Hospital, reportedly of jaundice brought on by radiation sickness. This one death brings very close to home the horrifying aspects of the hydrogen bomb.

I admit to being a complete amateur in the physical sciences. My entire source of information has been a large number of our national magazines, quarterlies, reviews, and daily newspapers. The material on the atomic and hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, the cobalt bomb, radioactivity, and the various aspects of nuclear warfare that I have accumulated has been authored by eminent scientists and laymen. The end result has been enlightening but disturbing.

It is difficult to realize that science has progressed to such a point that 1 hydrogen bomb can destroy 200 square miles of a city and kill several million city dwellers. New York, London, Moscow or Peking could be effectively destroyed by a single H-bomb.

As I understand it, each exploded nuclear weapon sends into the atmosphere its share of radioactive byproducts. One result of this is an increase in the radioactivity of the gases which make up the earth's atmosphere. The other is "fallout." The increase in radioactivity now appears inconsequential and will remain so unless there is a general war with the all-out use of nuclear weapons, in which case the matter could become serious, according to the experts. Unless such a war occurs, radioactivity will continue to be less of a menace to humanity than automobile exhausts and cigarettes. (The Commonweal, December 10, 1954.)

Fallout, according to an article in the Commonweal, December 10, 1954, is quite another matter. When a nuclear explosion occurs, particles of radioactive matter—vaporized metal, sand, etc.—are thrown into the upper air and carried by the winds until they cool and resolidify. Then they drop like rain. It was such an unexpected fallout which struck the *Fukuryu Maru*.

Atomic weapons, particularly those in high-penetration missiles and "small" bombs, do not produce fallout of any drastic consequence. But the Commonweal article says that a strategy of attacks on industrial complexes would almost inevitably mean the large-scale employment of air-burst hydrogen bombs. Judging from published reports, an all-out air-burst hydrogen attack on a scale intended to cripple a modern State could render uninhabitable an area equivalent to the populated portions of Russia or North America. Unexpected winds, like those which affected the Japanese fishermen, could bring the fallout down upon the attacking—or an innocent—nation. The combination of these two dangers, general radioactivity and fallout, not to mention the incredible physical destruction involved, would mean that a nation launching all-out nuclear war would be toying with human suicide.

Overshadowed by the official announcements and speculation about the hydrogen bomb and the atomic bomb is the so-called C-bomb or cobalt bomb.

According to a New York Times article, March 28, 1954, "This in itself will not be an explosive weapon designed primarily for mass destruction by blast and heat, but a vehicle of radiological warfare. It would be an additive to powerful explosive weapons. The explosion would disseminate the radioactivity impregnated in the element cobalt."

In an all-out war situation, there might be a need for other means of incapacitating enemy troops or war workers or of rendering a big area uninhabitable for a period. In such a case the natural fallout of radiated material from an atomic cloud, with its short life, would be inadequate. The problem seems to be to keep alive, at a high level, the radioactive contamination. The mineral element cobalt is providing the answer.

Cobalt, according to the New York Times, is not fissionable. That is, its atoms cannot be split readily like uranium, nor fusioned, driven together, like hydrogen. But some forms, such as the element cobalt 60, have a prolonged radioactive life when impregnated. The contamination can last for several years. Of equal significance militarily, other atomic forms of the element have much shorter life spans, so the contamination can be imposed for days or even years.

Prof. Otto R. Frisch, the noted British professor of nuclear physics at Cambridge University issued a warning in a speech in January, 1954, that he believed that a cobalt bomb could wipe out all civilization. Frisch helped build the first American atom bomb.

According to a February 13, 1955, news release from Hamburg, Germany, Nobel Prizewinner Otto Hahn, first man to split uranium, declared that the explosion of 10 cobalt-coated hydrogen bombs could endanger continuation of human life, no matter where they are dropped. The scientist said radioactive explosion dust, coated with cobalt 60, would retain its fatal effects for years and destroy all life. He said the danger for mankind is even bigger since the price of radioactive cobalt is only a small fraction of that of the same amount of radium.

As a finale to the intrigue and speculation over the atomic and hydrogen tests, the Washington Post and Times Herald reported on March 5, 1955, that the thermonuclear device detonated on March 1, 1954, in the Pacific was more than a single hydrogen bomb—it was an incredibly enriched superbomb offering the most potent weapon of death and destruction thus far known.

It was not the long-dreaded cobalt bomb, either, but its fireball blast and lethal radioactive fallout quickly outdated even the concept of the C-bomb.

The International News Service has learned authoritatively the March 1 blast used a hydrogen bomb core surrounded by a deadly jacket of natural state uranium (U-238), a relatively inexpensive substance. The result of this new superbomb, the U-bomb, surpasses the death potential of the theoretical C-bomb. This conclusion has been verified by top nuclear scientists.

The February 15, 1955, AEC report revealed that the death zone from radioactive fallout in the March 1 blast covered a cigar-shaped area up to 7,000 square miles.

According to the press the same principle works in both the U- and C-bombs. A cobalt jacket would surround the bomb core and—when exploded—lay down a lethal radioactive blanket of dust over large areas. The difference, as already noted, is that cobalt decays very slowly while uranium decays rapidly. Since the rate of decay is related to the radioactivity given off, this means that cobalt has a relatively low lethal value per day. On the other hand, uranium gives off a high dosage in the first few hours.

So, while cobalt can contaminate an area for a long period of time, its low radioactivity gives populations a chance to evacuate. With uranium, enough radioactivity is laid down to give an immediate lethal dose. One of the advantages, if that can be said, is that the new U-bomb is cheap and very effective. There is no need to refine uranium into the precocious U-235. Scientists have been unable to experiment with the cobalt bomb because it would leave a large area contaminated for a long period of time, years perhaps.

The United States is far advanced in many respects as compared to the Soviet Union. While their military strength is considerable and increasing, we outstrip them in most fields except mass manpower.

Published estimates of comparative nuclear strength in the New York Times, March 4, 1955, indicates that the United States stockpile of all types of nuclear weapons is probably more than 5,000. The Russian stockpile may be more than 500, perhaps as many as 1,000. If a more accurate yardstick is used—the total yield of the two stockpiles—the combined power of available Russian weapons today is between 20 and 40 megatons, or the equivalent of 20 million to 40 million tons of TNT. One United States thermonuclear test device, detonated a year ago in the Pacific released the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT.

Moreover, according to the New York Times, there is no clear-cut evidence that Russia yet has an operational hydrogen bomb, one that can be carried by plane. There is no physical evidence that the Russians have practiced air refueling. Another illustration, the bulk of their long-range bomber fleet is still composed of more than 1,000 B-29 type propeller-drive aircraft, which are obsolete in our services except for special missions.

My immediate concern is not that the Russions are going to take the lead in this race very soon or that the United States will ever take a secondary role.

The danger which has disturbed me above all the mysteries of the atomic age, is whether or not there is a worldwide cut-off, or danger point. Will the abnormal amount of radioactivity released in each explosion have a very slow but definite cumulative effect upon the earth's atmosphere and or upon its vegetable and animal life, and hence upon human life?

There are many scientists and lay people who are worried about this possibility and they do not know the complete answer. According to a November 8, 1954, article in the New York Times, "The increasing worry—and it is nothing more definite than that—is primarily about the ingestion and inhalation and absorption of tiny radioactive particles—not at the moment about the external menace of these particles to the human body."

According to the press, there seems to be a real possibility that continued explosions could slowly raise radioactive levels around the world to the detriment of health and human genetics, and there is the sure knowledge that the area of immediately dangerous fall-out is much larger than had been expected before the last tests in the Pacific. Views on this topic extend from one extreme to the other. Nevertheless there is genuine concern about this problem, and I am in complete sympathy with that concern.

In November of 1954 Prime Minister Winston Churchill stated in the House of Com-

mons that it was his "understanding" that the radioactivity released by the explosions of nuclear devices might be "cumulative" and that the detonation of an "undue number" might have serious effect upon the earth's atmosphere for 5,000 years. This statement may have created unnecessary fear, but at the same time no one has the answer.

During the CBS Years of Crisis broadcast on January 2, 1955, correspondent David Schoenbrun, spoke of the great scare that was raised in France last December when Nobel prize-winning physicist Prince Louis de Broglie claimed that the danger point in atomic saturation of the earth's atmosphere has already been reached, perhaps it has even been surpassed, by the result of 10 H-bombs being exploded experimentally in the last 2 years. He warned that life on earth might be changed or even wiped out if 10 or 15 more bombs are exploded in the next year or two, even without war.

Is there a biological threat? As nuclear tests go on, will the earth's atmosphere become contaminated? Will animals and humans occasionally subjected to small but more than normal amounts of radioactivity, absorb, breathe or eat these particles to such an extent that development, growth, or life itself might be affected?

In a series of articles in the Washington Evening Star by Science Editor Thomas R. Henry, he writes of the threat to the continued existence of man on earth during this atomic age.

What is involved in this threat is not the frequently voiced fear of slaughter and destruction in war on an unprecedented scale, but of the effects of a hidden, insidious, largely undetectable and uncontrollable poison which perhaps is capable of destroying the human race as a biological genus.

According to this thesis, which admittedly is far from satisfactorily established, it is not members of the present generation who are being injured. It is their unborn descendants for generations to come.

These implications were stated forcefully by Prof. A. H. Sturtevant in an address before the Pacific Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. "There is no possible escape from the conclusion that the bombs already exploded will ultimately result in the production of numerous defective individuals—if the human race survives for many generations. The risk is one to which the entire human race, present and future, is being subjected," the California professor said.

Scientists are very concerned over the possible effect of radiation on the genetic structure of man. The series of articles by Thomas Henry is only one of many attempts to bring the problem to the general public in words they can understand.

In the face of warnings from some of the world's foremost geneticists that the human race may suffer serious deterioration over a course of generations because of the inevitable buildup in the background radiation of the earth due to atomic bomb detonations, experiments to date indicate the danger may be quite exaggerated.

This is reassuring but at the same time there is no positive proof that future generations will not be affected.

On February 15, 1955, Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, announced officially that a hydrogen bomb such as was exploded in the Bikini Atoll last March is capable of blanketing a 7,000-square-mile area the size of New Jersey with deadly radioactive fallout.

According to the Washington Post and Times Herald:

"Such a bomb, if exploded over Norfolk, for example, could shower enough fallout particles to:

"Kill all the unprotected persons living as far north as the southwest edge of Washington.

"Kill half the unprotected persons living between Washington and the outskirts of Baltimore.

"Kill 5 or 10 percent of the unprotected living between Baltimore and the Maryland-Pennsylvania line.

"Allow the residents of Harrisburg, Pa.—more than 220 miles away from Norfolk—the dubious privilege of being left alive to gaze at the holocaust within the deadly fallout ellipse.

"The projections, drawn from figures in the report, are extremes, based on the assumption that the inhabitants remained fully exposed to the radioactivity over a 36-hour period, taking no shelter or other protective measures. Even simple shelters, Strauss said, greatly reduce the danger from radioactivity."

This belated admission of this new atomic hazard has come long after unofficial analyses had described the newest danger. It is assumed by some that this report was planned to coincide with the start of the new series of atomic tests in Nevada and may have been intended to assure the American people that the Nevada tests represented only a very slight danger. As I understand it, atomic weapons, particularly those in high penetration missiles and "small" bombs, do not produce fallout of any drastic consequence. Presumably these are the type atomic weapons which are being tested in Nevada. The second test of the 1955 series in Nevada, a small nuclear device—the probable prototype—exploded on February 22 with a force that jarred cities 135 miles away. The predawn flash was seen 400 miles away, according to the February 23 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

The device tested on the Yucca Flats is said to have been one of the smaller weapons. The shot rattled windows in Las Vegas, 75 miles away, and jolted St. George, Utah, 135 miles eastward. It gave the Congressmen, AEC scientists, and 200 military observers a sharp jolt or two, depending on where they were standing. Wind and atmospheric conditions were such that the rumble of the blast was heard in Bishop, Calif., about 140 airline miles west, but skipped the Charleston range where many observers were watching the tests.

The orange flash was reported to have lit up the morning sky in Los Angeles, about 250 miles away, and was visible in Sacramento, Calif., and the San Francisco Bay area, 400 miles distant.

The biggest blast of the new atomic test series on March 7, this year, flashed forks of light visible in a dozen States including Montana, caused an earth rumble 360 miles away, and sent scientists and soldiers scurrying for safety from the Nevada test site. The predawn flash of a nuclear device believed to be at least 1½ times the strength of the standard A-bomb was seen in the Black Hills of South Dakota, more than 800 miles northeast, south of the border in Mexico, and in all 11 Western States. The fireball lasted 20 seconds, according to the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Incidentally, in statements to the press, two Colorado University professors said that fallout from the Nevada tests can no longer be ignored by persons concerned with public health and safety. Dr. Ray R. Lanier and Dr. Theodore Puck were not suggesting that necessary nuclear tests be discontinued but stressed the importance of continued study of the effects of these experiments on the human race.

I recognize the necessity and value of tests and experiments, but at the same time it is difficult to reconcile this with the possibility of miscalculation and the number of hydrogen and atomic bomb explosions that it will take to make the atmosphere radioactive, if there is any basis to the numerous fears of some of the world's greatest scientists. In addition to the remarks of scientists and statesmen that I have already cited, a statement made by Dr. Edgar D. Adrian has been brought to my attention. He is quoted as saying last fall, "We must face the possibility that repeated atomic explosions will lead to a degree of general radioactivity, which no one can tolerate or escape." Adrian, president of the Royal Society, is a former Nobel prize winner and serves officially as the master of Trinity College, Cambridge University in England.

President Eisenhower and Chairman Strauss have answered the question: Should we continue to test hydrogen weapons? Their answer was yes. There is a great element of risk in this decision, but at the same time it is the only answer at the moment, for it might very well be disastrous if the Soviet Union was allowed to gain an advantage over us.

There are those who feel that continued atomic and hydrogen bomb tests are a crime against humanity and will only intensify the jeopardy to the human race. Others feel the program should be expanded and accelerated in this race with the Soviet Union. Few will argue against forging ahead in the nuclear sciences, but relying on the hydrogen bomb as our principal offensive weapon is something else again. It is definitely a deterrent but complete reliance on such a suicidal weapon may lead to self-destruction.

The latest move along this dangerous path is the new doctrine of "limited" atomic war with tactical weapons, recently expounded by Secretary of State Dulles, with the endorsement of President Eisenhower. This new doctrine has merit in time of war when considering our present nuclear power superiority when faced with the Communist advantage in ground forces. But this argument seems to be rather shortsighted.

Tactical atomic weapons used on military targets only is a wishful attempt at minimizing the dangers of nuclear warfare. Can we rely entirely on this increased precision and accuracy? We must not overlook the unpredictable changes in weather, human error, and mechanical failures. Military targets, particularly airfields, are usually near towns and cities. A weapon large enough to insure the destruction of such targets will almost inevitably take a toll of nonmilitary areas. To completely paralyze an enemy it would be necessary to hit the cities, the centers of industry. The nuclear bombardment of cities might well turn war into suicide. I find very little assurance in the possibility of limiting an atomic war once it was started.

It is not my intention at this time to discuss the merits and demerits of the present military and defense program in general. An excerpt from an address by Sir Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on March 1, 1955, at this point might be very timely. He said:

"The hydrogen bomb has made an astounding incursion into the structure of our lives and thoughts. Its impact is prodigious and profound, but I do not agree with those who say, 'Let us sweep away forthwith all our existing defense services and concentrate our energy and resources on nuclear weapons and their immediate ancillaries.' The policy of the deterrent cannot rest on nuclear weapons alone. We must, together with our NATO allies, maintain the defensive shield in Western Europe."

We do not have the answers to substantiate or discredit the fears about continued hydrogen tests, or if answers do exist, they are kept under a tight lid of secrecy. Until such time as we know of these things, we should not for one moment forget the earth-shattering and destructive power that we are placing so much confidence in.

The working paper before the United Nations sponsored by the United States proposes the establishment of a United Nations disarmament and atomic energy development authority composed of the members

of the Security Council and Canada. The objectives in establishing this authority were:

1. To provide international control of atomic energy so as to enforce compliance with the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and insure that nuclear materials are used for peaceful purposes.

2. To supervise programs for limitation and balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, and prohibition and elimination of major mass destruction weapons.

3. To supervise the various safeguards necessary to enforce a disarmament program, including disclosure and verification.

4. To assure each participant that the other states are observing the various agreements.

It is the opinion of many that such a disarmament program as this is somewhat of a lost cause in many respects. The Soviet Union has placed many obstacles in the course of any plan which would meet the approval of the Western World. The most recent was the new Soviet demand, made public almost on the eve of the latest London negotiations, for a preliminary "freeze" on armed forces and armaments as of last January 1. Such a freeze would prevent the armament of Japan and, more particularly, West Germany. This is unacceptable to both the United States and Great Britain. At this point it is very unlikely that any system of inspection can be arranged to meet the approval of all nations concerned.

In recent months a great deal of interest has been rallied around a proposal to seek an international moratorium on experimental detonations of hydrogen bombs.

Such a moratorium was suggested last fall by David R. Inglis, of the Argonne National Laboratory, and proposed informally to the President and the Secretary of State by Pierre Mendès-France during his Premiership. It also has the backing of the Asian Prime Ministers who met at the Colombo plan conference in Jakarta last December, though they suggested it not only because they thought it would be a substitute for disarmament but because so many of them do not like the nearness of the Pacific proving grounds.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, on February 11, 1955, suggested in its editorial columns five significant advantages of such a proposal. They are briefly: (a) The plan would be a step, even though a small step, away from war; (b) the ban would be self-enforcing, no elaborate enforcing machinery; (c) it would tend to curb the development of new nuclear devices; (d) the ban would relieve fears about the further accumulation of radioactivity in the atmosphere; (e) a careful proposal would help convince the world of the sincerity of this country's efforts to reverse the drift toward war.

Before I conclude I wish to make note of a proposal sponsored by the Federation of American Scientists which would establish a United Nations commission to study the effects of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. The 2,000-member federation suggests that the U. N. commission examine the extent of radioactive contamination as the result of past tests, evaluate the potential genetic effects on human beings of future tests and attempt to establish a "danger threshold." This proposal is more or less a modification of the plan I have just discussed.

If the United States were to initiate a program along these lines, it would undoubtedly have a great effect in quieting many fears.

It is difficult to understand how a great nation, such as ours, which has shown such genius in the fields of science and nuclear warfare and, at the same time, has had such poor success in charting a path away from the destruction brought on by these discoveries. Need we advance beyond the point of no return?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce, after consultation with the minority leader, that when action on the unfinished business is concluded, it is my plan to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 651, to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended. That bill, which is Calendar No. 127, provides for permanent certificates for local air-service carriers.

It is planned to have a call of the calendar on Monday; and at that time I shall have a further announcement to make.

We hope we shall be able to take up the agricultural appropriation bill after we have disposed of the calendar.

We also have on the calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 58, to designate the 1st day of May, 1955, as Loyalty Day. As soon as the author of the joint resolution can obtain the floor, I expect to ask unanimous consent to have that joint resolution considered by the Senate.

Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	McCarthy
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Scott
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Duff	Lehman	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Wiley
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ervin	Mansfield	Young
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

CONSERVATION OF THE WATER OF THE COLORADO

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, owing to the fact that a unanimous-consent agreement was reached last evening by which debate has been limited, and that it is possible to speak only now upon amendments offered to the bill, and inasmuch as I was unable to make some remarks which I desired to make upon the bill last night because the unanimous-consent agreement was reached without my knowledge, it becomes necessary for me, in order to be within the parliamentary rules, to offer an amendment. I shall do so, Mr. President, by moving that there be added to the bill a provision repealing a law which was enacted by a recent Congress. I am waiting for a copy of the bill in order that I may submit my amendment in proper order.

Mr. President, I move that there be added at the end of the bill the following new section:

> There is hereby repealed the act of July 28, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses, from the Santa Marguerita River, Calif., and other purposes."

Mr. President, that is a pro-forma amendment which I do not wish to debate at the present moment.

I should like however, to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the facts about the Colorado River and the procedure for harnessing its water which is proposed in the bill (S. 500) recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

This is a matter which is far more important than mere dry statistics. This is a matter of homes, a matter of construction, a matter of increasing population, a matter of providing opportunities for men to raise their families and to build communities by conserving the waters of a vast river basin in an area which has been throughout most of the life of the Nation almost completely desert.

At this moment, according to the announcement which was made on yesterday, the President of the United States

is preparing a message which will come to the two Houses of Congress with respect to some of the point 4 programs to be carried out in other nations of the world in order to promote economic improvement and peace among the peoples of the world.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of the greatest of these programs initiated under the Foreign Operations Administration is the program for the River Jordan. I refer to it, Mr. President, because the area which will be irrigated when the $80 million plant has been fully constructed, when the dam has been built and the waters are being distributed, consists of arid land, such as is found in some areas of the United States. That arid land in a far-off country will receive the water of the River Jordan which for centuries has been wasted into the sea, with consequent disastrous effects upon the population of ancient Palestine and the surrounding areas. Water will go to Lebanon; water will go to Israel; water will go to the Transjordan area. This reclamation project authorized by the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, is in conformity with policies which, unlike those having the aspects of war, consisting of equipping of armies, and the making of atomic bombs, have to do with building for the future peace of the world.

The Department of the Interior has loaned 87 different experts of the Bureau of Reclamation to foreign countries with which to construct irrigation works. The countries include India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Colombia, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Formosa, and Australia. Many of those areas are dry and even desert land.

Fortunately for those countries, there are no theorists there who are devoted to the belief that it is better to preserve the ancient ruins of centuries gone than it is to use the scientific capacity of modern man to build modern engineering works in order to conserve and use the water which has been wasted for thousands of years.

Mr. President, I understand from the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that the Senate today has the great pleasure of having as auditors in the Chamber some members of the German Bundestag. Inasmuch as they, like the Members of the Senate, especially the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, are vitally interested in taking steps designed to promote peace and culture among mankind, I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of permitting him to introduce these gentlemen. I hope that the time to be taken for this greeting will not be charged to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time to be used for this purpose be not charged to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

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

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not take the time to introduce these gentlemen individually; but I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very short biographical sketch of each of them, in order that Senators may know something about each of the gentlemen who are honoring us with their presence today.

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

Dr. Richard Jaeger, Christian Social Union, vice president of the Bundestag, chairman of the Committee for European Security. Born February 16, 1913, in Munich. Studied law at Munich, Berlin, and Bonn, and was admitted to the bar in 1940. Entered the Bavarian government as an official of the ministry of culture in 1947 and became Lord Mayor Eichstaett in 1949. He was elected to the Bundestag on August 14, 1949, and has been vice president since September 7, 1953.

Mr. Fritz Erler, Social Democratic Party, vice chairman of the Committee for European Security. Born in Berlin on July 14, 1913. Active in Berlin city government until 1938. Later director of a chemical plant and an editorial contributor to a law journal.

Became a member of the Socialist Youth Movement in 1928 and was a member of the Socialist underground during entire Nazi period. He was arrested in 1938 and sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment the following year. After the war he was county manager (landrat) in Biberach (a position he later held in his adopted hometown of Tuttlingen) and became an official of one of the German provincial governments in 1947. At the same time he became a member of the provincial legislature. He was elected to the Bundestag in August 1949 and has been one of its delegates to the Council of Europe since 1953.

Mr. Hasso von Manteuffel, Free Democratic Party. Born in 1897 in Potsdam. Became a professional officer in 1916 and participated in both World Wars. In World War II he was commander in chief of an armored army and severely wounded on several occasions. Since 1948 he has been active as export manager for a German metallurgical firm. He joined the Free Democratic Party in 1949, where he became chairman of its security committee. He became a Member of the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Ernst Paul, Social Democratic Party. Born in 1897 in Bohemia. He was an early functionary of the Socialist Youth Movement. He worked in the Social Democratic Party in Czechoslovakia until 1938 when he fled to Sweden in the light of a threatened arrest. Since 1945 he has been editor in chief of the Wuerttemberger Abendzeitung. He was elected to the Bundestag in August 1949 and is an alternate delegate to the Council of Europe.

Mr. Fritz Berendsen, Christian Democratic Party, born in 1904. Officer and businessman. 1923 to 1936 officer, commander of the 2d Cavalry East Prussia War Academy, Berlin. Member of general staff 1938 to 1945 when he reached the rank of colonel. Became a member of a commercial firm Duisburg after his release as prisoner of war. He entered the city council of that city in November 1952 and became chairman of his party's group in the city council in March 1953. He was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Fritz Eschmann, Social Democratic Party. Born in 1909, he was a locksmith in his early years. From 1932 to 1936 he attended police school and became a police official. He was an officer in the German Army from 1936 to 1945. From 1951 to 1952, he was a county manager (landrat) in Bavaria and was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Dr. Georg Kliesing, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1911. Dr. Kliesing has been a teacher at high schools. He studied at the University of Bonn, where he made his doctorate in modern history in 1932. He served in the German Army as an officer from 1939 to 1945 and spent the years from 1945 to 1949 in the Soviet Union as a prisoner of war. In 1950 he returned to his teaching profession. He was elected to the Bundestag in September 1953.

Mr. Johann Peter Josten, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1915. Mr. Josten is a master carpenter, a field in which he has been active since 1929, with the exception of a short period of army service. He became a member of the Catholic Youth Movement in 1929 and after the end of World War II was one of the local founders of the Christian Democratic Party. He was elected to the Rhineland—Palatinate provincial legislature in 1947 and became floor leader for his party in that legislature the same year. Since September 1951, he has been chairman of the Christian Democratic Union's Youth Movement in his state. He was elected to the Bundestag in 1953.

Mr. Josef Stingl, Christian Democratic Union, born in 1919. He attended the University for Political Affairs in Berlin and became a member of a Berlin commercial firm. He was a member of the German Army from 1939 to 1945 and became a member of the executive committee of the Christian Democratic Union in Berlin after World War II. He has been a member of the Bundestag since September 1953.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senate is favored, from time to time, with visits by guests representing legislative bodies of the different countries of the world. We are always happy to see them, to receive them, and to have them stay a while with us in the Senate.

I take great pleasure in presenting to the Senate nine distinguished members of the German Bundestag. I shall ask them to stand and to receive the greetings of the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I hope that as many Senators as may find it possible to do so will take the time to greet and speak to the members of the Bundestag, and to make them feel welcome.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes, in order that the greeting suggested by the Senator from Alabama may take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCOTT in the chair).

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to make clear to the Members of the Senate what the proposed works in the upper Colorado storage basin and particularly the so-called Echo Park Dam will do, I have had brought to the floor of the Senate some pictures depicting the scene before and after the event to show, as I think I can show conclusively, that there will be do damage or danger to the scenery of this area and no injury to wildlife, but only a scientific and engineering triumph which will make useful the water which has been pouring down the Colorado River system for years beyond the memory of man.

I shall ask Mr. Wilson, of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to bring me two of the photographs. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, many of the Members of the Senate are at luncheon, so I speak, as in increasing degrees, due the pressure of congressional business, we must all speak these days, to empty seats.

ECHO PARK IS NOT A NATIONAL PARK

I have before me, Mr. President, photographs of the Echo Dam site, before construction and after construction. Here can be seen the scenery as it now exists, and as those who wish to strike Echo Dam from this project wish it to remain. Here is shown the same canyon with the dam as it will look when constructed. Nothing is taken from the beauty of the scene. The dam is planned to be 502 feet high. It stands in a canyon which is probably 3,000 feet deep. Can anyone who has ever visited this area say with any truth and justice that the building of that dam will ruin this scenery? Let it be remembered that Echo Park is a local name. It is not and never was a national park.

The dam was sketched on the photograph of this canyon by draftsmen, with engineering accuracy. It represents the situation as it will exist.

I now point to two photographs of Steamboat Rock and the Yampa River junction.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has asked me for specific information about this question, and point out to him Steamboat Rock as it now stands. I point out to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who will speak on this question a little later, when he presents his amendment to strike out the provision for Echo Park Dam, that shown here is the beautiful Steamboat Rock. I point out Steamboat Rock, after the dam is built and the water has been stored. Again, I point out the gateway of the Lodore. I point out the scenery today, and the scenery as it will be after the dam has been constructed. Here again no natural beauty is being destroyed.

Mr. President, it seems to me that no person with an open mind should be misled by the arguments of the conservationists of the canyons of Manhattan Island. Those canyons were manmade. Nobody objected to the engineering triumphs by which the skyscrapers that make those canyons were built, and yet from offices in those skyscrapers are pouring out editorials and propaganda by men who never visited this area, and who would like to condemn the upper Colorado Basin to be forever a graveyard of the dinosaurs.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will pardon the language, how many dam developments are there to be in this project?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it will depend upon what future Committees on Appropriations may do.

Mr. WILEY. My question is not facetious. It is based on the idea that the desire is to hold the water back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All the dams are subject to the compact between the States. There will be 6 storage reservoirs of which 5 will develop power.

Mr. President, I should now like to call attention to the map which stands at the rear of the Chamber.

It is important to remember that the Colorado River compact was written in 1920, by the authority of Congress. Congress passed the law because at that time Congress was persuaded by the Representatives of the West in Congress and by Herbert Hoover—not then President, of course—that the water which had been pouring down the Colorado River Basin for millions of years should finally be harnessed and put to use. So the area was divided by compact among the affected States into two sections, the lower basin and the upper basin, which was approved later by Congress. It was provided that the States of the upper basin, which included Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, a part of New Mexico, and a part of Arizona, should, every year, deliver to the lower basin 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually, or 75 million acre-feet in the 10-year period.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. My question was based upon the thought that if a great deal of the scenic beauty, or however it may be described, should be obliterated by construction of the project, where is the next lower dam? If it is water that is desired, where is the next lower dam, and how would that affect the water supply?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has based his question on the premise that the scenic beauty would be obliterated.

Mr. WILEY. No; I meant that it is said by some that it would be. I ask, where is the next lower dam? The proponents of the measure are after water.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are after water, and the desire is to begin to use the water on the upper reaches of the stream, not with the purpose of keeping it from California, but to prevent it from going uselessly into the sea; but in order to accomplish that purpose, it is necessary to build storage reservoirs lower in the river. There is proposed, therefore, the great Glen Canyon storage project, shown here at the bottom of the map. That is a project for storing water. I point to Echo Park and Flaming Gorge near the top of the map. These are storage and power reservoirs. Then there are numerous participating projects throughout the upper basin.

What I wish the Members of the Senate to understand is that whatever may happen, we must and shall deliver 75 million acre-feet every 10 years to the lower basin. The lower basin has already used about 6 million acre-feet of the amount which was allotted to it. We in the upper basin have not yet begun to build large projects like the Hoover Dam. Our use at the upper basin if the bill should be enacted into law, would amount to about 4½ mililon acre-feet, as I understand. In other words, if the projects were all constructed, we would be able to use only about two-thirds of the water which is ours under the Colorado River compact. We are under the obligation, which is in no wise impaired by any provision of the pending bill, to deliver 75 million acre-feet for the use of the lower basin in every 10-year period.

This is a flowing stream, Mr. President. Every day water goes to waste and will continue to go to waste until we begin to build these works. We are trying to harness these wasting waters in the upper basin so that they will benefit the whole valley of the Colorado.

I can understand, of course, that some of the people of California may be fearful that they may lose something. They will not. Some of them may be guided by the false or unworthy thought that if the construction of the dams in the upper basin can be stopped, since the water must continually flow down hill, that water may be put to use in the lower basin, and claims could be asserted sometime in the future which would make it difficult for the upper-basin States to use the water allotted to them in the compact.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I have been looking at the map, off and on, for the past 2 or 3 days, and I am somewhat puzzled by it. There are a great many sites for the application of water on the left-hand side of the map, and some on the right-hand side. So far as I can judge, the application of the water to the upper basin does not seem to be related to those dams.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Vermont asked that question. The Senator has raised the engineering question of how water is exchanged. What we are proposing to do is to store the water from the very moment the proposed dams are built. When the dams are constructed—and that will be done in such a manner as not to deprive the lower basin of any flow—it will be possible to use upstream the daily run of the river for the projects in the upper basin until it is necessary to release the water to fill the storage

basins lower down or to transmit water to the lower basin.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me see whether I correctly understand the situation. Is it true that in order to use the water on the other streams of the Colorado watershed it is necessary to provide water from the dams on the Green River and the Yampa River, to replace water which will be used at the other spots? Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. So that is the project, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the project which will store the water which otherwise would be wasted, water which California cannot use, water which the lower basin cannot use, water which Mexico cannot use—because Mexico also has an interest—and water which otherwise will, therefore, flow into the sea. By means of this project we shall stop that waste; and by stopping it in the storage basins we shall make it possible to use upstream the water which will be flowing down the next day, the next week, the next month, the next year, until we are required to pass on that water, to fill this dam.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then, without building those dams, or their equivalent, under the agreement, it will not be possible to carry on the irrigation projects on the east side of the watershed, will it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite correct. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that the present Governor of Colorado, who was for many years a distinguished and very much admired Member of the Senate—I refer to Gov. Edwin Johnson, of Colorado—came before the committee to plead the cause of some of the areas in Colorado, among them the city of Denver. Unless this project is built, unless this water is stored, unless it is held back, the city of Denver will not have the water. In that event, the State of Wyoming and its citizens also will simply have to sit on the banks of the stream, twiddling their thumbs, watching the water flow by their doors. They will not be able to use it. That is what the conservationists would have us do.

Mr. FLANDERS. I see that certain Wyoming projects are involved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I see on the map the city of Green River.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Vermont sees the city of Green River. It will be one of the beneficiaries of this project.

Mr. FLANDERS. I have seen it many times.

I think I am reaching a clear understanding of the theory of the proposal. I am still disturbed that the first development lies in the river bottom or the canyon bottom at the Echo Park site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what priority the engineers will give to the construction. Nothing at all in the bill would give Echo Park the first priority.

Mr. FLANDERS. There would seem to be more storage in the Glen Canyon Reservoir site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is, but the Echo Dam site is ideally suited to storage without evaporation.

Mr. FLANDERS. And there would seem to be even as much or more storage in the upstream Yampa site, and there would seem to be as much storage in the Flaming Gorge site. Yet, somehow, the emphasis—by what means I do not know—seems to be laid on the construction of the Echo Park Reservoir site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation is simple. Opponents of this reservoir have diligently cultivated the false impression that this is a national park. It is not a national park. The Echo Park is a local name and not a Federal name. Opponents acknowledge that the Echo Park Dam will not disturb the original Dinosaur National Monument. All this has been set forth, but unfortunately the burdens of the Senate are so great that Senators are detained in committee rooms and are not present.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Wyoming and I are here; that answers that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; we are here.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We shall explain the proposal to ourselves. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used by Senators who ask me questions may be charged to the time available to them, and not to the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, other Senators will have an opportunity to comment, by way of objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, other Senators will have 30 minutes, under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, do I further correctly understand that the time required for the questions which now are being asked by other Senators will be charged to the time available to the opponents?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, which amendment is under consideration at this moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may state the parliamentary situation, without having the time so required charged to the time available to me for discussion of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senate for giving that consent.

Will the Senator from Vermont please repeat his question?

Mr. FLANDERS. The question is, What amendment is now under consideration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, yesterday afternoon, at a time when only a handful of Senators were upon the floor, it was agreed that there would be a limit upon the time available today for debate, and that each Senator could speak for half an hour on each amendment; and thereafter, after the amendments had been disposed of, 2 hours would be available for debate on the bill, with the time to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

There being no amendment before the Senate, in order to secure time in which to address the Senate on this subject, I had to offer an amendment; and I offered an amendment to repeal the Fallbrook Act, which was enacted at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. But I wish to assure him that the amendment was a pro forma one, for the Fallbrook Act is killing itself so rapidly that the Californians are now beginning to realize it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; if the time so required is not charged to the time available to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. With that understanding, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to have the able Senator from Wyoming give credit to the junior Senator from California for not raising the question of germaneness in connection with the pro forma amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming; but at the same time I wish to suggest that he might have chosen a somewhat different subject-matter for his pro forma amendment, because when he began to mention the name "Santa Marguerita," which I recognize is to many persons, a term of opprobrium, he gave me a little paroxysm of fear. [Laughter.] I hope that if he has a second pro forma amendment to offer, he will consider some other area of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me confess to the Senator from California that I felt sure that if I mentioned Fallbrook or the Santa Marguerita River, the telegraph wires and telephone wires would carry the story to California, and might result in more of the Senator's constituents favoring this bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now return to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Am I allowed, in putting myself in opposition to a pro forma amendment of which I have no comprehension——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Vermont does not have to. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall be glad to allow my time on the other side of the pro forma amendment of the Senator from Wyoming to be expended in asking these questions, if that is parliamentarily permissible.

May I inquire who is in control of the time on the other side of the pro forma amendment?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senators to whom that authority was given are not present.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair take time out for a moment and have the agreement read, and then we can start over. The clerk will read the agreement.

The unanimous-consent agreement was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some one designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, as I heard the order read——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield any time to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am trying to arrange matters so that the Senator from Wyoming will not have to yield his own time. That is my purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was my request, I will say to the Senator. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, the Senator may have whatever time he desires to use assigned to the opposition to my pro forma amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I heard the unanimous-consent agreement read, it seemed to be that my request should be made of the majority leader, who is not present. He not being present, or represented, my request is made to the acting minority leader [Mr. PAYNE], who is present. I request of the acting minority leader that I be assigned 5 minutes, in the course of which I shall question the author of the pro forma amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has no time at this juncture.

Mr. FLANDERS. Who has the time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that I am the acting majority leader, although on the minority side of the Chamber, I understood the Senator from Vermont to address his query to the genial Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] who is occupying the seat of the minority leader. He was endeavoring to find some Senator who was in opposition to the amendment. I find no one, I will say to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], unless he rises and gives his colleague some time.

Mr. KUCHEL. To the contrary——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the explanation of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] been completed, so that the time now is under control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that it has.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I do not know where that leaves us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 5 minutes left of his 30 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, has the other amendment, which was under consideration, been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have offered the new amendment in order that I might have additional time. The Senator from Vermont may take a part of my time to ask me the question he wished to ask.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that a pro forma amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, I still had 3 minutes to go on the first amendment. In order to meet the technical objection of the Parliamentarian, I withdraw the first amendment. I hope the Senator from California will rise.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I will tell the Senator what I was about to do——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the last word of section 1 be stricken.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator speaking in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator will yield to me, I want him to know that I was about to inquire whether I could obtain the 30 minutes which would have been available had the Senator's amendment been germane, so that I might make a gift to him of the 30 minutes, in order that he might have an hour. I enjoy listening to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very gracious, and I acknowledge receipt of the ghostly gift which was thought of but never tendered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move to amend the first section by striking out the last word.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is not in order under the precedents of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move to strike out the authorization of the Juniper Reservoir. That is a substantial amendment to the bill as reported by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOW WATER IS EXCHANGED (BY STORAGE)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont desires to ask an important question about the exchange of water, I believe.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I think I have now clear in my mind the practical means by which water is provided for these specific irrigation projects by means of conserving water in a stream which does not supply them, but which does supply the necessary number of acre-feet—or whatever measure is used—to the lower basin, in that way permitting the withdrawal of more water from the other Colorado tributaries for local use. Apparently that is the theory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the theory.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the means. That is clear in my mind. What is not clear in my mind, and about which I wish to interrogate the Senator from Wyoming, is the reason for concentrating so heavily on the Echo Park Reservoir site.

Both the proponents and the opponents of the bill are directing their fire to this one site. I can understand the feeling of the opponents of the bill, because it is a natural feeling with me also. I believe that the bottom land in some of the western mountain regions affords some of the most beautiful scenery in our country. I have seen many of such places. I have seen them even on such an ill-named stream as the Dirty Devil River in southern Utah. So I understand why people like to visit them and like to camp on them and would regret to see them flooded under 500 feet of water. I understand their point of view.

From the opponents I should like to inquire—to put the question into the vernacular—why pick on the Echo Park Dam? Why not make the first development, at least, at some other site?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator from Vermont has raised the question. It is a subject which was referred to the engineers. They are the best engineers in the Government. A long time ago, before the Dinosaur National Monument was created by the Executive order of President Woodrow Wilson, there were reclamation withdrawals and power withdrawals in this area. They are represented on a map which the Senator from Utah brought to the Chamber. That map shows the site of the Echo Dam. It is at the confluence of the Green River and the Yampa River. Because it is at that confluence, it has ideal qualities for a dam and for the storage of water.

The problem before the engineers was that of storing enough water to provide for the amount of water which must be delivered to the lower basin. The Glen Canyon Dam and the Echo Park Dam and the Flaming Gorge Dam were deemed to be the most feasible and most economical sites for the storage of the water. That is stating the problem as simply and as clearly as I can state it.

The expert engineers since early in this century have called it an ideal site for a dam. Again I say the site is a park only because local inhabitants have called it a park, as they call every open spot in the mountains.

However, it should also be stated that the Antiquities Act, under which Woodrow Wilson withdrew the Dinosaur Quarry, provided that for the purpose of preserving the historical and scientific landmarks in that area the least possible land area should be withdrawn. He withdrew 80 acres. That area is marked on the map which the Senator from Utah brought into the Chamber. It would not be flooded. Not one inch of stored water would reach it.

However, in 1938, long after the withdrawals on the Yampa, Green, and Colorado Rivers had been made for reclamation and for power purposes, the National Park Service sought to withdraw the beds of these rivers. They did not come to Congress. Only Congress can create a national park. They sought to attain their object by Executive order under the Antiquities Act. There was a long controversy in the bureaus about the Executive order, and when it was finally written the Executive order contained language which was intended to preserve the power rights and other existing rights.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation with respect to this subject. In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, why Echo Park has been made the center of attention and why it is being emphasized, I would say the reasons are very simple. The first reason is that the upper basin area must have water. The second reason is that it is important to hold the water when it comes down from the mountains at a time when we cannot use it, until we can use it. Therefore, we must have storage facilities. Storage is second in importance only to the water itself.

It so happens that Glen Canyon is the largest possible site for storing water. Twenty-six million acre-feet of water can be stored there. Echo Park is the next one in importance from the standpoint of storage. Looking at it on the map, it would seem that there is more land there.

Actually, Echo Park would have deep storage. There is less evaporation there. It is strategically located with respect to the distribution of power. It is also in the center of other reservoirs, such as Flaming Gorge and Juniper. It is necessary to have at least one reservoir which can be used to meet the peak load and to release it. Echo Park is in the center of the group. It has been, from the very first investigations of the Colorado River, considered to be one of the best sites for power and water development. That is the reason why it is second in importance to Glen Canyon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Utah.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How many dams will there be?

Mr. WATKINS. If I may answer that question, at first there are six. Eventually there will be nine, which will have power possibilities.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What is meant by power possibilities?

Mr. WATKINS. First, they will be used for water storage, and, second, for power development.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How much will the power repay?

Mr. WATKINS. All the costs of the power, together with interest. It will also help to repay the cost allocated to irrigation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How long will it take to amortize the cost of the water, as well as of the power, and all other costs chargeable to the project?

Mr. WATKINS. Fifty years, under the plan now proposed; 50 years, plus a 10-year development period for the irrigation end of it, with participating projects. But the projects will be paid out. Farmers will pay out all they can pay, and the power will "pick up the check" for the irrigation allotment. But the cost will be paid in 50 years. Industrial water and irrigation water will be paid for in 50 years, with an additional period of 10 years which is now permitted under existing law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are operating under a time limitation, it becomes very difficult to answer any questions in detail.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the majority leader yield me some time in opposition to the motion?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield the floor in a moment. I think there are as many Senators present as we can gather here today until the time for voting comes. The Senator will have time in which to speak.

DEMAND FOR HOMESTEADS

Mr. President, I refer Senators to the report of the committee for the detailed information with respect to the dams. But what I wish to emphasize is that we are dealing with a problem which arises from the demands of the people of the United States, from veterans of two wars, and from those who wish to settle upon the land. The Bureau of Reclamation has presently before it approximately 90,000 applications from all parts of the United States for settlement on 1,838 units which the Bureau of Reclamation is now in position to offer for settlement. There will have to be a drawing for every one of those units. There are 90,231 persons from all over the country who are seeking opportunity to settle upon the lands. There is fear that the dam, which the pictures show is only 502 feet high, will destroy scenic values created by the floods of a thousand years, and opposition has been raised all over the United States to the construction of these works.

I pointed out that under the program of trying to rehabilitate the peoples of the world and to bring about peace we have loaned to countries of the Middle East 87 of our reclamation engineers who are working upon the deserts which were created in those areas where warring armies destroyed ancient waterworks and people were driven from their homes which subsequently were covered by the sands swept in by wind. So we have a clear record of the demand of the people for projects of this kind.

In the area of these projects, Mr. President, there are minerals of all kinds, including uranium, coal, and oil and gas shale which can be developed. The first Army officer, a lieutenant, sent up the Colorado River to investigate it, on an exploratory trip financed by the War Department, reported to Washington that in his opinion no man ever would be able to make his way up the river. But the trip was made. The Hoover Dam was built. The Imperial Valley and other places in the area have already prospered and new sources of profit and income have been created. Give us the dams we are now requesting, and the water which is now going to waste can be used where it originates. It will result in the starting of new businesses, the establishment of homes, and the building of schools and churches. Why should we be condemned to the desert created by the waters which men before our time were unable to harness for the public good?

So, Mr. President, I hope the pending bill as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be passed.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendments I have offered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the 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. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, and 66 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, and 23 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, there are two amendments at the desk which I desire to have considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 7, beginning with the word "Sec. 2.", it is proposed to strike out the committee amendment, as follows:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when this proposed legislation was originally introduced it provided for the construction of 2 storage units and 13 so-called participating units. As it comes to the floor of the Senate by reason of the adoption in the Senate committee of a whole series of amendments, 6 storage units are provided for and 33 participating units are likewise provided for.

Again and again, during the debate on this measure, I have endeavored to point out to the Senate that one after another the projects which are now included in the bill have been found to be feasible by nobody. The amendment which I have offered deals with a section which provides, or purports to provide, for a declaration of intent to authorize more unnamed projects in the future. Let me read the section on congressional intent as it originally appeared in the bill:

SEC. 2. In order to achieve such comprehensive development as will assure the consumptive use in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters of the Colorado River system the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, it is the intent of the Congress in the future to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of further units of the Colorado River storage project, of additional phases of participating projects authorized in this act, and of new participating projects as additional information becomes available and additional needs are indicated. It is hereby declared to be the purpose of the Congress to authorize as participating projects only projects (including units or phases thereof)—

(1) for the use, in one or more of the States designated in article III of the upper Colorado River Basin compact, of waters of the upper Colorado River system the consumptive use of which is apportioned to those States by that article; and

(2) for which pertinent data sufficient to determine their probable engineering and economic justification and feasibility shall be available. It is likewise declared to be the policy of the Congress that the costs of any participating project authorized in the future shall be amortized from its own revenues to the fullest extent consistent with the provisions of this act and Federal reclamation law.

In the committee, I attempted to argue that one Congress could not bind a subsequent Congress; that it was meaningless for the 84th Congress to attempt to sit in judgment on what the 85th Congress, or any succeeding Congress, might do; and that to that extent the section dealing with legislative intent was irrelevant, was meaningless, and ought to be deleted in its entirety.

The committee did not see fit to eliminate the section, but it did see fit to rewrite it. I now wish to read the present section 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive developments as will provide for the consumptive use by the States of the upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River compact and to each State thereof by the upper Colorado River Basin compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated.

The report of the committee, on page 13, contains the following paragraph:

The committee recognizes that it may be found desirable to authorize additional storage in the upper reaches of the Colorado River and its tributaries above Grand Junction, Colo., and of additional participating projects in the several upper division States (see sec. 2 of the bill); but it recommends deferment of any commitment by the Congress thereto, due to the fact that engineering reports are not complete.

It seems to me that no one will stand on the floor of the Senate and defend section 2 on the basis of an attempt, constitutionally, to bind future Congresses. That would be an indefensible position.

Section 2 attempts to say, by some type of moral suasion, that the bill, ballooned up, as it is, to include presently 33 projects which are called participating projects, and 6 projects which are called storage units, is only a start. Some start, Mr. President.

Again, it seems to me that before any legislation of this nature is passed, there should be, first, a full and exhaustive study made by the Department of the Interior with respect to feasibility on every proposed project. That is the burden of my argument.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason why some of the projects are not included. It was the intention of the committee, in my opinion, that the projects should be studied by the Department of the Interior or by any other department which was concerned with making the final recommendation.

Mr. KUCHEL. I may tell my good friend from New Mexico that of the 33 participating projects, the great majority have not been found by the Department of the Interior to be feasible, but they are still included in the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as New Mexico is concerned, I cannot see any reason why the project for the Anima-La Plata, a tributary of the San Juan, which eventually flows into the Colorado, should not be a recipient of the benefit of legislation which will take care of the upper basin States.

Is it the intention that merely because it may be desired by some to prevent the construction of certain projects in the future, even if they are reported as being feasible, the water shall go to the lower basin States or to the Republic of Mexico? Would that be doing justice, in the eyes of the Senator from California?

Mr. KUCHEL. No. Let me say very frankly to my friend from New Mexico that it seems to me the bill, by a whole series of amendments, has become almost a Christmas tree, if I may say so, and that this section is an attempt to indicate that more projects, in the future, will be approved for the upper basin.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from California that I like the expression "Christmas tree." I have been a Member of the Senate for a long time. I remember when the Central Valley, in California, Friant Dam, in California, and Shasta Dam, in California, were characterized as Christmas trees. But I did not think they were Christmas trees; I thought those developments were for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate the Senator's statement; certainly. I do not desire to make any statements which are critical or caustic. I tell the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I do not wish to indulge in that kind of language.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. In a moment.

Mr. President, that is the burden of my argument. There ought not to be provision for any additional projects. Such a provision serves no useful purpose. It constitutes, indeed, a red flag which I should think some of the proponents of the bill would like to be rid of.

On that basis I offer the amendment and ask that it be adopted.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from California indicated that on more than a majority of the participating projects sought to be authorized by the bill no report had been made as to feasibility, and no report from an engineering standpoint. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that on page 5 of the bill, beginning at the top of line 1, there is contained an exception, which reads:

Except as hereinafter provided, section 1 (c) of the Flood Control Act of 1944 shall not be applicable to such supplemental reports: *Provided further*, That with respect to the San Juan-Chama, Navaho, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, and Sublette participating projects no appropriation for or construction of such participating projects

shall be made or begun until coordinated reports thereon shall have been submitted to the affected States (which in the case of the San Juan-Chama and Navaho participating projects shall include the State of Texas), pursuant to the act of December 22, 1944, and such participating projects shall have been approved and authorized by act of Congress.

My question is, The Senator understands that provision is in the bill; does he not?

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed I do.

Mr. WATKINS. And that it means that every one of the projects which I have mentioned cannot be authorized, and no construction can be started on them, until they have been further considered by the Congress. It means that nothing can be done until final reports are made as to feasibility, and all the engineering details have been gone into carefully. No work can be done until Congress acts again on these same projects. In other words, those projects are not being authorized by the bill. It is true that they have been decided upon as projects which in time may again be brought before the Congress, when the engineering reports have been made and other necessary work which is necessary has been accomplished. So we are not actually seeking to authorize these particular projects by the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. What useful purpose can be served by including the projects in the proposed legislation?

Mr. WATKINS. One useful purpose will be to concentrate the attention of the Bureau of Reclamation on what will have to be done if these projects are to be approved. At several sessions I introduced a bill to authorize the Colorado River project, largely on the theory that there might be available a report from the Department of the Interior. I knew the bill would not pass, but I also knew that by having the bill introduced we would keep the Bureau of Reclamation busy on the subject, because there would be something for it to aim at. In that way the Bureau of Reclamation would know that eventually, if the reports were finally made saying the projects were feasible, and if there was a favorable cost-ratio basis, the projects would then be before Congress. That was one of the principal objectives we had in mind in including the projects in the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. At least that is a novel treatment of the process of legislative authorization of projects.

Again, to comment on the suggested amendment which I have offered and which I have asked the Senate to consider, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree with me that no legal purpose is served by the inclusion of section 2 in the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Probably no legal purpose is served, but a policy is established by having the section in the bill. The provision sets forth that we do not intend in the future to exclude the projects from possible benefit under the program.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator from California that there is a distinct legal purpose and a very practical purpose served. The provision puts the Bureau of Reclamation on notice that as to certain future projects which it may have to consider it should get its reports and other papers ready and do its own preliminary work. How else can an agency be alerted to such contemplated projects unless they are included in proposed legislation? Let me ask the Senator what harm there is in putting the provision in the bill. Why does he want it stricken out?

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me endeavor to answer both questions which the Senator from Colorado has raised. I think he knows the respect in which I hold him both as a Senator and as a lawyer. I think the Senator knows the basis on which I have endeavored to raise the very serious questions which have occurred to citizens of my State who are responsible for continuing the water supply of my State.

On the basis of what I endeavored to discuss the day before yesterday, with respect to the Colorado River compact, the differences in interpretation of the compact by the State which I in part represent and the State which the distinguished Senator from Colorado in part represents, I tried to point out that there was a hazard with respect to the continuance of the flow of the waters of the Colorado River to which my State feels she is entitled. A part of the hazard, a part of the fear, comes from the prodigious number of subjects which are encompassed in the bill. Then there is added a section which purports to be a declaration of intent to add more projects in the days to come. I suggest to the Senator that the provision would serve no legal purpose. To that extent it is needless. It constitutes a red flag that should not be in the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The supply for future possible participating areas will come from water which has been allocated, by the 1922 and the upper basin compacts, to the upper basin States. So the upper basin States have, under the language of the law, provisions carrying legal intendments. The language has the effect of doing those things which are necessary to deal with the distribution and consumption of water, so as to get the water which has been allocated. If the bill mentions certain projects, its only purpose is to alert the Bureau of Reclamation that it must consider those proposals and make reports on them. What harm can the provision do to the upper and the lower basins? The provision has a beneficial purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator agree with me that the language of the provision is surplusage from a legal standpoint?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I do not think it is surplusage from a legal standpoint. I think it serves notice on the agency which is charged with the administration of the proposed act to be prepared to submit reports and to get ready for the future.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not a fact that this Congress cannot bind any future Congress?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. That is true of every provision in the bill that goes beyond this immediate Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to say that the point just made by the Senator from Colorado has some justification from experience in his own State. After all, the State of Colorado contributes more than 70 percent of the water of the Colorado River. By the compact it is entitled to 52 percent of the water allocated to the upper basin States. Under the projects listed in the bill, Colorado will get only a small fraction of the water, maybe as little as 15 percent. Colorado has a right to look forward to future utilization of the waters allocated by the compact.

We tried hard to meet the objections raised by the Senator from California. I did appreciate the point he raised. He made the point that this Congress could not bind any future Congress. He is making the point that we are trying to say that certain things should be done in the future. Because of the point made by the Senator from California, and because of the very fair and friendly way in which the point was raised, we went to the trouble of rewriting the whole section so as not to bind any future Congress. But we permitted the Senator from Colorado to go home and say, "I did not settle for the small amount of water now being given to Colorado."

We who are in the upper basin States recognize that our claims to the water come merely because of our geographical position, and not because of the water we contribute to the stream. My State receives a substantial percentage of the water—11 percent or so. Yet all we contribute is the water of the San Juan River, which is a tributary of the Colorado. I do not wish to commit myself, in case the Senator from Colorado and I get into an argument subsequently. But nearly every drop of water in the Colorado River rises in his great State, and the San Juan River flows across a corner of my State, giving New Mexico an opportunity to use it.

I say frankly to my friend, the Senator from California, that I supported this provision because I wanted the Senator from Colorado to believe that we felt that his State had rights in the matter, and that when the time came we wanted to see that his State received its rights. I say to the Senator from California that I recognize his position; but we went as far as we could go in meeting a valid objection he raised, at the same time recognizing the rights of the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for stating his

position, as well as that of the other members of the committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not intend to labor this amendment; and so I intend to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, unless the distinguished Senator from Colorado wishes to ask a question at this time. If so, I now yield to him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, it has already been pointed out that before any of the future participating areas can be recognized they must meet all sorts of tests, must cross all sorts of hurdles, and must be submitted to the other States for approval. If every project should become authorized we would still be within the water allocation made to the upper basin States.

I repeat what the Senator has said: Colorado contributes over 70 percent of the water of the stream. I say, not in a contemptuous sense, but as a matter of fact, that the State of California does not contribute a single drop of the water. I do not know exactly what importance that fact has, but it has something to do with the emphasis with which we explain these matters.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Colorado suggest that any of the States through which that magnificent stream runs contribute any water to it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply say that the State of California, which contributes the most complaint, contributes the least water; that is what I am saying.

I repeat that if there is constructed every participating project which possibly is thought of—every project which challenges the Bureau of Reclamation to produce facts and figures, in order to show its feasibility—if all of them are found feasible, if Congress approves their construction, and if all of them are constructed we shall still be using less water than the amount allocated to Colorado under the compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not dispute that point, either. But I am pointing out that people who have lived and made their living in my State since the 1870's have been able to use the waters of the river which came from Colorado; and over the years the population of that area has grown, and the demands have increased. So, Mr. President, when on legal questions of interpretation the people of Colorado take one position, and the people I in part represent take another, is it any wonder that I have tried to reach a fair conclusion by saying, "Hold this up until the Supreme Court decides the controversy." That is what I have been urging throughout the hearings in committee and here in the Senate. But, again, that is a little far afield from the pending amendment.

Mr. President, if there are no further questions to be asked of me, I desire to yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California be so kind as to yield again to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, Mr. President; I yield once more to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish for a moment to deny to the people of the State of California any of the water they have been using in the past.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure that is the position of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not wish to deny them the use of any of the water to which they have a legal right at present. However, I am as anxious to deny to them water which belongs to the upper basin States as the Senator from California is anxious to have the upper basin States prohibited from using water which he thinks belongs to the people of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I repeat that I do not want my State to get either a drop less or a drop more of the water than the amount to which she is legally entitled.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further? It will take me only a minute.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If every point now before the Supreme Court of the United States is resolved adversely to our section, we in the upper basin still will have sufficient allocation of the water to be able to meet the needs of the various projects which are contemplated or authorized or given any status at all in the pending bill. If every issue under the present litigation is resolved against us, there will still be enough water in the apportionment to the upper basin to make it possible to meet the needs of all the projects which are covered by this bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be glad to yield, although I do not wish to be guilty of delaying the procedure. I have another amendment to submit, and, first, I wish to have the pending amendment disposed of.

However, I now yield to the Senator from Utah for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, instead of asking a question, I shall speak in my own time, in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me; and I ask the Senate to adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 30 minutes under his control.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to answer the argument submitted by my good friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

We in New Mexico are interested in some of the water which has its source within Colorado.

At the beginning, I wish to say that I am 100 percent in favor of the enactment of Senate bill 500; but I am particularly interested in the water New Mexico should have, even though the amount be small.

I agree with the Senator from California that what California is entitled to, she should receive. But I do not want California or any other State to get one drop of water to which we in New Mexico are entitled and which we can use.

As I have said, I am 100 percent in favor of Senate bill 500, which provides for authorization of the Colorado River storage project, namely, dams known as Curecanti, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Juniper, and Navaho. Certain limitations on Curecanti and Juniper are provided in the bill. I feel that the Navaho Dam should be included so that the State of New Mexico can start deriving the benefit of the water to which it is entitled under the Upper Colorado River Compact. This dam is needed in order to regulate water for beneficial consumptive use. Until that is done, what the Senator from California has said is true, namely, the water will be going down the river, and California will get the use of the water.

There are also included a number of participating projects on which the water would be put to beneficial use. Construction of these participating projects would not be undertaken until the Secretary of Interior had reexamined to determine the economic justification of the projects, and had certified to the Congress that the benefits of such projects would exceed their cost.

Is there anything wrong with that? All the provision in question says is that if and when the Secretary of the Interior, be he a Democrat or a Republican, finds that those projects are feasible, they shall be included within the purview of the law we are now considering.

The bill also provides, with respect to the Navaho and San Juan projects in New Mexico, that in addition to the review by the Secretary of the Interior these projects must be submitted in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944. The only project which is included for complete authorization in New Mexico, therefore, is Navaho Dam, while the Small Hammond project and the Small Pine River extension would be authorized, subject to reexamination for justification. The Navaho and San Juan projects are included for the purpose of assuring that they may participate in the financial returns from the power revenues resulting from the large power dams.

An additional project of considerable importance to the northern part of New Mexico is the Animas-LaPlata project, which is not included in the bill because reports are not available from the Department of the Interior. But the water is there, within our sphere.

There are many Indians residing in the San Juan Basin. We all feel sorry for them when we have a little cold weather, or when a snowstorm comes; but when we try to do something in Congress for them, we are told California needs the water. The trouble with California, I will say to the minority leader, is that if we shed a tear in Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, or Utah, Califor-

nia thinks it belongs to her. California wants all the water which belong to the upper Basin States.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say for the RECORD that the Senator's statement is simply not correct. The State of California does not want any water to which it is not legally entitled under the terms of the compact. We recognize the fact that the upper Basin States are entitled to 7½ million acre-feet above Lee Ferry. We believe we are entitled to the same amount below Lee Ferry, divided among the lower Basin States. There is also a certain division of the surplus over that amount.

As my colleague pointed out, we do not want a single drop of water to which we are not legally entitled under the compact. We do not want to deprive the upper basin States of a single drop of water to which they are entitled. I submit that it is a gross libel and slander on the people of California to say that they are seeking to gain that which properly belongs to the upper-basin States. I have not injected myself into this discussion up to this moment, but I could not let the statement of the Senator from New Mexico go unchallenged.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that is the way the Senator feels, why is he against the proposed legislation, which seeks to carry out the purposes of that compact?

The bill has as its ultimate purpose the carrying out of the compact to which the Senator from California refers. If the Senator feels as he has expressed himself, he should be for the bill and take his chances that the right thing will be done. Under the compact California will get its share, the other States will get their share, and we poor people in New Mexico will get our just share.

Let me say something else to the Senator from California, and see if he wishes to deny it. The junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] stated that the people of California have been using the water from the river since 1872. I can point, on the map, to the town of Blanco, in San Juan County, N. Mex., where water was used 50 years before that time. California wants that water too.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that, had the Senators from all the States, the upper and lower basin States, been as alert to the interests of the entire Colorado River Basin, both upper and lower, when the Mexican Treaty was before the Senate, both the upper and lower basin States would not have been in quite the serious difficulty in which they now are.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will say to the Senator from California, on the question of alertness, that if at that time the Senators from New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming had been alert, when the original compact was made, we would not have been in the present difficulty. That was the original trouble. The irony of the situation is that the original compact was made at Santa Fe, N. Mex. However, neither Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, nor New Mexico stood up against California. The only State which stood up against California at that time was the State of Arizona, and because she did, she was able to protect rights to which she was entitled.

There are many white people in northern New Mexico who are barely eking out an existence by subsistence farming. Supplemental water in that area will improve their means of livelihood. With the additional water supply to irrigated land which can be obtained through the upper Colorado River development program, the pressure on grazing lands can be reduced, and the destruction of those lands prevented. New Mexico has had an increase in population in recent years, and the cities and towns are finding it difficult to obtain adequate municipal and domestic water supplies. Many fine people from California are now in that particular area looking for gas, oil, uranium, and other minerals which the area furnishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we in New Mexico feel that in order to progress, the proposed projects must be completed, which will enable us to increase our usable water supply. In terms of water quantities, the amount is not great, as measured by the supplies of other States in the Union. We are thinking of using all possible water from our allotment of about 838,000 acre-feet. Actually the amount which would be used by the Navaho, San Juan-Chama, and the Small Hammond, and Pine River extension projects would be in the neighborhood of 600,000 acre-feet annually, and the benefits would be very great.

So far as our water is concerned, we feel as Daniel Webster felt in the famous Dartmouth College case. New Mexico is small, but we love her.

The projects to which I am referring in this area are the San Juan-Chama, the Small Hammond, and Pine River extension projects, the Animas-La Plata, and the Navaho.

On the San Juan River, at approximately the place I now indicate on the map, is the town of Blanco, which has existed for more than 100 years. An overflow of people from the fine State represented in part by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] came there as early as 1872 and settled in that valley. They are using only 18 per cent of the water they are entitled to use. Why? Because the lower basin States never would allow a project to be built; and so long as the project was not built in that area, or in the area of the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the water ran down the river.

We all know the law relating to the waters of the West. Usage results in the accrual of rights. One of these days it will be said that we can use that water, even if California is legally and morally right, because we have been using it for so many years, and they have not. Even Mexico may raise the same question. Even Mexico may acquire some accrued rights unless we take some action.

In the interest of humanity and in the interest of protecting the rights of every State in the Union, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from California will be rejected, and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to yield myself 1 minute. Then I shall yield back the remainder of the time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, when the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] was speaking, he raised a question about the amount of water which was to be used. I thought the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] had pointed out very clearly that if all of the comprehensive storage projects, including the participating projects in the upper Colorado Basin were built, it would not result in the use of more than two-thirds of the water allocated under the 1922 compact to the upper basin States. That fact should be made abundantly clear, so that there will be no doubt whatever as to the situation that exists.

If we strike section 2 from the bill, it will have the effect of leaving the impression that Congress intends the opposite to what the bill reported by the committee intends, namely, that Congress does not intend to have the Bureau of Reclamation go ahead with its preparation of the necessary data and engineering studies. It seems to me, therefore, that the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire time only to say that the position of the committee must be one of opposition to the pending amendment.

Again I say that we took the suggestion of the junior Senator from California and adopted it so far as we could and tried to make out of it the most we could. However, we did feel that we had to protect the position of States like Colorado. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I, too, yield back the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 14, beginning with the word "available", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the period on line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. When the Hoover Dam legislation was adopted, Congress provided that revenues after repayment, should be utilized for the entire Colorado River Basin. There is nothing unfair about that. When the Parker Dam legislation was adopted by Congress and when the Davis Dam legislation was adopted by Congress, it was provided in each case that the revenues, after repayment, should be placed in the Treasury of the United States. There is nothing wrong about that.

The bill before the Senate provides that the revenues, after repayment of the Colorado River storage project costs, shall be utilized exclusively for the benefit of the upper basin. There we have a distinction made which to me is unfortunate.

In the three pieces of legislation to which I have referred, revenues after repayment were not sequestered for one State or for only half of the Colorado River Basin. Provision was made that the revenues be utilized for the benefit of all the States in the basin. In the case of the Parker and Davis Dams, it was provided that the revenues be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

My only desire, therefore, is to have my friends, the authors of this bill, consider adopting the same type of yardstick in this proposed legislation that was adopted in the others.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from California brought this up in the committee, and his statement was as fair there as it is here, but it is difficult to study all the other legislation proposed and to decide in a few minutes what should be done with it. As I understand the Senator's statement, he is trying to equalize the situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why does he not propose to strike out the word "upper", have the amendment sent to the House, and in that way try to deal with it before final action is taken?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would have to consult with the ranking minority member of the committee, but I assume that he would not be averse to some such amendment as that, with some clear understanding that the idea is to amend the Parker Dam Act and the Boulder Canyon Act, and then try to bring them into conformity.

If the Senator from Colorado is agreeable to that, and the Senator from California is agreeable to striking the word "upper," I realize that he has a valid point. It is not fair to take the revenues from Boulder Dam and apply them all up and down the basin, and take the revenues from the other dams and apply them only to the upper States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from California have recognized what I, too, think is a basic lack of reciprocity between the upper basin States and the lower basin States so far as handling the revenues to which reference is made are concerned.

I think it would be unfair for the upper basin States, getting revenue from Boulder Dam, to keep all their own revenues. I believe they should be separated. I believe the lower basin States should be allowed to keep their own revenues and we will keep our revenues.

What is the best way to do that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would be agreeable, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado, to take the amendment to conference with the understanding that we will try to work it out, provided the Senator from California limits it to striking the word "upper."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be so changed; and I would accept the statement of the Senator from New Mexico that he will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think the attitude taken by the distinguished Senators from New Mexico and Colorado, as well as by my colleague from California, is very sound. As I understand, what they are seeking to do is by amendment to get the matter into conference, so that the question of handling the funds may be determined on an equitable basis. If the funds derived from the Hoover Dam, the Davis Dam, and the other dams in the lower basin now go to the entire basin account, then all other funds should be allocated in the same way. If they are to be handled on an upper basin-lower basin basis, possibly that would be the right solution. But I agree that, under the circumstances, we should either have the policy established that they all go to the entire basin account, or there should be an equitable adjustment so that the funds from the lower basin would go to the lower basin account and that the funds from the upper basin should go to the upper basin account. But we should not use one yardstick for the lower basin and another yardstick for the upper basin.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think what we are talking about specifically is what to do with the revenues from Boulder Canyon, because that is the only project in the lower basin which, as I understand, makes a special allocation of all its revenues to the whole basin. Therefore, I should like to be very sure that the RECORD states exactly what we have in mind. I think it is entirely clear that we are asking that the revenues from the upper basin be made available to the upper basin projects and the funds from Boulder Canyon be dedicated to the lower basin. If that is the case, I support an amendment of that kind. I wish to make it very clear, however, that when the bill goes to conference we shall not lose the point, because it is a very important matter to the upper basin States. It is a most important matter, and there should come back from conference something along the line we have indicated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to yield this point, either. I realize that the Senator from California has put his finger on a question which should be considered. It is in that spirit that I suggested that the amendment be taken to conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The matter will be in conference in the form in which we have discussed it. I do not wish to yield something which is now in the bill for a conjecture that something like it may come back from conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can only say to the Senator that I do not know who the conferees will be. I do not know whether the House will pass the bill. All I can pledge is my best effort to see that it will be presented in conference.

Mr. MILLIKIN. This is a very important matter to the upper basin States, for the reason that there are many projects in the bill which, at best, will not come into being for many, many years to come, and it is recognized that the proceeds from power in the upper basin States have to contribute to these projects. What I am trying to arrive at, in my own mind, is how we can be certain that there will be brought back from conference a bill which will contain terms such as those which have been discussed.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from California will yield to me again, I should like to point out to him that the people of the lower basin States are as anxious to modify it as we are, because Hoover Dam will be paid off in approximately 30 years, whereas some of the others will be paid off in 80 years. If by some strange working of fate the bill should not come back from conference, then I think the Secretary of the Interior would promptly suggest a bill dealing specifically with the subject.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRETT and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield, first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I rise to ask a question of both the Senator from California and the Senator from New Mexico. When this matter was discussed in committee it was my understanding that the proposal was made that the Boulder Canyon Project Act could be amended so as to be in con-

formity with the provisions of this bill. The question I should like to ask is this: If we adopt the suggestion made by the junior Senator from New Mexico will that open the door so that in conference we can amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act and put the same provisions into it for the lower basin States as this bill has for the upper basin States?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall first say, so that there will be no question in the minds of any Senators as to my position on the matter, that I shall oppose the bill. I am going to ask the Senate to reject it. I hope the Senate may take that position.

Meanwhile, however, I do not think I am inconsistent in suggesting on the floor, as I did in committee, some amendments which I offer in good faith and which I believe to be reasonable. I welcome the acceptance by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] of a theory that all these projects should be treated equally with respect to revenues after repayment of construction costs.

I should be quite agreeable in this instance to the recommendation which has been made by the Senator from New Mexico, in which the Senator from Colorado joins, to have the matter taken to conference, if there shall be a conference, and to endeavor in conference to bring into accord the present distinctions in treatment.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from California that the difficulty was that when an attempt was made to draft a simple amendment, it was found that it was not quite so easy to do. When we tried to adapt the Boulder Canyon Act, that was not so difficult. All that was necessary to be done was to insert the word "Lower" before the words "Colorado River Basin." But it was necessary to deal, as well, with Davis Dam and Parker Dam, and that involved some commitments. It looked like a very difficult situation to handle.

I thought it would be wise to ask the counsel of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation to study the problem and to submit language which would deal with the whole matter properly.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I am entirely in accord with the theory which is sought to be adopted for both the upper and lower basins.

The question which has arisen in my mind is, Will the situation be confused more by this amendment, making the revenues available to both the upper and lower basins, rather than by opening the door whereby an amendment to the Boulder Canyon Act, including Parker and Davis Dams, could be adopted at a later date? If the Senator can give assurance that we will not get into a worse position, rather than a better position, I shall certainly agree to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I cannot give an absolute assurance. All I can give is assurance that we shall do the best we can.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's amendment relates directly to the matter of income from the project after all payments to the United States for the cost of construction have been made.

I did not understand the language the Senator had offered. Has he a copy of the amendment, so that I can compare it with the language of the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have modified my amendment, at the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico, so as to strike out the word "upper."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California withdraw the preceding part of his amendment?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do.

Mr. WATKINS. As I understand, the amendment would be on page 10, line 12, as follows:

After repayments to the United States of all money required to be repaid under this act, such revenue shall be available for expenditures within the Colorado River Basin as may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Is that the provision as the Senator from California would amend it?

Mr. KUCHEL. It is.

Mr. WATKINS. All that is done is to strike out the word "upper." Is that correct?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I desired to have the record clear about that. In accordance with the parliamentary situation, it is necessary to take some action on the amendment. It cannot be left to some future arrangement. The provision must be amended now; it cannot be amended later.

I have no objection to the theory, if this is the best way to handle the matter. I agree that the money which is derived from the lower basin projects should be used in the lower basin; and that the money which is received from upper basin projects should be used in the upper basin. I do not think there should be any commingling of funds. We in the upper basin will have our developments under way when the lower basin has accomplished most of its developments. So there should be a complete separation of the funds.

I do not object to the amendment as it is drawn. If some other wording is necessary, it can be taken care of in conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from California.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated J. 61286 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "Echo Park."

On page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out ", Navajo and Echo Park" and insert in lieu thereof "and Navajo."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering en bloc the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. NEUBERGER. On these amendments, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient second, according to the result of the last call of the roll.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. How many Senators did the Chair count?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that a sufficient second for the request for the yeas and nays will require the approval of 18 Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to discuss the amendment at great length today, because yesterday both sides of this issue had considerable—I might say ample—time to discuss the merits of the question.

Briefly, the amendment provides only that the Echo Park feature of the proposed upper Colorado River project shall be deleted. In the upper Colorado project there are 39 separate units, including 6 proposed storage dams. My amendment would eliminate authorization for one of the storage dams, that at Echo Park.

The reason for the amendment is simple. The Echo Park Dam would flood a substantial portion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

For nearly half a century it has been the basic policy of this Government that the national park system shall be free of commercial development, whether by the United States Government or by private corporations. That policy has been adhered to without deviation. If the Echo Park project is authorized, that policy will have been breached.

There are now pending in various parts of the country no fewer than 16 requests that commercial activity be authorized in various national parks or monuments. The lumbermen want to log some of the great pine and spruce

rain forests in Olympic National Park. Some persons desire to construct dams in the Glacier View region of Glacier National Park. Some persons want to divert portions of the Great Yellowstone Lake for irrigation.

If the basic principles governing our national park system are violated at the Echo Park site, these other groups will have equally compelling reasons to seek diversion of water from Yellowstone, to construct a dam in Glacier Park, or to engage in the logging and cutting of forests in Olympic National Park.

The Government cannot say to one group, "You can breach national park system doctrine in the Dinosaur National Monument," but to another group, "You have to obey that doctrine in Olympic National Park or Yellowstone National Park."

The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], capable and brilliant as he always is, pointed out this morning, with the aid of photographs, that the inundation of Dinosaur Monument might actually enhance its beauty. I do not think there is in this country a single national park or monument whose scenery or grandeur would be enhanced by having it converted into a lake or reservoir.

Furthermore, let me say it is a basic policy of the national park system that the area in a park shall be unimpaired. Let me also say that such an area is not going to be unimpaired if it is flooded out.

Whether a great reservoir would make a place more beautiful or not might be open to debate. I do not happen to think that a reservoir would add to the beauty of Dinosaur National Monument any more than it added to the beauty of Hetch Hetchy in California, which was the subject of much controversy in the days of Governor Pinchot and John Muir and other great conservationists and naturalists.

It is possible that some persons might think that the beauty of a place is enhanced when four-lane highways, reservoirs, and golf courses are constructed. We might even eliminate the squirrels on those golf courses. But there are others who believe that there are areas—and they are comparatively small in size and number—that ought to be kept as nearly as possible as nature formed them before the white man came to this country and exploited so much of it.

I think that is the basic issue at Echo Park.

Before I conclude this brief opening portion of my argument, I wish to point out there has been a great deal of discussion about the legal question involved. In 1938, when the President of the United States proclaimed the Dinosaur National Monument, he referred only to a distant site, not Echo Park, but to the so-called Browns Park Reservoir, in the reservation, about which there has been so much discussion.

Mr. President, the basic issue at stake is not a legal one; it is one of conservation. Surely there is no doubt of the fact that the Congress of the United States has the right and the authority to change policy regarding a national park or a national monument. But, Mr. President, the people of this country for years to come will never forgive this Congress if it permits, for the first time in history, the breaching of the boundaries of our park system with this sort of commercial development.

In conclusion, I wish to say, that I am a supporter of the upper Colorado storage project. The distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who made such a profound and convincing argument for the project, knows well that I am a supporter of the project. There are among the conservation groups, for whom I have the privilege to speak today, however incapable or unworthy I am of being their spokesman, some who wanted me to oppose the entire project. I declined to do that, because I believe that the intermountain West needs water, needs power, and needs this general kind of development.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should merely like to state that those of us who are highly interested in the bill appreciate very much the fact that while the Senator from Oregon has opposed a portion of the bill, he has stated, very forthrightly, his general position in support of the development of reclamation projects in the West. I did not want the opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation to him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very kind remarks.

Mr. President, I am merely asking that one of the six storage reservoirs be deleted from the authorization contemplated by the bill. I ask that the bill, if it should pass and go to the House of Representatives be so amended as to eliminate the Echo Park authorization, and then perhaps, either in the House, or in the House committee, or in the conference committee, some alternative site can be provided which will furnish equal storage, or nearly as much storage, but which will not breach established policy or invade either a national park or national monument.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is advised that he has used 8 minutes of the time allotted to him, and has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is necessary in this discussion to get back to fundamentals. To have any kind of reclamation project, there must first be water, and in the intermountain area, where snow falls on high mountains and melts and runs down steep canyons for long distances until finally the waters flow into the ocean, it is necessary to have storage facilities to hold the water until it is needed.

I have gone over this matter before, but it cannot be emphasized too strongly in this debate. I should like to point out that the map which stands at the rear of the chamber is a general picturization of the area where are to be located the various dams which we claim are necessary to store the water which belongs to us under the Colorado compact, and which also would make it possible for us to fulfill the commitments to the lower basin States under the 1922 Colorado River compact.

I was asked this question a while ago by a Member of the Senate: Why do we need these big dams? Glen Canyon is the number one storage dam for water. We have to store water because, as I have pointed out, we have to supply the lower basin States with water for consumptive use, according to the compact; and it is necessary for us to take water from the tributaries of the Colorado—from the Green, the Yampa, and the other streams of the upper basin—so that we can have water for the use of our towns and for industries, because the snow which falls in the wintertime melts in the spring, and it is necessary to have these storage dams or reservoirs, to keep the water from flowing to the sea and being lost forever.

The No. 1 storage dam, from the standpoint of efficiency, is the Glen Canyon Dam. The No. 2 dam, from the standpoint of efficiency, is the one at the Echo Park site. It has been recognized as being one of the best locations for the storage of water and the development of power; that has been recognized from the earliest days, from the time of the making of the first studies by the Army engineers and others. For many years a continuous study of the entire area has been made. The Echo Park reservoir is second in efficiency because it has room for a large quantity of water; and it is a deep canyon, where evaporation does not occur at the rate at which it does in shallow reservoirs. Echo Park is not only beneficial from those points of view, but it is also strategically located, so that when the second use of the reservoir is made—that is to say, the production of power—it is located in such a way that the power can go into one of the great power markets on the eastern slope of the Colorado, and also to the power markets on the western slope. It is not quite so close to Salt Lake City as it is to Denver; but it is located in such way that it will take care of the Salt Lake City situation, as well.

In the operation of this project it will be necessary to have the other dams constructed—namely, the Flaming Gorge, which is shown by the cross-hatched area indicated on the map in pink; and the Cross Mountain, now known as the Juniper project, which I now point to on the map, just east of Echo Park; also the Split Mountain, which is just below Echo Park. Echo Park will help make all the other reservoirs become much more efficient. Echo Park will be used to supply the peak demands for power. It has a large volume of water which can be turned on immediately, to respond to the heavy demands when the power load is at its peak. For that reason, it will help the other projects and make the whole arrangement much more feasible than it otherwise would be.

The program contemplates the construction of transmission lines from Glen Canyon to Echo Park; and, of course, there will be transmission lines

to the marketing centers, where the power will be marketed.

As I have stated, the first requirement in our area is water. Power is worthless to us unless we have water. Of course, we could develop power by means of the use of coal, although at greater expense—approximately 7 or 7½ mills—and perhaps in the future we could develop power from uranium, although no one knows what that prospect amounts to. At any rate, such power will not be cheaper than the self-renewable source of hydroelectric energy. The principal point is that there is no substitute for water.

So, Mr. President, by means of this project, we shall accomplish two purposes. First, we shall be able to develop the necessary water; and, second, from the same program we shall be able to develop power at no extra cost to the people of the upper Basin States or to the people of the United States, who will loan us the money, to be repaid over a period of 50 years, for each of the projects.

I have made this explanation several times to the Senate, but on previous occasions a smaller number of Senators were present.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me? I should like to ask a question.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. In the event the provision for the Echo Park site is eliminated from the bill, will not it place in doubt the development of the irrigation projects in Wyoming, at the points marked on the map—at LaBarge, at Seedskadee, and at Lyman—for the reason that it will be extremely difficult, except in years when there is an abundance of rainfall, to fulfill the commitments at Lee Ferry?

Mr. WATKINS. Not only will it be extremely difficult to fulfill the commitments at Lee Ferry, but it will be difficult to fulfill the commitments for the central Utah project.

It is also contemplated that in the comprehensive program, water may be pumped directly from Echo Park, to take the place of other water which will be taken in the Uinta Mountains, in Utah, in connection with the Utah program.

At this time, Mr. President, I should like to discuss other phases of the situation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have received a great many letters from residents of my State who are very much concerned because they fear that the enactment of this bill will result in destroying one of the great national monuments of the country, which includes deposits of dinosaur bones, coming from centuries ago. I have been told by the Senator from Utah and by other Senators that the dinosaur relics are below the Echo Park site, and that the Echo Park site really was not a part of the original national monument which was established for the purpose of protecting the deposits of dinosaur bones. Is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from New Jersey is entirely correct. I shall now indicate on another map just how that is.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I have received many letters to the effect that if I vote for this bill, I shall be voting for the destruction of one of the great natural wonders of the world. I believe it is not clear to the public that, in the first place, this site is not a national park, but is a national monument, and originally comprised only 80 acres, although now it includes approximately 200,000 acres, and that the part we wish to preserve as a monument will be entirely outside the area to be inundated by this reservoir, so far as concerns covering with water the area in which these relics are located.

Mr. WATKINS. As regards the location of the dinosaur bones, Echo Park Dam and Split Mountain Dam will not in any sense of the word inundate any of the area where the Dinosaur Monument was originally created.

Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is to be found a pamphlet, entitled "The Colorado River News." It has been published by the citizens of the upper basin States. The pamphlet includes a map which is outlined in red.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Utah has expired. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is under control.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me inquire how much more time the Senator from Utah wishes to have.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall need to have at least 15 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty minutes remain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 additional minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I have already had 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator from Utah to say that he desired to have an additional 15 minutes, and I have yielded that much additional time to him. Does he desire to have more time?

Mr. WATKINS. I think I shall need more time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much more time does the Senator from Utah think he will need?

Mr. WATKINS. I may need 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah all the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has yielded to the Senator from Utah, the remaining time, namely, 20 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to examine the folder to which I have referred, including the map which gives the key. First, let us see where the original national monument was. By examining the lower lefthand corner, Senators will find that the area of the original Monument was 80 acres. It is supposed to be shown in white on the map, although it has been somewhat smeared in the course of printing; but it is a little tract with an arrow pointing to it. That was the original Dinosaur Monument, created in 1915 by President Woodrow Wilson; that was done under the Antiquities Act, under which the dinosaur bones discovered in this area have been protected. Many of the bones have been excavated, but some still remain there.

In 1938, the Monument was expanded by a proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to include more than 200,000 acres. The Monument was thus increased in size some 2,500 times, without any additional evidence of any kind that there were in the additional area more prehistoric bones or other antiquities to be taken care of.

I am not quarreling with that, because I think it was a good idea to go through with the program they had in mind at that time. My only objection is that they are trying to get away from the program which was announced in those early times.

It will be noted that the area in black covers all the area in dispute here with respect to Echo Park. The river bottom and the sides of the canyon had all been reserved in prior withdrawals, a long time before 1938, when President Roosevelt issued his Dinosaur proclamation. Those withdrawals are now in full force and effect. I submitted the documents in my speech of March 28, when I gave a complete documentation of the various steps which were taken in the creation of this monument and in its expansion, and also the interpretations made by competent officials of the Department of the Interior of the United States.

So all this area in black, which takes in the entire river area, is a reserved area. There was a reclamation withdrawal in the North, called Browns Park. That is at the top of the map, looking north. That is not in dispute. Even the conservationists admit that that was actually reserved. But what they overlooked for a long time was the fact that all the other area had been reserved, and that the reservations were still valid, legal, subsisting reservations. I submitted the documents at that time. It required an hour and a half to go through that speech, and I know I shall not be able to crowd that presentation into 30 minutes at this time, so I shall not attempt to do so.

I point out, however, that the people of the State of Colorado and the people of the State of Utah are vitally interested in this question, and they were at the time. They were not asleep. They were not allowing the expansion of the monument to take place without finding out what was going to happen, and the program which was intended.

In 1936, some time before the proclamation of President Roosevelt was actually entered, the late Senator King, of Utah, who was a Member of the Senate for many years, wrote a letter to the Department of the Interior in which he said:

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of a letter under date of January 22 from Gov.

Henry H. Blood, of Utah, in which attention is called to a matter of great importance to the State. He refers to studies which have been made of lands along the Colorado and Green Rivers in Utah with a view to their possible development as national monuments or national parks, and he suggests that these areas possess latent possibilities as sites for reservoir development, irrigation and other purposes; also that there are mineral resources which are susceptible of development. The Governor states that unless specific reservations are made covering the matters referred to the State would be blocked in the construction of reservoirs, etc., and the right to locate and develop mineral resources might be denied to the State or to individuals.

I shall be glad if this matter may receive your attention. Certainly the State ought not to be deprived of the benefits which may result in the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River for power or irrigation purposes nor the right to the mineral wealth within the area referred to and locked up within areas within the boundaries of monuments which may be established, or public parks which may be created.

I am advising the Governor that I have brought this matter to your attention and stated to him that as soon as I heard from you I would further advise him.

I shall be glad to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. KING.

So the people of the area were vitally interested in this question. They were told, when the proposal for the expansoin of the original Dinosaur Monument from 80 acres to more than 200,000 acres was advanced, that they would have the right to build reservoirs and develop the reclamation possibilities. They were told that such rights would be preserved. They were also given assurance that they would be permitted to continue grazing in the area. It takes in a great deal of territory. They were led to believe that that question had already been taken care of.

I will say, to the credit of President Rooseevelt, Secretary Ickes, and Mr. Demaray, the acting director of the National Park Service at that time, that in my opinion they carried out, to the letter, a sort of gentlemen's agreement which was entered into with respect to the expansion of the monument from 80 acres to more than 200,000 acres.

Mr. Demaray wrote a letter to the Federal Power Commission on August 9, 1934, on this subject. In that letter he said:

Gentlemen, we are studying the possibility of setting aside certain lands in northwestern Colorado as a national monument. The area considered is within the watershed shown on the map marked exhibit H (a), which accompanied an application of January 30, 1932, of the Utah Power & Light Co., for a preliminary permit, and which is on file in the Denver office of the Reclamation Bureau. The proposed monument would be affected by the Echo Park Dam site and the Blue Canyon Dam site, as indicated on the enclosed map of the proposed monument.

With that letter he enclosed a map.

Continuing to read from Mr. Demaray's letter:

Such an area would be established by Presidential proclamation which would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is of course an existing right.

I wish Senators to keep in mind that language:

I continue to read from the letter of Mr. Demaray:

However, we feel that we should call this to your attention. If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration.

I read the concluding paragraph:

If you have any data or reports on this area, we would appreciate very much receiving copies.

Very truly yours,

A. E. DEMARAY,
Acting Director.

In reply to that letter, Mr. McNinch, the head of the Federal Power Commission said:

This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation and power possibilities on the upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In another portion of the letter he said:

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power posibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1,500,000 to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the greater part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of these streams.

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme.

He had been asked if he could cancel out the power withdrawals.

The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.

I now come to President Roosevelt's proclamation. I have just quoted language from Mr. Demaray, and his reference to existing rights.

The proclamation is dated July 14, 1938. This was carrying out the understanding among Mr. McNinch, of the Federal Power Commission, Senator King, Governor Blood, and the people in the Uintah Basin area. Incidentally, that is where I resided for many years. I know that area very well. The people there had the understanding that they were fully protected. The people of western Colorado had the same understanding, because meetings had been held with them by park representatives, who told the story, and told what it was hoped to accomplish.

Let us examine the language of the proclamation, which was signed July 14, 1938, by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, enlarging the Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah:

Whereas certain public lands contiguous to the Dinosaur National Monument established by proclamation of October 4, 1915—

That is the Wilson proclamation on the 80 acres—

have situated thereon various objects of historic and scientific interest; and

Whereas it appears that it would be in the public interest to reserve such lands as an addition to the said Dinosaur National Monument;

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by section 2 of the act of June 8, 1906 (ch. 3060, 34 Stat. 225 U. S. C., title 16, sec. 431), do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following-described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument: * * * aggregating 203,885 acres.

The Acting Director, Mr. Demaray, himself said that all existing rights would be protected and would be subject to existing reservations. Of course a water-power withdrawal is an existing right.

In a letter written by the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission he lists 10 power withdrawals in addition to the Browns Park withdrawal. I shall not read all of the letter. It was included in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate on the 28th of March, and the RECORD is available to the Members of the Senate.

Along with that letter the Chairman enclosed a map. I have had that map blown up to show the situation. It shows the location of the lands in question.

I point to the map to indicate the location of the original site of the 80 acres mentioned in the Woodrow Wilson proclamation of 1915, when the Dinosaur National Monument was created. The blue sections of the map, of course, indicate the river. I point to the Green River, a tributary of the Colorado, and also to the Yampa River.

The area marked in orange shows the area that was withdrawn in this power withdrawal. There would seem to be some overlapping, but practically the entire area was withdrawn prior to 1924.

In the letter he makes the statement that the status is the same as it was in 1938, and that the existing rights are still in good standing. That statement is contained in the letter to which I have referred.

That is the situation, Mr. President. We feel a little bit put out by our good friends, the conservationists, who contend, in effect, that we are trying to

invade the parks. Incidentally, I am just as good a conversationalist as they are—did I say "conversationalist"? If I did, that is a rather good description of them. They are not only good in conversation, but also in correspondence, I might say. They have the mistaken notion that we would invade their territory. The fact is that the people in the area resent the invasion by them of the water withdrawal area and the power withdrawal area. We believe those reservations should be respected. They were made pursuant to an order, and they are still there.

Mr. Demaray wanted to get them out of the way. Mr. Ickes wrote a letter to the Federal Power Commission and asked if it were possible to have them excluded. The Federal Power Commission stood its ground and said these places were too important for power and water development purposes, and therefore it refused.

President Roosevelt, in his proclamation, refers to the valid existing rights, and then describes the lands in Colorado and Utah, by providing:

> Do proclaim that, subject to all valid existing rights, the following described lands in Colorado and Utah are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument.

When he reserved the lands from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws, he excluded homesteading and that sort of thing.

Without reading the whole proclamation, particularly the portions dealing with the description, I come to the following:

> The reservation made by this proclamation supersedes as to any of the above-described lands affected thereby, the temporary withdrawal for classification and for other purposes made by Executive Order No. 5684 of August 12, 1931, and the Executive order of April 17, 1926, and the Executive order of September 8, 1933, creating Water Reserves No. 107 and No. 152.

They are not involved at all in this matter.

I continue with the Roosevelt proclamation:

> The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916—

The proclamation cites the statute—

> except that this reservation—

That is, the reservation reserving all this area as a monument—

> shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project.

There is a specific reference to the language used by Mr. McNinch in his letter when he said he had no objection, if the operations of the Federal Water Power Act would be permitted to be carried on.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I have only 2 or 3 minutes, but I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission support the view of Mr. McNinch?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; he does. I received a letter from the present Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in which he said these lands were all in the withdrawal status and were in good standing at the present time, and valid.

Mr. President, it would be impossible for me to discuss, in the few minutes left to me, all the matters that ought to be called to the attention of the Senate. If Senators will read the speech I made on the subject they will find a clarification of all those points.

The Roosevelt proclamation was issued in 1938. A year later, Mr. Margold, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior at the time of the issuance of the Roosevelt proclamation, was called upon to interpret the power of the President to create a national monument subject to other uses. Mr. Margold held that the President did have the right to create a national monument. The question came up with respect to a monument in the Boise area, namely, the Boise National Forest. There, too, power and water withdrawals had been made.

The question was whether the President could issue a proclamation establishing a monument subservient to the dominant use by the water program. He held the President could do so. This is a specific opinion in point.

He was asked the additional question whether the Federal Power Commission had the power to issue licenses. He said it did not.

The conservationists have taken that statement to mean that that gave the President the power to cancel out everything, because the commission did not have any power to issue licenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the Senator from Utah is permitted to speak for an additional 5 minutes, will the proponents of the amendment be granted an additional 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate agrees to such a request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of additional time be allowed, and that the time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, be equally divided between the opponents and proponents.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have an appointment to speak in New York this evening. We are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. I should like to vote on this measure. Therefore I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

The time on the other side is under the control of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it would be a tragedy if a power dam were constructed in the magnificent Dinosaur National Monument at Echo Park. We must not despoil this wonderful handiwork of nature.

After listening this afternoon to the debate on the pending amendment, which I hope will carry, I should like to refer to the witnesses who appeared before our committee urging that the committee delete Echo Park as one of the storage unit dam sites.

It will be recalled that the bill in its original form called for the construction of but two storage units. They have now been increased to six. Among those who appeared to urge the committee to delete Echo Park were many representatives of the great conservation organizations of the country. One of the organizations that appeared through a representative was the Izaak Walton League of America, whose reputation for sound conservation principles is known in all the States of the Union. It was vigorously opposed to the Echo Park Dam site. Opposition was registered also by the Sierra Club and the National Parks Association, and many other conservation groups across the country.

A distinguished American who bears a distinguished name, Ulysses S. Grant III, testified at length against the proposed desecration of that magnificent beauty which is one of the joys of all the people of this country.

I am going to read a paragraph from this morning's New York Times' editorial.

Says the New York Times:

> But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 1 further minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I read, Mr. President:

> But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the national park system, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowing filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ECHO PARK DAM

With the speed that bears evidence of political maneuvering the Senate has suddenly taken up the administration's billion-dollar upper Colorado Basin storage and power project containing authorization for the bitterly controversial Echo Park Dam. It is difficult to believe the Senate can be cajoled into voting for a measure that could pave the way for the destruction of the National Park System.

The entire upper Colorado scheme itself should be subjected to severe analysis and questioning. The plan involves construction over the next half century or so of a number of water storage, power, and irrigation projects in eastern Utah, western Colorado, and neighboring areas. The first phase of it is to cost over a billion dollars, with sums of untold magnitude yet to come. Quite apart from the governmental propensity for underestimating costs, the entire economic basis for this scheme has been cogently attacked as unsound. It has been shown by such authorities as former Governor Miller of Wyoming that power to be produced at the Echo Park site, for instance, will cost $883 a kilowatt, while power produced by steam-electric plants in the same area costs less than $170 a kilowatt. The potentialities of cheap atomic power development have, of course, not yet been scratched. So far as the irrigation aspects are concerned, the estimated costs range from a few hundred dollars to a thousand or two per acre. There are far cheaper ways to increase our agricultural surpluses, if we insist on doing so.

But no matter what one thinks about the entire upper Colorado project, the proposed dam at Echo Park inside Dinosaur National Monument ought to be eliminated. Its construction would constitute a precedent-making invasion of the National Park System, which was established nearly 40 years ago. Creation of a dam and of a reservoir slowly filling up with silt and scarring the river banks for miles with the typical rim between high and low water levels would destroy two of the Nation's most beautiful river canyons forever.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not wish time to be granted to me under false pretenses. I am still not quite clear in my own mind. I wish to ask some questions. I am predisposed to the amendment which the Senator from Oregon has offered.

Let me say, first, that I feel convinced as to the rights involved in the matter. I am convinced that the proponents of the dam have rights. I am not at all disposed to grant that this region is going to be beautified by the projects for which the bill provides. Lake Mead, which is situated near a large town, has a sandy bathing beach. This region is not so accessible, and the beauty of the canyon will be diminished when the stored water covers the lower part of it and there remains what is between the water level and the top. So far as its beauty is concerned I do not get any thrill from the photographs showing what the canyon will be like when the water level is raised. That canyon floor is beautiful. I happen to be a lover of canyon floors. I raise the question in my own mind as to how many conservationists or other persons will visit it. Two a month? One hundred a month? Two thousand in a year? I do not know. But I do not look with pleasure and satisfaction on seeing that floor inundated.

It is being advertised. This debate advertises that canyon floor and those steep walls, Steamboat Rock, and the other natural features.

In looking over the storage units, it would appear from a hasty and unprofessional examination that of the various storage reservoirs indicated, 1 or 2 more might replace, certainly in order of priority, the Glen Canyon Dam. It is a matter of regret that the arguments, pro and con, have been focused on that dam. I should like to see the Glen Canyon site left as it is and then find out whether many people in the United States really want to visit it and see it. If they do not, let us build a dam there.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes remain.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on some of the arguments made to justify the Echo Park proposal.

To begin with, I think it is quite significant that in the proclamation of President Roosevelt in 1938 the only reservoir site referred to is Brown's Park, which is on the extreme northern end of the monument. It is vastly different from the proposed Echo Park reservoir, both as to size and through its impact on the scenery of the monument.

I should like to say, with reference to the inquiry concerning the dinosaur bones, that there is no issue as to the bones, and the distinguished Senator from Utah knows that to be so. President Wilson set aside an area of 80 acres in 1915, to take care of dinosaur relics. This project has no relation to dinosaur bones. That was merely a name. The question now is based on scenery, grandeur, and outdoor majesty. That is what is threatened by this proposed project—no more, no less.

No mention whatever was made of Solicitor Margold's opinion rendered shortly after the monument was expanded to its present size. He said:

Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Federal Power Commission by specific provision in the National Monument proclamation would be ineffective, since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an executive proclamation of this character.

If the argument is valid that filling up this magnificent canyon—which is now in its natural state—with a reservoir will enhance its scenic beauty, then every single river canyon in every national park or national monument in this country is imperiled by being filled up with water. If this argument is valid, then why not build dams in Glacier National Park? The issue is quite as valid at Glacier Park so far as anything enhancing scenic beauty is concerned. Why not decide that a reservoir would add to the wonders of Glacier Park? The theory is the same.

The distinguished Senator from Utah made some mention of grazing, because grazing is allowed in the monument. In practically every national park, grazing is permitted because of the grandfather rights which inhere in the people who had ranches there before boundaries were created. In this respect I might mention Grand Teton, Bryce Canyon, Theodore Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota, and Grand Canyon National Monument. In all those places grazing has continued. But that is no argument for the Echo Park Dam.

Those rights had to be extended, because the people had been on the land prior to the establishment of the monument or the park. Their rights continued so long as they or those directly associated with them should live.

Mr. President, I now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as the population of the country increases and as the real income per capita increases, there will be, of course, an even more rapid increase in the demand for recreation. Already our national parks are overused and overrun. It is vitally necessary to build up new places to which people may go to be revived in spirit and recharged with energy. The question is, What kind of recreational areas are needed? There can, of course, be lakes—and I may say that I think Lake Mead behind Boulder Dam was an addition to the recreational facilities of that region.

But certainly there should be also wild places and deep canyons where man may acquire some humility and see how little he is in comparison with the great works of nature, and so that his mind may go back into the enormous stretches of time which have gone into the making of the earth and the development of life on the earth. That is an experience which we all need and particularly city people.

It would be a very tepid United States if all the streams were dammed and if everything were reduced to a series of placid lakes. At times we should feel that nature is tough, that nature is awe-inspiring.

That is why I think we should maintain the Dinosaur National Monument, rather than dam it and create another lake.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall not take all the 9 minutes.

The basic issue in the amendment resolves itself into a single question: Does Congress and in this particular instance the Senate, wish to authorize the construction of a commercial power and irrigation project within the borders of a national park or monument? This has never taken place in the entire history

of the National Park System since its establishment.

If this amendment shall be defeated today, I presume that the Senate will then proceed to take that step. I believe it will be a backward step. I believe it will be a backward step for recreation, for scenic and esthetic values, and for other similar areas throughout the Nation.

As I said yesterday, there exist in other places in the United States—in the Olympia peninsula, in Glacier National Park, in Yellowstone Park—similar pressures by persons who want to cut trees, who want to divert lakes, or who want to dam rivers, to have this sort of commercial development, either by the Federal Government or by private industry, take place within a national park or a national monument.

In this respect, I completely agree with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], even though he knows we are not entirely in agreement upon the project as a whole—he opposes it; I support it—that there should be some inviolate areas in the United States where the basic word of our national park system continues to prevail—and that word is unimpaired. If the Dinosaur National Monument is flooded, it will no longer be unimpaired. That is clearly evident.

I conceive the basic issue today to be the integrity of our national monument system. A national monument is a basic part of the national park system. It is true that a national monument is established only by Presidential proclamation or Executive order, whereas a national park is established by act of Congress. Nevertheless, many of the present national parks once were national monuments. So a threat to a national monument is, in every sense of the word, a threat to the entire national park system. That is what my Echo Park amendment is all about.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 or 3 minutes of his remaining time, so that we may complete a discussion we started yesterday?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think there was ample time for the discussion yesterday. I yielded sufficiently then.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short statement I have prepared on the Neuberger amendments be printed in the RECORD just prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

As I have indicated, this upper Colorado River bill includes in its present form one project that I most earnestly oppose, along with millions of other American citizens throughout our Nation. We all have heard of it again and again—Echo Park—for conservationists from all over the country have protested this with almost unprecedented determination. Last summer the Speaker of the House himself in a statement said that the whole upper Colorado project had died in the 83d Congress because there were so many protests against the Echo Park Dam. And we in the Senate have heard the protests echoing in our Halls in this 84th Congress also.

Why these protests against this one dam—the Echo Park Dam?

There is one simple answer. It would be an invasion of our National Park System, and, Mr. President, the American people intend to see that the National Park System is not invaded but rather that it is held sacred for themselves and their children and their children's children.

Thirty-nine years ago next August the President of the United States approved an act (39 Stat. 535) whereby the Congress established a National Park Service, and provided for the orderly and effective administration and protection of the national parks and monuments. In that act the Congress also carefully defined the "fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations."

I am using the exact words of the act, which goes on to say that this "purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." For four decades the people of the United States have respected this policy and today they are more deeply determined than ever before that the National Park System shall be so handled in our own day that these areas cannot only be enjoyed by their increasing millions of visitors but also that they shall be left unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

During all these four decades there has not been a single successful challenge of this policy. Year after year has strengthened it and endeared it to the American people.

No wonder the people have so violently and so persistently protested against the Echo Park Dam. For this dam would be deep in the heart of one of the truly superb areas in this National Park System. Unimpaired? The Echo Park Dam would so seriously impair the Dinosaur National Monument in which it would be located that never again could this area serve the great and unique purposes for which it is now so deeply cherished.

Do the gentlemen who advocate or condone this desecration of the Dinosaur National Monument think that I exaggerate? Let me then, try to present to you a brief description of the marvelous canyons with which we are here concerned. Then let me try to give you some idea of what the proposed dam would do to this area. And I am sure Senators will agree that this dam is indeed a threatened impairment of a superbly great unit in our National Park System.

But, first of all, I should like to make it plain that I am opposing the Echo Park Dam for what it will do and not for what it will not do. Proponents of this dam would have you believe otherwise. They want you to think that the Echo Park Dam is opposed because it would flood dinosaur bones, and then they eagerly point out that it will not inundate any of these great skeletons. Mr. President, I know that the great dinosaur quarry in this monument is many miles down the river from Echo Park. I know full well that the dinosaur quarry is high in the hills above the river it overlooks. I know that these interesting bones are high and dry and safe from the Echo Park Dam. But, Mr. President, I know also that the Echo Park Dam will create a reservoir through mile after mile of marvelously beautiful canyons for which the monument was deliberately enlarged from its 80-acre quarry to its present size of 209,744 acres so that it could preserve these canyons. That is the reason conservationists oppose it.

Let me try to convey to you some idea of what these canyons are like. I regret that I have never seen them with my own eyes. Indeed, I am among the many Americans who, never having seen them, all the more earnestly support their protection. In the meantime we see such areas through the eyes of others. Our National Park Service describes for us each of the areas within the system it guards and interprets. I have here the folder which it publishes on the Dinosaur National Monument—a folder which carries the name of the Secretary of the Interior and is surely reliable. Here again we read:

"The National Park System, of which Dinosaur National Monument is a unit, is dedicated to the conservation of America's scenic, scientific, and historic heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

This leaflet admires the Dinosaur National Monument because it "contains a vast wilderness almost untouched by the works of man." And well we may cherish a few such areas in our great country where the wilderness can still live on in its natural splendor. Let me continue with this description of the Dinosaur National Monument.

"Its principal scenic features are formed by the Green and Yama Rivers, which flow through deep, narrow canyons with precipitous, strangely carved, delicately tinted sandstone cliffs. * * * Between high vertical walls of tilted strata that represent millions of years of geologic processes, the Green River, largest tributary of the Colorado River, flows on its turbulent way toward its junction with the Colorado."

These canyons, which the Department of the Interior in this folder describes as "spectacular" and "awe-inspiring"—these canyons this Department's Bureau of Reclamation calls a great "storage vessel" and wants to use as a site for reservoirs that would inundate these turbulent wild rivers and replace their unspoiled scenic splendor with one of the works of man.

Through the eyes of one of the conservation leaders who has testified at the hearings on this bill I get a further impression of the grandeur of these scenic wild canyons. Again and again, he says, he has tried to convey to his friends some of the grandeur of this area, and he says he has come closest to it by thinking first of the Washington Monument.

Think of the Washington Monument. Think of its nobleness. Then, and I am paraphrasing a part of the statement by the Wilderness Society's secretary that appears in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Think of standing at the base of the Washington Monument and looking up at its grandeur. Imagine the respect and admiration which you feel as you place yourself before its 555-foot thrust into the sky. Think then again of a solid natural rock a hundred and fifty feet yet higher than the Washington Monument, towering above you like the prow of a great boat a mile long, its hidden mast a thousand feet high—a monolith of natural rock, golden and brown. Imagine the awe and wonder you feel as you place yourself before its massive stand

against time and the elements. That is Steamboat Rock.

Think too of the river flowing against the side, winding around the prow of this great rock. That is the Green River. It has come through the Canyon of Lodore and at Steamboat Rock has found its confluence with the Yampa. These waters have flowed through canyons which surpass, in the scenic superlatives of those who have known them, even this marvel of Steamboat Rock.

The testimony continues:

"Climb out of these canyons onto the great plateau land in which they are cut. Walk out along the edges of the chasm, on Harpers Corner. Stand on this tongue of solid rock that holds you 2,000 feet above the river. And see the abyss to the right and left and straight ahead of you.

"Turn right and see far below you Steamboat Rock that awed you in its presence. See the river flowing around it. Trace its course on up the stream, and the course of the Yampa River's Canyon as it winds to its confluence with the Green there in Echo Park.

"Turn to your left. Find yourself looking straight downstream between the narrow walls of Whirlpool Canyon, and the rough river, deep in the chasm, so apparently quiet from your height.

"Try to tell yourself that there before you, deep below you, the United States Bureau of Reclamation—your Bureau of Reclamation—wants to build a dam 525 feet high above that river. The Echo Park Dam. And up to its concrete foot would come the reservoir waters eventually of another dam—Split Mountain — inundating those whirlpool rapids.

"Turn again to your right and imagine the reservoir waters of that impertinent dam below you. Imagine Echo Park inundated. See nothing of Steamboat Rock but a stone island in a storage basin deep almost as the Washington Monument is high."

What great impairment this proposed Echo Park Dam would be in this superb part of our national park system. As the witness, who himself had been there, went on to say:

"Think of the rivers and the canyon-bottom riverside camp spots above Echo Park, buried in the waters of that basin—along the Green's marvelous canyon of Lodore, and along the deep meanders of the Yampa—that great gorge twisting through colored rock around unnumbered bends, loops, and curves. Think of the unique wild, river-running recreation in these canyons, the like of which is nowhere else, flooded out forever by miles and miles of a storage reservoir."

We thus can gain some idea even at this great distance of the magnificence of these canyons. We can see why they properly belong in our National Park System. And we can see why a dam almost as high as the Washington Monument would most assuredly impair and desecrate this great area. Truly, "it would destroy one of the unique, irreplaceable, scenic, wild wonders of the world."

How greatly the American people will benefit from the preservation of these canyons is only beginning to be realized. At the Senate hearings from which I have quoted another conservation leader told of the great experiences that are being enjoyed by vacationists traveling in rubber boats down the turbulent rivers of these deep canyons, savoring their splendor and feeling the grandeur of their wildness. Read of it, and I am sure you will be impressed with the great and appropriate use being made of this priceless scenic treasure of the American people.

This Dinosaur National Monument should be preserved as the unit of the National Park System which it now is and should remain.

Let me make plain, however, I do by no means wish to deny to the people of this region the full economic use of the waters that flow through these canyons. I am the rather convinced that reservoirs can be provided to the maximum extent needed or desired or possible without invading this national park area. I am impressed with the great choice of an alternative program that would respect the sanctity of this area. And I am convinced that these alternates should be much more fully studied than apparently they have been.

Let me refer to just one of several alternatives. This one would be an increase by some 35 feet or so in the height of another dam already in the program—the Glen Canyon Dam. It is indeed, along with the Cross Mountain Dam, the only dam that is expected to produce power at a cost less than it can be sold for. The Department of the Interior itself posed this heightening of the dam at Glen Canyon as a possible alternative to constructing the Echo Park invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument. But the Reclamation planners threw out this possibility—for just one reason, they said—added evaporation losses.

I can well understand the importance of saving every possible acre-foot of water, and I can well understand the force of an argument that claims that an alternate proposal will lose an extra 165,000 acre-feet of water. That was the claim with reference to this alternative. But when I see this claim—under the scrutiny of critics concerned with preservation of the national parks—reduced first to 77,000 acre-feet and then finally brought down to only 25,000 acre-feet, I say let us by no means sanction an invasion of our national park system on the basis of such recommendations as these.

Our people, in the increasing stresses and strains of our modern life, need the resources of scenic wilderness, and those who follow us will need them more. It is a thirst all its own. Truly the people of America need the best possible development of their water resources. But let us not needlessly sacrifice any great need of the American people. Let us be absolutely sure that we are proceeding on a program that will be sound from all points of view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is absent. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Accordingly, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—30

Barkley	Gore	McNamara
Byrd	Green	Neely
Case, N. J.	Hennings	Neuberger
Clements	Humphrey	Pastore
Cotton	Ives	Potter
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Duff	Kefauver	Russell
Ervin	Knowland	Smathers
Frear	Kuchel	Thurmond
Fulbright	Lehman	Williams

NAYS—52

Aiken	Ellender	McCarthy
Allott	Flanders	McClellan
Anderson	George	Millikin
Barrett	Goldwater	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bender	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Holland	Payne
Bible	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jackson	Scott
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Kerr	Sparkman
Case, S. Dak.	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Long	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Watkins
Daniel	Malone	Young
Dworshak	Mansfield	
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridges	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bush	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Dirksen	Mundt	Welker
Hill	Murray	Wiley
Kennedy	Purtell	

So Mr. NEUBERGER's amendments were rejected.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the so-called Neuberger amendments were rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 2 hours are available for debate on the bill itself; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, and the time is to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents, and it is to be under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of Senators on either side of the aisle as to what Senators may desire to speak at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very short statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time does the Senator from California desire to have?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no desire to speak for more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well. Do any other Senators on this side of the aisle desire to have time?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I voted for the Neuberger amendments because as far back as I can remember, I have been a very vigorous proponent of conservation policies, both in my own State and elsewhere throughout the Nation.

However, Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill itself. I shall so vote despite the fact that the bill will have no immediate benefit to the people of my State. I shall vote for the bill in accordance with my long-held philosophy that what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for every part and every section of the Nation.

I am convinced that within measurable time the Nation will need greatly increased cheap power, publicly developed. I am also convinced that within measurable time the Nation will need more reclaimed and irrigated land on which to grow the food which an ever-increasing population will require. We shall no longer be able to indulge in the doubtful luxury of cutting back our agricultural acreage and reducing agricultural production. Instead, we shall be crying for more food, and we shall be doing so within a shorter time than many people now contemplate.

I hope that my thesis that "what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for every section of the Nation," will be generally followed by the Members of the Congress of the United States. If we have failed to follow that philosophy or if hereafter we fail to follow it, I believe that all progress on a national scale will stop.

If we, in Congress, vote for appropriations only because they help benefit our own particular States, we shall be entering the field of provincial or parochial legislation; than which nothing would be more dangerous to the interests of or to the advancement of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, we who live in New York State have a great power potential in the Niagara River, which can produce power for New York State and for the adjacent States as cheaply as any power development in the entire continent. The development of cheap power from the Niagara River will be of great benefit, not only to New York State, but to the entire Nation; and it will cost the Nation and the taxpayers of the United States nothing, because the project will be self-financed by the State itself.

Just as I shall vote for the pending bill because I believe so strongly that it is greatly in the national interest, so I hope and believe that my colleagues will vote for other projects which are in the broad interest of the entire Nation, not solely in the local interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I heartily agree with my friend, the Senator from New York, that what is good for the Nation is good for each section of the Nation. It is because I believe that this project is not good for the Nation that I oppose it; and I ask that my colleagues consider very briefly the great disadvantages which are connected with it.

In the first place, Mr. President, although I have supported public power developments in the Tennessee Valley and on the Columbia, and although I am supporting them on the Snake, and although I would support such development on the Niagara, the area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the Columbia River, only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River, only one-third the flow of the Tennessee River, and only one-half the flow of the Snake River.

The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over $500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost at most dams on the Columbia River.

The cost of generating power at the most favorable damsite covered by the pending bill, namely, Glen Canyon, will be from 4¼ to 4¾ mills per kilowatt-hour. The cost of generating power at Echo Park will be close to 6 mills; and the cost of generating power at the damsite further up the river will be more than 6 mills.

In comparison, the generating costs for the multiple-use dams on the TVA average 1.1 mills; on the Columbia, about 1 mill including indirect costs, and at Hells Canyon, the estimate is only 2½ mills, directly.

Mr. President, if we were to pick out one of the worst places in the United States at which to erect a public-power project, we would pick out this one. It is extraordinary, to me, that an administration which refuses to establish power projects on the Columbia River, and is opposed to the big dam at Hells Canyon, and turns a cold shoulder at the proposal to construct a project on the Niagara and which calls public power "creeping socialism," is nevertheless picking out this project, where, in my judgment, even the power project will not pay out. So much for the power features.

What about the irrigation features, Mr. President? The appropriation for power is proposed to be $650 million. I doubt that this sum will be paid out, for power from coal oil and shale oil in this region can probably be produced at the same or a lower cost. Furthermore what about atomic energy? Will not that be ready for use in 60 years?

The irrigation features are to cost approximately $915 million, but this amount does not include interest; and for 10 years, no retirement on principal will be made, and no interest will be paid; and then, for 50 years more, while the principal is supposed to be retired, no interest will be paid on the money allocated for irrigation.

So for 60 years, plus the construction period, however long that may be, no interest will be paid, but the taxpayer will have to pay interest upon the bonds which will be floated to finance the project, or he will give up purchasing power out of taxes. So if we add the hidden interest costs, which will amount to more than $1,100,000,000, the cost of the irrigation features will come to more than $2 billion and the total cost of all features to probably close to $3 billion or more.

What will be the irrigation cost per acre under these features? Yesterday I placed in the RECORD tables which will be found on pages 4637 and 4642, showing that the average cost of construction, let alone interest, for the project as a whole would be $952 an acre, on the basis that 3 acres of supplemental land can be taken as the equivalent of 1 acre of new land. If we include interest, the cost per acre will be $2,142. The cost for the central Utah project with interest will be $3,953. These are fantastic figures. The most fertile land in the country, land in the central belt of Illinois, which I have the honor in part to represent, is not worth more than $600 or $700 an acre. Here we are proposing to spend more than $2,000 an acre for land which, when fully irrigated, will not be worth more than $150 an acre. On a big project, we will be spending approximately $4,000 an acre.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from California yield me more time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We must remember that these irrigation projects are not in low altitudes, as were the early projects in Arizona and California. They are not projects as those are at which the average temperature is high and the growing season long. They are, instead, in the mountains, at altitudes from 4,500 to 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, where the winters are long, and where the crops produced will be, by the admission of the proponents of this bill, primarily alfalfa, hay, and some corn, for the feeding of live stock. These are costs which cannot be borne. Irrigation can better be used to put water on the more fertile land of the Midwest to raise the yields per acre there. This would be at a very low cost instead of at the astronomical costs of this project.

Who, then, will pay for this gigantic project? The interest is forgiven, and borne by the taxpayer. Eighty-five percent of the principal is not to be paid by those who own the land, but is supposedly to be saddled on the power revenues.

If we examine the costs and the power revenues, we find that it would be almost impossible for the power system to earn the money necessary to meet the 85 percent of direct irrigation costs. This is a lavish, extravagant, unjustified program. It is about the worst program I have ever seen during the time I have been a Member of the United States Senate. It would be a waste of the taxpayers' money. It would probably create huge dams behind which there would be some idle reservoirs, because the water is being overpledged. It would destroy the recreational features of Echo Park. To my mind it is not justified on any basis whatsoever, and I hope the bill will be defeated.

Mr. President, if it is in order, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not repeat the arguments which have been made. I think the time may come when this proposal will be justified. My principal objection at the present time is on the ground of timing.

As to the power aspect, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has already discussed the cost of the power features of the bill. I do not think there is any dispute about the high costs of power production in this program.

As to the flood-control project, it is of no great importance, because flood control is not a major problem, nor is it a principal objective of this program.

As for the production of food, it seems to me that the argument which has been made by the proponents of this bill is again untimely. I would assume, as a wild guess, that perhaps when our population reaches 300 million or 350 million, there may develop a sufficient pressure upon the food-growing capacity of the country to warrant bringing in submarginal lands by irrigation methods under such a program as that proposed here. I have no doubt that in time conditions will arise under which such a program as this will be justified, but I certainly think it is not justified at the present time, when our real problem is the disposal of surpluses rather than the production of additional food.

When we are spending large sums of money and racking our brains for methods to dispose of unwanted surpluses, and taking out of production large agricultural acreage far greater than the area of land which would be brought in here, it seems to me rather ridiculous to enter into a program of this magnitude on the theory that we need the production for food.

As I say, I have no doubt that in time that need will arise, and in time this program will be justified on the basis of economics. However, it seems to me that it is entirely out of order at the present time, and that there are many other programs which are far more pressing than this one and far more justifiable on many counts, either for the production of power or for the conservation of water for purposes of industrial or municipal use.

I say again that I believe that in due time, when the population in this area has grown to a sufficient extent—and it is growing at the present time—there will arise a sufficient demand for water for municipal and industrial use to make a much better case than is presently made.

Finally, there is certainly no great pressure for employment in this area. If this proposal were before us during a period of great unemployment, and this program were being offered as a program which would serve to some extent the purposes I have mentioned, and in addition, relieve unemployment, that would be an argument in favor of the program.

On the contrary, in our country generally there are greater signs at the moment of a tendency toward inflation than toward deflation. So I think there is no argument whatever to justify bringing forward this proposal at this time.

In conclusion, I feel that I must vote against this program because it is improvident, extravagant, and unjustifiable under present conditions, recognizing that, in due time, it is probable that the development of this country will justify a program of this kind.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my junior colleague from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I very much regret that I am compelled to oppose this bill. However, the fact is that this bill is bad legislation. It is bad because it bypasses the precedents established by the Congress. It is bad because it is premature. I wish very briefly to demonstrate why I make these statements.

First of all, I wish specifically to point out to my brethren in the Senate that this is not a bill sponsored by the administration. The administration made a comparatively modest recommendation. That recommendation was in favor of two storage units, so-called, and a dozen participating projects, so-called, whereas the bill before us provides for 6 great storage units and 33 participating units.

Let me read from the report of the Department of the Army, printed in the committee report accompanying the bill when it was reported to the Senate:

> Comments on 4 of the major units (Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Navaho, and Curecanti) in the comprehensive plan covered by S. 500 and on the participating projects are not practicable from an engineering and economic standpoint without an up-to-date engineering and economic report. However, with respect to the two remaining units (Echo Park and Glen Canyon), the Department of the Army has reviewed a report of the Department of the Interior and has advised that Department that these two storage projects appear to be justified.

The Department of the Army does not endorse the legislation as it comes before the Senate. I wish particularly to add that when the Senate committee saw fit to increase the number of participating projects from 12 to 33, it placed in the legislation new proposed participating projects which in no event have received the test of feasibility from the Department of the Interior or any other agency of government.

It is said by the proponents of the bill that in regard to these projects they will be required to come back to Congress a second time.

That is a novel approach. That is not the pattern which has been laid down in the Senate in years gone by. The logical question that occurs to anyone is why should there be this initial and indirect attempt to approve projects upon which at this moment there has been no determination with respect to feasibility?

The States in the Colorado River Basin many years ago entered into an agreement or compact. That compact apportioned the waters of the Colorado River. There are various interpretations given to it by the States which approved it. Indeed, at this moment the sovereign State of Arizona is plaintiff in a law suit in the Supreme Court of the United States in which the State of California is defendant. The very questions which are at issue concern themselves with how the Colorado River compact shall be interpreted.

The United States Government has intervened in that suit, and a motion has been made to join as parties to the action the other States which signed the Colorado River compact. The bill before us rests on the compact. Until the Supreme Court decides what it means, until the legal dispute among the States is finally settled, how can this proposed Colorado project be administered properly?

It seems to me that here is an instance where prematurity is the very essence of the legislation before us. Those who seek to have the legislation adopted interpret the compact in one way, as I endeavored to explain on Monday, and those from the State which I in part represent interpret it in a different way.

I suggest that until the States involved know what the rights and liabilities are under the compact we should not pass legislation of this prodigious size, as we are being asked to do. Many issues are involved here, Mr. President. The debate here on the floor has touched

upon legal questions, economic questions, and policy questions. All of them are important. I look across the aisle and I see the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I congratulate him for the comments he made concerning the bill from the standpoint of economic feasibility.

We should refuse to pass S. 500 at this time. Here is a bill calling for the expenditure of $1½ billion with a built-in guaranty that more will be spent later. It will not settle a dispute. It will multiply the dispute. And in the process, it tosses away the long-time precedents of the Congress. It ought to be defeated.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I had prepared a speech on the bill, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to deliver it at this time. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

I have made a careful study of the question whether authorization of the Colorado River storage project should include the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects located in the canyon unit, added to Dinosaur National Monument by Presidential proclamation in 1938. My study has considered the following main questions:

1. Whether the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain power and storage projects would create a bad precedent by violating the general principle that national parks and monuments should be immune from such developments?

2. Whether the alternative projects, proposed in the main by General U. S. Grant III, on behalf of the National Park Association, etc., are acceptable as substitutes for Echo Park and Split Mountain projects in connection with the legitimate use of the upper basin on a sound multipurpose basis?

3. Whether any other alternatives should be considered in an effort to find a compromise solution which would preserve the most important scenic and other features of the canyon section of the monument, while at the same time preserving the legitimate interests of the upper States in water and power?

4. Whether the project, as proposed to Congress by the Department of the Interior, represents the best multipurpose plan for developing the upper Colorado Basin in accord with the general principles of division of water, set forth in the Colorado River compact of 1922 and the upper Colorado River Basin compact of 1948?

BRIEF ANSWERS

In very brief, my answers to the four questions are as follows:

1. I think there is no question but that the Presidential proclamation of 1938, adding the Green and Yampa Canyon area to Dinosaur Monument, was intended to safeguard the future opportunity to develop the storage and power values of the various sites, and was further intended to assure the people of the region, as well as the Federal Power Commission, that the enlargement of the monument would offer no new obstacle to such development. Actually, the principle itself is not a blanket exclusion of developments involving water storage, irrigation, and power from national parks and monuments, but a reservation to Congress of the decision where such uses of park or monument lands are proposed.

2. I do not think that the proposed alternatives are acceptable as substitutes for the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects.

3. An attempt to determine whether a compromise approach, designed to modify the Bureau plan in such a way as to preserve the most important features of the canyon unit of the monument without serious impairment of the Colorado River storage project, could be found produced a negative answer.

4. I think that the project as proposed to Congress is a sound embodiment of the principle of multipurpose river-basin development to provide water storage and hydroelectric power, as well as a considerable protection of lower-basin projects against encroachment of sediment. I concur, however, with the Federal Power Commission comment that somewhat larger power installations than proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation will be warranted.

In reaching these conclusions I have not ignored the very great importance of affording as many people as possible opportunity for the kind of recreation which comes from association with the untouched wilderness in all its forms of beauty and historical interest. In all my association with river-basin programs I have tried to bring about planning which would recognize these as well as the other more material values as worthy of equal consideration. My effort has been to harmonize all possible uses of the resources of a basin in a multipurpose plan.

In this particular case, I have come to the conclusion that (a) the people of the upper basin States are entitled to the best use of their water resources for purposes of economic development; (b) they were assured that this would not be blocked by expansion of Dinosaur Monument to include some of the best water storage and power sites in the upper basin; (c) the entire basin is replete with scenery and records of geological history; and (d) without minimizing the extent to which the natural beauties will be altered by the Echo Park and Split Mountain projects, the conclusion is warranted that there will remain an expanded opportunity for the people of the country to enjoy outstanding recreational values of a wilderness, scenic, and prehistoric record character.

I shall now turn to some more specific observation supporting my general appraisal of this project.

ECHO PARK WOULD MEAN NO VIOLATION OF PRINCIPLE

The 1938 addition of about 200,000 acres, including the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites, to the 80-acre Dinosaur National Monument, was accomplished by a Presidential proclamation which deliberately and effectively reserved the opportunity to use those sites, or any other sites, for power development.

The Federal Power Act, as amended in 1935, by definition, excluded national parks and monuments from the operation of the act. The President's proclamation said that the designation of this additional Green and Yampa Canyon area as part of Dinosaur National Monument "shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act as amended."

What the opponents of the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites overlook is the fact that the act's definition of the public lands which are open to the operation of the Federal Power Act is not a part of the operation of the act but a restriction of the field within which it operates. The Presidential proclamation was accurately directed at limiting the designation of these public lands as monument lands to the extent that the result would be to prevent development of their power resources. In other words, the proclamation said that reservation of these lands for monument purposes was not complete to the extent that it would preclude operation of the Federal Power Act within their boundaries.

The whole background of the "except" clause in the 1938 proclamation makes this clear.

The House committee 1954 hearings show that in 1934 the Acting Director of the National Park Service wrote the Federal Power Commission stating that the contemplated proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument "would exempt all existing rights, and a power withdrawal is, of course, an existing right." The latter stated further: "If it is possible to release the power withdrawals that you now have in the area, our monument will be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of the administration" (hearings, p. 727).

Chairman McNinch of the Commission replied emphasizing the magnitude of the power resources involved. He referred to the Utah Power & Light Co. application, estimating the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site at 130,000 horsepower and pointed out that this estimate, as well as the estimate of the Woolley United States Geological Survey report on the Green River, would justify installations of about 300,000 horsepower. He continued:

"It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1.5 million to 2 million horsepower of installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the great part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any plan for development of these streams.

"Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time will elapse before the power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to creation of the monument if the proclamation contains specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted" (p. 728).

From this 1934 letter, antidating the expansion of Dinosaur Monument, it becomes very clear that there is no ground for the charges of General Grant and his associates that the whole purpose of those supporting the Echo Park project is to undermine the national park principle.

In November 1935, Secretary of the Interior Ickes again took the matter up with the Federal Power Commission, calling attention to the fact that the Utah Power & Light Co. had voluntarily withdrawn its application for a preliminary permit for a power site reservation along the Yampa and Green Rivers. He said: "This suggests that the power resources of the section may not be as important as originally believed," and continued: "I shall appreciate receiving your opinion as to the possibility of releasing the power withdrawals that exist in the area. By such action the proposed monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of the administration" (p. 731).

Chairman McNinch, in a reply of January 9, 1936, said the Utah Power & Light withdrawal of its application "was not based on any reduced appraisal but was taken because the Commission was unwilling to carry the application any longer in suspended status, and the growth of the company's power market did not justify the construction of any

of the plants within the comparatively brief period which would have been allowed under the Power Act after the issuance of the permit." He continued: "Nothing has occurred to change the status of the Power Commission withdrawal, or power site reserves Nos. 121 and 721, and power site classifications Nos. 87 and 93, which are also involved."

Chairman McNinch quotes the paragraph from his previous letter to the Director of the Park Service beginning "Regardless," quoted above, and added:

"Since receipt of your letter this whole subject has been given further study but no information has been developed to change the views of the Commission as expressed in the above quotation" (pp. 731–732).

Clearly, it was to meet the Federal Power Commission's estimate of the importance of this portion of the basin as a power resource that the President's proclamation contained the limitation: "except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended." In other words, the judgment of the Government's principal power agency was accepted, that the value of the resources involved for hydroelectric power development was too great to permit an unconditional setting aside of the area as a monument outside the operation of the Federal Power Act.

And it should be recalled that this exchange of letters occurred after the 1935 amendment to the Federal Power Act definitely excluding national monuments from its operation. Under the proclamation the land set aside was not a national monument for the purposes of the Federal Power Act.

Certainly it was not the intention of the President, or his advisers, to mislead the people of the upper Colorado States or the Federal Power Commission. In this connection a portion of the statement of Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, in the House committee 1954 hearings is significant. He referred to contemporary representations by the late Senator King and the late Governor Blood, both of Utah, expressing concern about the expansion of Dinosaur National Monument to include the upper Green and Yampa River canyons. He quoted Governor Blood as stating that "unless specific reservations are made covering the matters referred to, the State would be blocked in the construction of reservoirs, etc." He continued:

"In response to these representations, even the then Acting Director of the National Park Service, Mr. A. E. Demeray, assured Senator King by letter in May of 1938 that the reclamation and power reservations were being incorporated in the President's 1938 order designed to protect the water power developments within the monument." (House 1954 hearings, p. 230).

One other fact should be noted. As embodied in the successive amendments to the Federal Power Act which have been the focus of discussion, the principle is simply that developments for power involving national park or monument resources shall not be undertaken solely on the decision of an administrative agency. The decision, in such instances, is reserved to Congress itself. And Congress has acted to leave the door open for the utilization of national park lands for reclamation purposes in the case of both Grand Canyon and Glacier National Parks. Apparently a major objective of the Federal Power Act amendments was to prevent an administrative agency from allowing private exploration of park resources.

This interpretation conforms with the provision of the Glacier National Park Act of May 11, 1910, "that the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project" (House 1954 hearings, p. 595).

PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES ARE INADEQUATE

In dealing with possible alternatives to individual projects in a Federal agency program for multipurpose development of a river basin, it must be taken into account that the entire comprehensive program is, in a real sense, a single integrated project with its individual site developments hydraulically, as well as economically, integrated to produce the greatest values from the basin's water resources.

This means that it is necessary to look at more than the contrasting storage capacities, evaporation rates, energy production at site, or even initial costs of the alternative projects, to determine their comparative effects on the total basin project. Provision for storage is located not only in terms of its contribution to power development at the site and downstream but also in terms of the control of flows contributed by various tributaries, etc., where storage of high flows will have to be carried over many years.

A review of various presentations of alternatives to Echo Park and Split Mountain suggests that there has not been sufficient weight given to this consideration. There has not been ample consideration in terms of the economic feasibility of the entire undertaking. Specifically, I find the following among the rather serious inadequacies in efforts to recombine Bureau of Reclamation figures to produce and justify alternatives:

1. Minimization of the significance of the additional evaporation losses due to the lower reservoir elevations and greater surface areas of his alternatives. No river basin planner can dismiss 100,000 to 200,000 acre-feet, representing not only additional land brought under cultivation and additional industrial water supply, but also additional kilowatt-hours at the reservoir site and below. Water is valuable, particularly in the arid States.

2. Opponents did not use comparable figures in presenting Bureau of Reclamation project figures to develop comparisons between proposed alternatives and the Echo Park-Split Mountain combination. In specific instances there were used figures for cost and energy output which, because representing different periods in the planning or operation of the projects, are not comparable.

3. Alternatives would not treat the Colorado River storage project as a whole, including all the objectives and especially the importance of release and routing of stored water in terms of the schedules for long-range requirements of cyclical storage as well as the development of maximum supplies of economical power from the combination. Thus, in offering the combination of the Cross Mountain and Gray Canyon units as the initial development, in place of the Echo Park unit, there was presented the full energy production figures for the Bureau's Gray Canyon unit, although about one-third of its energy capacity is due to the stream flow regulation provided by the Echo Park unit which he eliminates.[1]

4. In minimizing the need for about 48 million acre-feet of total storage, there is a failure to take account of the multiple purposes to be served by the combination of reservoirs in the Colorado River storage project. These include not only provision for cyclical storage to enable upper States to make full use of their allotted consumptive use of water but also dead storage to make possible economically feasible power development and sediment storage to prolong the life of such downstream units as the already constructed Hoover (Boulder Canyon) development and the projected Bridge Canyon power development. An additional 200 years life for the Hoover Dam unit is not to be easily dismissed.

5. Little, if any, attention was given in proposed alternatives to the problems of project timing associated both with the orderly filling of reservoirs and the overall economics of developing a feasible program for enabling the people of the intermountain States to use their share of Colorado River water for constructive regional development. And no one should minimize the difficulties which face those responsible for enabling the upper basin States to use their share of the water.

In this connection it may be noted that California thinks of the Glen Canyon project, to which there is no real opposition, as benefiting primarily the lower basin, in terms of both sediment control and power. California wants the 800,000 kilowatts of power transmitted downstream to be picked up by the Los Angeles transmission lines at Hoover Dam, rather than upstream to combine with Echo Park and other upper basin power to support economic development in the Mountain States.

It is my conclusion that substitution of proposed alternatives would significantly reduce the water for consumptive uses and the hydroelectric power available to the upper basin States. I also conclude that it would jeopardize economic feasibility of the entire program.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO ECHO PARK QUESTIONABLE

In connection with the work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee, agencies of the Department of the Interior under the direction of Leland Olds (1951–53) worked out alternatives to certain Corps of Engineers proposed power projects in the Kennebec and St. John Rivers in Maine. These were designed to accomplish substantially the conservation storage and power objectives, while avoiding interference with important wilderness recreation opportunities in the Bigelow Mountain and Allagash River areas. The alternatives consisted in the main in shifting the location of storage and power developments in such a way as to protect and even enhance the wilderness and semiwilderness opportunities without eliminating storage of the flows of specific tributaries or utilization of important power resources.

With the relatively limited basic data available I had tested the possibility of such compromise solutions in the general area associated with the canyon section of the Dinosaur National Monument. Specifically, this compromise approach, if feasible, would not have eliminated development within portions of the monument but would have preserved to a very considerable extent the Echo Park and the Green River and lower Yampa Canyons immediately above it, including Steamboat Rock, unoccupied by dams or reservoir pools.

In other words, the alternatives would not be sought on other streams or in lower reaches of the Green River, but in the same general portion of the basin as the proposed Echo Park unit.

Specifically, I had explored the possibility of moving the Flaming Gorge Dam still farther downstream, while maintaining the same maximum reservoir elevation, or alter-

[1] In the Bureau's program the Gray Canyon unit is scheduled to come into production with the following active storage behind it: Echo Park, 5,460,000 acre-feet; Flaming Gorge, 2,950,000 acre-feet; and Cross Mountain, 4,200,000 acre-feet. This total of 12,610,000 acre-feet would be about three times the storage in Cross Mountain unit alone, as used in Grant's alternative initial project. Furthermore, the Cross Mountain unit would control only the Yampa average flow of 1,617 cubic feet per second, whereas the Echo Park unit would control both Yampa and upper Green flows, totaling about 4,100 cubic feet per second.

natively, of adding a Lodore Canyon unit. Coupled with this would be an experimental moving of the proposed Cross Mountain Dam somewhat farther downstream, to gain head and storage. Another experiment involved consideration of the possible combination of the Gray Canyon and Desolation units into a single project. In general, it was assumed that the Split Mountain site would be developed for power as part of the alternative combination.

After working with the available geological maps and checking with the Bureau of Reclamation to determine whether additional data was available, the conclusion was that in terms of one or another obstacle, including the spreading of storage over wide areas, excessive evaporation, foundation conditions, costs, etc., the probabilities were against such alternatives proving out even if the data in the Bureau's Salt Lake City office were obtainable.

There is another obstacle to finding a substitute for the Echo Park unit. It is contained in the upper Colorado Basin compact, which recognizes the right of the State of Utah to take 500,000 acre-feet a year of Yampa River water for its central Utah irrigation project. This provision is a safeguard against the possibility that full use of the irrigation water—to which Wyoming is entitled—may result in return flows which introduce enough alkaline salts into the Green River so that dilution with the mountain water of the Yampa will be required. So far as studies have been able to determine, the Echo Park Reservoir is necessary to enable Utah to exercise this right under the compact.

In general, this serves to emphasize the extreme complexity of the task of working out a feasible program for such a basin where many of the forces of nature seem adverse to full utilization of the resources. It is a gigantic task of bringing nature into cooperation with man's several major purposes.

It is my general conclusion that the Bureau of Reclamation engineers have made a sincere effort to investigate all possible alternatives to use of the storage and power resources within the expanded national monument.

A SOUND MULTIPURPOSE PROGRAM

The main issue as to whether the Colorado storage project represents sound multipurpose planning involves chiefly the question whether the losses in scenic, geological history, and other recreational and cultural benefits, through construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain units, will outweigh the particular storage and power benefits associated with those projects.

In attempting to find the answer to this question I have come to the conclusion that the prospective losses in cultural and recreational values have been considerably exaggerated by those fighting for the inviolability of a principle, which was deliberately made subject to power development at the time when Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the canyon unit.

I think that the soundest discussion of the question is found in a Report of Progress, dated May 13, 1943, submitted to the Director of the National Park Service by Frederick Law Olmstead concerning the Dinosaur National Monument region (pp. 733–735, House 1954 hearings). This was part of a Survey of Recreation Resources of Colorado River Basin approved by the Secretary of the Interior in January 1941 to contribute to the general formulation of a comprehensive plan of utilization of the waters of the entire Colorado River system. The Secretary appointed Olmstead, distinguished landscape architect, with wide experience in regional and site planning, as consultant for the survey.

The Olmstead report records certain problems and tentative conclusions in regard to the Dinosaur National Monument, as developed to date by unfinished investigations by George F. Ingalls, Olmstead, and others, "in relation to plans now in process of development by the Bureau of Reclamation for water-control projects on and near the Monument."

Olmstead's report recognizes that "reservoir construction as contemplated by the Bureau would submerge a number of sites, geologic formations, and wildlife habitats, and would alter the character of the landscape by substitution of still water for flowing streams, and by reducing the visible height of the canyon walls." It says that "the latter effect would be most disastrous at and near Pats Hole, where the extraordinary feature of Steamboat Rock would be submerged to more than half its height, and in the inner canyon of the Yampa for some miles upstream well beyond Harding Hole. The report continues:

"Nevertheless, the canyon unit would still have scenic and recreational values of notable importance and of nationwide interest. I venture to cite a very few examples,

"The canyon of Lodore, in general roughly V-shaped in section, is so deep that raising of the water in its bottom by 100 to 500 feet or thereabouts would hardly diminish its great impressiveness to a perceptible degree. Its rapids and low waterfalls now visibly continuing the process of erosion which cut all these canyons in the uplifting mountain mass as it rose athwart the rivers that once meandered across an ancient peneplain—would be changed to a fiordlike lake. Such an artificial change would not be justified in a national monument administered to preserve notable features of nature for enjoyment of mankind as nearly as possible in their natural condition; but it cannot be denied that if the area is deliberately made a 'multiple-use' area, for power developments plus any recreational values compatible therewith, a great many more people can and will derive pleasure and inspiration of a high order from traversing the canyon of Lodore in boats on a fiordlike lake than would even be able to see it all in a more perfectly natural state by shooting its dangerous rapids in boats or by following the 25 miles or more of narrow trail that might with difficulty be contrived to traverse it without much scarring of natural conditions. The upstream portions of the meandering narrow inner canyon of the Yampa, incised into the 'bench' in many places to a depth of about a thousand feet with almost vertical walls, would appear much as at present seen from above. One of the most impressive and geologically illuminating features of the entire area would remain at the eastern end of the monument, wholly unaffected by the damming. It is where the high, bare sandstone escarpment of the unfolded strata has so obviously been sawn through, on the axis of an anticline, by the river; which there quietly flows from a broad flood plain into the dark deep canyon it has cut in the slowly rising rock. The notable outlooks from many places on the rim of the upper plateau south of the rivers, especially on and near Harpers Corner—some very beautiful, all interesting geologically or otherwise—would in most cases remain substantially unchanged in appearance (unless transmission lines, as yet not definitely planned, should be so located as to impair one or more of them seriously."

Olmstead's report summed up his chief considered impressions and opinions in regard to the scenic and recreational values of the canyon unit in two paragraphs, the second of which seems of great importance as indicating what sound multipurpose planning for this portion of the basin calls for. He said:

"1. It is without doubt sufficiently notable and distinctive and good of its kind, from a national standpoint, to justify in the absence of very strong special reasons to the contrary, retaining it as a national monument, administering it as such, and in due course of time expending a considerable amount of Federal taxpayers' money to make certain parts of it conveniently accessible by road and to provide simple conveniences for visitors and for its operation.

"2. It is not so unique and precious for such purposes (in the sense that Zion National Park is, for example), and the scenic, recreational, and related values which it would have if so administered would not be so largely sacrificed by the introduction of the waterpower developments contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation as to give very strong grounds for opposing those economic developments if and when it becomes clearly evident that the installation of some or all of those waterpower developments would produce economic values of social importance largely and certainly in excess of the economic cost of producing them. Under those conditions it would be reasonable for the Park Service to approve changing the legal status of the unit from that of a national monument to that of a 'multiple-use area' devoted to the storage and regulations of water and production of waterpower and also (to the full extent compatible with the reasonably efficient performance of that function) to conserving and utilizing the potentially great scenic, recreational, and related values of the area."

In conclusion, let me say that I shall vote for the bill because it will guarantee an adequate water supply to millions of boys and girls yet unborn, who will constitute the increased population of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado in the decades immediately ahead.

Water is essential to their welfare.

There will be plenty of gorgeous scenery and recreational opportunities available for the boys and girls throughout the country, including the very area where this project will be developed.

I prefer to look into the future and see happy faces of boys and girls benefited economically, recreationally, and spiritually by the water potential of this project, rather than to look into deep canyons, untouched by human hands and undeveloped for the happiness and welfare of our people as a whole.

However, it does not follow that the development of the water resources of this project will lead to any impairment of the wild beauty of great canyons in America. It means only that in this instance the development of the water running through these particular canyons will be used to promote the greatest good of the greatest number.

Without an adequate supply of water, the prosperity of the area of the United States covered by this project will suffer, and it will suffer to the detriment of the entire United States.

On the basis of what I think is a clear preponderance of the evidence presented in the debate, I must conclude that the pending bill is meritorious and in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Therefore I shall vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I wish to say in addition is that I wish to compliment and commend my colleague from the State of Oregon for the exceedingly able argument and case he presented in support of his position on the amendment he offered.

My colleagues know very well that if I felt the merit of the argument was on his side of the case I would certainly lean over backward and vote with him on that issue.

However, I gave a very careful study to the bill and all of its ramifications, and I came to the conclusion that the legal argument did not support my colleague's amendment. I felt that the law of the case, so to speak, was in favor of the Echo Park project. Therefore, I

voted for the project, and I shall vote for the bill.

I wish only to read the conclusion of the speech that I prepared and had inserted in the RECORD:

In conclusion, let me say that I shall vote for the bill because it will guarantee an adequate water supply to millions of boys and girls yet unborn, who will constitute the increased population of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado in the decades immediately ahead. Water is essential to their welfare.

It does not follow that the development of the water resources of this project will lead to any impairment of the wild beauty of great canyons in America. It means only that in this instance the development of the water running through these particular canyons will be used to promote the greatest good of the greatest number.

Without an adequate supply of water, the prosperity of the area of the United States covered by this project will suffer, and it will suffer to the detriment of the entire United States.

On the basis of what I think is a clear preponderance of the evidence presented in the debate, I must conclude that the pending bill is meritorious and in the best interest of the Nation as a whole. Therefore, I shall vote for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. If it is agreeable to the able minority leader, I should like to yield myself 5 minutes and then yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall have to inquire whether there are any further requests for time in opposition.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the Senator from New Mexico will yield himself 5 minutes and yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remainder of the time controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], under the present control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is yielded back, except 5 minutes, which the Senator from New Mexico has yielded to himself. The Senator from California yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I recognize that there is some point to the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to the effect that we have agricultural surpluses on hand. He tried further to point out that these agricultural surpluses might be difficult to handle, especially in view of what may develop as a result of the passage of this bill.

I point out that the central Utah project will not be in full operation for 26 years, and that in a matter of only 7 years we expect to reach a balance between the present production of agricultural products and the consumption that will be required by the country at that time.

The Navaho project in my State will not be completed and in full operation for 27 years. We are not dealing with a present emergency. We are dealing with a situation that may arise in this land.

I think we should build our agricultural program so that we can take care of the agricultural needs of the Nation when the time arrives. At the present time there are many threatening conditions. In the New York Times of yesterday morning there was a statement saying that dust and winds have afflicted Colorado areas, that fields and ranches are barren, crops of wheat ruined, that Kansas is also affected, and that grass roots are in danger.

As the able Senator from Utah pointed out yesterday, this does not happen under irrigation, and we should try our best to tie down by crops land which has been blowing and causing great trouble.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible to reproduce the picture carried in the newspaper, calling attention to the fact that the wind takes its toll. It is stated that the wheat crop northwest of Lamar, Colo., has been badly damaged by drought and by blowing. We seek to make it possible to tie down the land.

I received in the mail within the past 48 hours a copy of a publication entitled "Land and Water," published by the Friends of the Land, a conservation movement. The publication comes to me because I am a member of the group called the Friends of the Land. I have tried to render service to those who are interested in conservation. The publication points out that our water use is growing faster than is our population. It points out that the requirements for water have been increased from 4 to 6 times in the past 50 years, whereas our water supply has been increased only twice. It also points out that as the years go by, the problem of water will become increasingly acute.

Here are the conservation people asking us to save the water of this country. What does the Colorado River project do? It builds at Glen Canyon a great dam. Not 1 drop of that water will irrigate 1 foot of land in the upper river valley. It will be held there to take care of other obligations. That water is precious. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in appearing before a subcommittee on the saline water bill yesterday, brought with him an article entitled "Water." He pointed out that water was becoming increasingly scarce and that this country must not be prodigal with its water; that it must conserve every drop. This project seeks to take the water of the great Colorado River and save it.

Oh, Mr. President, to be sure, power rates in the great Tennessee Valley Authority will be lower than those in the area of these projects. To be sure, they will be lower in the Columbia River Basin. About all we can make out of that is that when God formed the convolutions in the topography of this country He put the Colorado River in the wrong place. But that is not our fault. We have to take it where it is and make use of it. If power costs 5 or 6 mills as against the part of the country which is favored with only a 1-mill rate, that is not the fault of the hardy pioneers who have tried to make something out of the Mountain States. As the years go by we shall see more and more need to be careful of our supply of hydroelectric power.

There was a debate several years ago concerning the natural-gas bill, and it was pointed out during the debate that the State of New Mexico had the lowest natural-gas rate in the Union. The rate was 1.9 cents per thousand feet of gas shipped out of the State. That was the actual fact.

Within the past few months a contract has been signed providing for the movement of natural gas into the Salt Lake area at a rate of 13 cents to start and 18 cents when it is finished. Yes, prices go up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hope this bill will pass.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Fulbright	McClellan
Anderson	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Monroney
Beall	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kilgore	Sparkman
Curtis	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Symington
Douglas	Langer	Thurmond
Duff	Lehman	Watkins
Dworshak	Long	Williams
Eastland	Magnuson	Young
Ellender	Malone	
Ervin	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the final passage of the bill. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Accordingly I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent because of illness.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave

of the Senate in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Ellender	Malone
Allott	George	Mansfield
Anderson	Goldwater	Martin, Pa.
Barkley	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hennings	Millikin
Beall	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bender	Holland	Morse
Bennett	Hruska	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Jackson	Payne
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kerr	Sparkman
Clements	Kilgore	Symington
Curtis	Langer	Watkins
Daniel	Lehman	Young
Dworshak	Long	
Eastland	Magnuson	

NAYS—23

Byrd	Gore	Potter
Case, N J.	Green	Robertson
Cotton	Ives	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Kuchel	Stennis
Ervin	McNamara	Thurmond
Frear	Neely	Williams
Fulbright	Pastore	

NOT VOTING—15

Bridges	Kennedy	Purtell
Bush	Martin, Iowa	Saltonstall
Dirksen	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	Mundt	Welker
Hill	Murray	Wiley

So the bill (S. 500) was passed.

FUNDS FOR EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF PATENT OFFICE—REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (S. Res. 92) providing funds for an examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

LOYALTY DAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar 140, Senate Joint Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to designate May 1, 1955, as Loyalty Day. That day will be celebrated in the 48 States in accordance with proclamations issued by the governors of the respective States.

Similar resolutions have been sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars before the State legislatures; and a representative of that organization appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary this year in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 58.

Last year the Committee on the Judiciary approved a similar resolution, but too late for timely action by the Senate.

The House has already passed an identical resolution, House Joint Resolution 184. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the consideration of House Joint Resolution 184 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. It is identical with the Senate resolution which is on the desks of Senators and which was reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas whether the adoption of the resolution would result in a conflict. Many years ago I sponsored and secured the passage of a resolution creating May 1 as Child Welfare Day. Until now there has been annually a proclamation of the President setting that date aside as Child Welfare Day. Will there be any conflict between that designation and the one sponsored by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I know of no conflict. According to the evidence received by the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee this year and last year, no conflict was suggested to the committee at those times.

Mr. BARKLEY. There would be no conflict in having the same day devoted to two different purposes?

Mr. DANIEL. I know of none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation.

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

The Chair hears none; and the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 184.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 184) to designate the 1st day of May 1955 as Loyalty Day was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 1st day of May 1955, is hereby designated as Loyalty Day and is set aside as a special day for the reaffirmation of loyalty to the United States of America and for the recognition of the heritage of American freedom; and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day, in schools and other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 58 is indefinitely postponed.

PERMANENT CERTIFICATES FOR LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2225, the feeder airline bill.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to make an inquiry. I understand the Senate bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We are now taking up the House bill, which is not identical. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is going to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the Senate bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that was my intention. I should like to state that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] held hearings on the bill. The only difference between the House and the Senate bills is the proviso in the Senate bill which leaves authority in the Civil Aeronautics Board to take care of certain airlines, such as spur lines, which might not be economically feasible. With such a proviso, the Department of Commerce and the officials in the Transportation Division are in wholehearted agreement with the bill. I

thought we could take the bill to conference and then work out the difference.

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 (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to substitute Senate bill 651, as proposed to be amended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding the following:

"(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within 120 days after the enactment of this paragraph shall show that, from January 1, 1953, to the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant has been during the period since its last certification inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certificates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this section and the date of its application: *Provided*, That the Board in issuing the certicate is empowered to limit the duration of the certificate as to not over one-half of the intermediate points named therein, which points it finds have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires permanent certification at such time."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, before it is passed?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question before the bill is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a unanimous vote. All the bill proposes to do is to offer aid to a group of what are called feeder airlines, small airlines in the United States, some 14 or 15 in number, which have become an important and integral part of our airline system, have established themselves in giving service to small areas, and feed into the big trunklines.

Those feeder airlines have been operating for a number of years under what is called temporary certificates, in some cases running for as short a time as 2, 2½, or 3 years. Obviously, since they have only temporary licenses to operate their airlines, their economic structure is not so stable as it should be. Questions of financing have kept the smaller airlines from buying new equipment, because they were not sure their certificates would be renewed.

All the bill proposes to do is authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to give the small airlines, which are permanently established as part of our air system, permanent certificates, so that they may find themselves in a more stable economic situation, and may be able to obtain more modern equipment.

I might say that aiding these feeder airlines is important to all sections of the country. Because of their financial situation, they have been forced to fly with equipment which is not suitable for feeder line operation. It is hoped that by granting permanent certificates to them, the airlines will be enabled to purchase more suitable aircraft. Most of them have been using DC-3's.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] heard the testimony. I am sure he can answer any questions Senators may desire to ask him.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the bill is passed would we not be permanentizing what started out as local service experiments?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They were not experiments. There were some airlines conducted on an experimental basis which dropped out of the picture; but those covered by the bill are now established feeder airlines. They operate in all sections of the country. They furnish service to the smaller communities, and feed into the main trunk lines. The feeder airlines were constantly making application to the Civil Aeronautics Board to be given permanent status, because of the deficits resulting from the type of operation they were compelled to adopt.

I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he would care to answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say the feeder lines would have no status in the way of permanentizing without governmental approval that they do not now have under their temporary certificates. If the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to have a hearing and to cancel the permanent certificates, it has that right to do so under section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act. Both the feeder and trunk lines are thus given permanent certification, but that section provides that at any time, for cause, the Civil Aeronautics Board can amend or modify or cancel the certification to fly these routes for which they are permanently certificated.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the bill place the burden of proof or evidence on the airlines, or does it place any restriction on freedom of action on the part of the Board?

Mr. MONRONEY. The provision gives the Board general freedom of action, in that 50 percent of intermediate points between terminals can be adjusted or canceled any time the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to do so if they do not generate sufficient traffic.

The principal complaint, and the only complaint, really, that was registered by the Civil Aeronautics Board was the permanentizing of the route structure. While it was well satisfied with the terminal points, it felt some of the intermediate points might not justify enough traffic or airmail service to warrant continued permanent service there.

In order to get away from requiring these lines with permanent certification, after formal hearing before the Civil Aeronautics Board and on application, to discontinue service we provide, in an amendment, that the Civil Aeronautics Board, on its own initiative, can change not more than 50 percent of the intermediate points in any of these feeder airline systems if they fail to produce sufficient traffic. I feel it reasonably meets the objection of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or at least it meets what the Board was driving at.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have been wanting to see the time when we could stop the subsidy to airlines, both feeder lines and trunk lines. Does not this measure permanently obligate us to pay a large annual subsidy to the feeder lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. It commits us to no more than what we are doing today in the case of the trunk lines; and I think we shall see the subsidy requirements reduced once these lines are able to effect the economies which permanent subsidization will give them. In that event they will have better planes, which they can operate more cheaply, which will carry larger payloads, planes which are designed for the feeder type of service, instead of using obsolete DC-3's. They will achieve further economies in operation by being able to keep their employees permanently, instead of having them ready to leave, in order to accept employment on the permanently certificated trunk lines, where steady jobs are now available. I believe we shall save the feeder lines $100,000 on each certification, by virtue of the fact that they will not be forced to go through unnecessary hearings every 2 or 3 years, in order to get a new lease on life, so to speak.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. One hundred thousand dollars would not go very far toward paying the subsidy to these lines.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the subsidy last year amounted to approximately $24 million. There are some 14 car-

riers. So $100,000 represents a substantial part of the subsidy.

Mr. GORE. How many passengers were carried, for which we paid the subsidy of $24 million?

Mr. MONRONEY. More than 2½ million passengers were carried last year. The load has been growing each year. This year the load is increasing by 20 percent or more.

In addition to carrying 2½ million passengers last year, the smaller lines transported more than 1¼ million ton-miles of airmail, more than 1 million ton-miles of express, and more than 1 million ton-miles of freight—in the calendar year 1954. That is evidence that they are growing. In 1950 they carried less than 1 million passengers.

Let me say to my good and dear friend from Tennessee that the hearing rather conclusively showed that today these feeder lines are in almost as good condition, subsidywise, as the condition in which the trunk lines, as we know them today, were when they were certificated permanently under the Civil Aeronautics Act and the grandfather clause, in 1938.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. According to the figures given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, when those figures are translated into the number of passengers, they mean that during the last year the taxpayers of the United States have been called upon to pay approximately $10 for every passenger who traveled on the lines, whether on a long trip or on a short trip—and most of the trips are very short.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator from Tennessee is completely ignoring, I believe, the fact that the airlines carried 1¼ million ton-miles of airmail. Certainly the growing airmail service, for which the Government has received payment in the neighborhood of $9 million in postage, is not to be ignored.

Let me say further to the Senator that much of the subsidy of which he is speaking comes back to the Government, because the local airlines collect Federal excise taxes on transportation in the amount of $3 million, which could not be collected if they were not flying those loads. The $9 million the Government receives in revenue on airmail could not otherwise be obtained. The annual payroll of $30 million is taxable, both on payroll taxes and on income taxes, in the case of the many mechanics and air crews who serve these lines.

I believe we certainly must realize that if we in the United States intend to limit commercial aviation to only the highly populous cities, we shall relegate ourselves backward, out of the air age, instead of forward. A trunk line on a railroad could not be prosperous had not the branch lines been established; and certainly many of the railroad lines—and I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee will agree with me—were built with a vastly greater amount of subsidy, in the form of public lands, than the cost of this service to the feeders.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me, for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the financing of these lines. Is it not true that until these feeder lines have something definite, until they know whether they are going to get permanent certificates, they cannot have access to the ordinary channels of sound financing, as modern airlines?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Mississippi is eminently correct. It was testified that their cost of financing is a great deal higher because no equity capital is willing to be invested in them, when they have hanging over them a death sentence of a year or two, as is true in the case of a 1-year or 2-year certificate.

Mr. STENNIS. Exactly.

Furthermore, has not this air service become an essential part of the economy of the small towns and small cities these lines serve? Moreover, as illustrated by the continuous flow of air traffic from north Mississippi into Memphis, Tennessee, is not it true that the feeder lines are feeding more and more wealth and income into the larger areas served by the larger airlines?

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to my distinguished colleague and friend from Mississippi that we heard testimony from a large rug concern, which not too recently has located a large plant in the State of Mississippi; and one of the major factors leading to the location of that plant in Mississippi was the fact that it had feeder air-line service by means of which the company could reach from its headquarters in New York City to that small town in Mississippi, by making connections through a feeder line operating from Memphis, and thus the company was able in a few hours to have distribution of patterns, orders, and personal visits for executive supervision.

Mr. STENNIS. And without the service from the small towns and small cities to the major population centers which are served by the major airlines, the small towns and small cities will not have a chance to compete on a modern basis, and will not have a chance to grow. Is that not true?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Let me say that 442 cities in 42 States are served by these feeder airlines, and 264 cities are served exclusively by feeder lines.

Are we going to limit air service only to New York City, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Miami, and the other large cities; and are we going to force the people, who live in the small and thriving communities, to live in a horse-and-buggy age?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield once more to me, let me say that we who serve on the Appropriations Committee, on the Armed Services Committee, and on other committees are concerned with dispersal; but this feeder airline service is doing much more than can be done by anything else I know of really to bring about the dispersal of small industries and to keep the population from centering further and further in the large, over-populated areas.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Mississippi very much for his contribution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The pending bill will give the feeder lines an opportunity to develop passenger traffic, will it not?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed it will; and there will be more permanence due to the fact that the service will not be here today and gone tomorrow, and will not depend on willingness of the CAB to renew a temporary certificate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I could point out to the Senator instance after instance I know of, of cities, towns, and communities having been denied air service simply because the local airline had only a temporary certificate and because, as a result, the cost of giving service on the temporary certificate, in terms of the cost of construction of the station and the cost of providing equipment, was so far beyond the ability of the airline to pay, in view of the temporary basis.

Thereby we lose the service to the community on the one hand, and we also lose the possibility of developing greater service in terms of trunk lines. I think this bill is long overdue. As I gather, under the terms of the bill, if the Civil Aeronautics Board finds that the lines between the main terminal points are uneconomic, if there are too many stations for the traffic, the freight load, or the express load, after hearings certain stops can be dropped. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. The entire certificate can be dropped after hearings, if the Board chooses to do so. But we attempt to allow a certain amount of flexibility without hearings. We give flexibility to the route structure, so that, without hearings, 50 percent of the intermediate points, as they are converted, can be dropped within a reasonable period of time if they fail to use the air service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us assume, however, that the Civil Aeronautics Board wishes to cancel a particular stop in the feeder-line service. What right does the community affected have to go to the Board and appeal its case? Representatives of communities are constantly writing to me in cases in which an airline, operating under a temporary certificate, is about to curtail service simply because of its present economic position. Often the mayor of the community, the city council, and the chamber of commerce will say, "If you give us 3 years or 5 years, or enough time to develop traffic, we will make this a paying proposition." Does such a community, under the terms of the bill, have an opportunity to appear before the Civil Aeronautics Board and be heard?

Mr. MONRONEY. Indeed it has. But there is a special case when the line is completely uneconomic. Fifty percent of the intermediate points are subject to being changed without the formal hearing provided for in section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that the Civil Aeronautics Board is to have unquestioned authority to cancel out up to 50 percent of the stops without even an opportunity on the part of the local people to be heard or to appeal and present their case?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Board has unquestioned authority today to cancel out the entire route structure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no protection against that. In order to try to satisfy the complaint of the Civil Aeronautics Board that making these certificates permanent would copper-rivet, in an uneconomic and hopeless manner, a great number of stops, the committee, I think, reached a very happy compromise in saying that 50 percent of the stops must be permanent. The others will be on a use-it-or-lose-it basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a better statement of what I feel is equitable and fair.

Is it correct to say that the rights which the local communities now possess, in terms of their representations to the Civil Aeronautics Board, would in no way be abrogated or weakened by the bill before us?

Mr. MONRONEY. They are increased manifold. That was the safeguard we wrote into the bill, so that there could be some flexibility of route structure, and so that the operators need not be uncertain, as they are today, as to whether or not their licenses will be renewed the next time they come up for certification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the committee for bringing this legislation before us. I think it will do great good for the aviation industry of the country.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say that the report of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Small Business Committee I commend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for the leadership they have given the Senate with respect to the pending bill.

I see our good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Chamber. He is the chairman of the Small Business Committee. He knows that the Small Business Committee has worked in this field for a considerable time.

I particularly wish to emphasize, speaking to the Senator from Oklahoma, that this bill will have an extremely beneficial effect on the feeder lines from the standpoint of commercial psychology within their communities. It will have an effect, for example, on their credit standing. It will give the business communities and the various feeder localities greater confidence in the perpetuation of these lines.

I particularly desire to stress the need for these feeder lines in the more sparsely populated areas of the United States. I find that it is easy, in highly populated areas which are served by other airlines, for people to overlook the importance of the feeder lines in less thickly populated areas—for example, in my section of the country. The feeder lines perform a valuable economic service to the people in the small towns in very remote areas—in our arid areas, our mountain areas, and our rural areas. I think this bill is of great importance, and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his contribution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said. I wish to add my commendation of the able Senator from Oklahoma and of the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and all other members of the committee, for reporting this bill. It was needed. I have followed with interest the development of the feeder system. I remember when the first hearing was held, and the first routes were authorized on a tryout basis. One of them operated in my State. I knew the management. I have flown on many, many of the feeder routes. They are certainly a very important and essential part of our transportation system.

I should like to make one further observation. As the Senator from Oregon has said, the Small Business Committee, during the entire life of the present committee, has been greatly interested in air transportation in the United States, and particularly its impact upon the small independent businesses engaged in air transportation. This is a part of the picture.

There are other phases of the problem. When I say that, I do not mean solely the so-called irregular carriers, but there are other carriers—freight carriers, and various other segments of the air transportation industry—which have not been given proper consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and, in my opinion, never will receive such consideration, unless this committee does a job in that field such as it has done in this particular instance.

There are many so-called irregular carriers. I hold no brief for a single one of them. I think they ought to observe reasonable regulations, but it is my opinion that at times the Civil Aeronautics Board has not been reasonable in the regulations it sought to impose upon those carriers.

Every time I go to the airport to take a plane and see the crowds milling around, and note the large numbers of persons in a "standby" position, waiting and hoping to get on a plane, I am impressed with the fact that our air transportation is not keeping pace with the growing demands day by day. There are possibilities, potentialities, in all the various phases of air transportation, which ought to be given serious consideration, both by the Civil Aeronautics Board and by the committee.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and other members of the committee for what they have done. At the same time, I urge them not to stop at this point, because one of the fastest growing things in this country is the demand for air transport of all kinds. I think we shall need to stay on top of this problem if we are to provide the American people with what they ought to have.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his contribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to commend my able friend for his excellent explanation and exposition of the bill. He seems to have satisfactorily answered all questions. However, I should like to ask one further question. Does he envision the time when the subsidy program can be substantially diminished, if not ended?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to my distinguished friend that I certainly can envision such a time, because the curve of subsidy payment is downward today. It is not downward on the total amount involved, but on the subsidy per passenger mile.

In 1950 we were paying for a very great portion of the operation. That is when it began as an experiment. Today we are paying a very small amount, although the airlines are flying many more passenger miles. In other words traffic, mail, and freight loads have grown as the route structures have grown.

This is little business, and little business is growing. These men are hustling for business. I wonder whether Senators know that 2 out of every 3 of these passengers carried by feeder lines were either coming or going farther distances via a trunk-line airline. Of the 2½-million passengers who originated on these feeder lines, 2 out of every 3 went farther on the trunk-lines, which, of course, have now worked out of a need for substantial subsidies.

When we consider the fact that nearly $50 million is being spent for overseas subsidies, the $24 million involved is not too great a price to pay for needed services to our local communities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I had prepared and intended to read to the Senate.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I introduced the local service certificate bill, S. 651, to strengthen our system of national civil air transportation. In providing for permanent certification of local service airlines, the bill will make air transportation available to many local communities on a permanent basis. For the last 10 years the Nation's scheduled feeder airlines have been operating under temporary certificates of public convenience and necessity even though most authorities were agreed the Civil Aeronautics Board, under the Civil Aeronautics Act, had the power and authority to certificate permanently these local service airlines.

The testimony which was developed during the hearings on S. 651 by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, under the able leadership of Senator MONRONEY, demonstrated both the right of the local service airlines to permanent certificates and the benefits which would result to the country from their receipt of permanent certificates.

In the last Congress the House of Representatives unanimously passed H. R. 8898

and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously and favorably reported out that bill with amendments. Because the report was made late in the season, the Senate failed to take action before adjournment. This week, April 19, 1955, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 2225, a bill similar to S. 651.

The 13 local service airlines, each serving its respective region, furnish scheduled passenger, mail and cargo service to 47 million Americans in 42 States and to nearly 400 cities, of which they furnish the only scheduled air service to about 220. Their importance to the economy of the great Western States is attested to by the unanimous action of the Western States Council. The council, representing the executives of the chambers of commerce of the 11 Western States, in annual session at Fresno, Calif., on March 22, 1955, endorsed the principle of S. 651 and urged all its Members in Congress to support the legislation. I offer a copy of the resolution for the RECORD.

These airlines are aggressive, small businesses with a proved record of steadily increased air service and a constant reduction in Federal subsidy per unit of service rendered. In calendar year 1954 2½ million Americans traveled on the feeder airlines. They traveled either between small towns on the local airline system or they commuted between a small town and a large metropolitan area, or they flew to a metropolitan airport where they connected with a truck airline for further transportation. In each event the unity and the commerce of the United States was promoted by the flight and our national system of air transportation was developed proportionately.

The rapid rate of progress of the local service airlines is eloquent testimony of the national need for this type of air service. In 1954 the local service airlines showed about a 20 percent improvement over 1953 in number of passengers, number of revenue passenger miles and mail ton miles. So far in 1955 the industry average shows about a one-third improvement over 1954.

This progress has been achieved in spite of the great handicap of temporary certification. Although the so-called "local service experiment" has been in process for 10 years, most of the carriers have operated under certificates which gave them only 3 or 4 years of life at any one time. The expense of renewing these temporary certificates has been considerable—estimated upward of $100,000 for each renewal proceeding—and every one of these airlines has had at least one renewal. Two of them have had two renewals and four are now in the process of attaining their second renewals.

The temporary nature of their certificates has made it extremely difficult for the feeder airlines to run stable and economical personnel programs. The inducement of planning a career with an employer that has three years or less to live before it must undertake an expensive legal proceeding to justify a further extension of its existence is obviously difficult. Its difficulty is at the root of a personnel turnover rate in the local service airline industry twice that in the trunk airline industry. High training and personnel replacement costs have thus been inevitable.

The difficulties of financing an airline enterprise that has only a temporary lease on life are also obvious. The local service airlines have paid the penalties of abnormally high interest rates and have generally found it impossible to secure any long term financing, or indeed any financing that runs beyond the expiration date of their certificates. This legislation would remove that obstacle to financing and leave each airline strictly on its own financial merit in securing further backing.

Up to now the local airlines have been necessarily required to make short term arrangements for hangars, navigational equipment, maintenance facilities and other operating equipment with all the financial penalties inevitable in short term arrangement. This legislation will permit the economies that go with long term arrangements.

States and municipalities have been understandably reluctant to invest large sums of money in aeronautical facilities when they realize that the airlines furnishing them their service have only temporary certificates. This legislation will not only reassure States and municipalities which have heretofore invested money in aeronautical facilities that their investments have not been speculative, but it will induce those States and municipalities to plan new or expanded facilities which will further generate improved service to the public.

Heretofore aircraft manufacturers have been reluctant to design an aircraft specifically tailored to the particular requirements of local airline service. The ever present possibility that the customers for such an airplane would be out of existence by the time it was ready to fly has understandably curtailed the enthusiasm of the airplane manufacturers, but this legislation will at least remove that danger from their planning so that they may undertake the design of a new suitable aircraft with confidence that customers will be available to buy it if it proves successful.

This bill provides that a feeder airline, in order to qualify for a permanent certificate, must show that it was a carrier furnishing passenger, property, and mail service from January 1, 1953 to the date of its application for a permanent certificate. This provision, however, does not mean that routes, segments, or points being served on January 1, 1953 are the only ones eligible for permanent certification. On the contrary, the route patterns and the segments and points to be permanently certificates are those for which the individual carrier applies and which it is serving between the date that this bill becomes law and the date that the carrier files its application.

I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to the proviso at the end of the bill. This proviso is an addition to the bill which was reported to the Senate last year and is not found in the bill passed by the House this week (H. R. 2225). The purpose of the proviso is to furnish all the flexibility necessary to the Board to guarantee that there will be no freezing of hopelessly uneconomical route patterns or segments or points. In order to make this guarantee the Civil Aeronautics Board will be authorized by the proviso to certificate temporarily up to one-half of the intermediate points named in the permanent certificate of the individual carrier if the Board finds that those points have generated insufficient traffic to warrant a finding that the public convenience and necessity requires their permanent certification at the time that the certificate of the individual carrier is issued. During recent renewal proceedings some additional intermediate points have been added. Some of these, we are told, have not yet developed sufficient commercial traffic to show the point is a real asset to the carrier or that the carrier's service is a substantial benefit to the intermediate city itself.

This proviso is not, however, an escape valve by which the Board is meant to duck the objective of the legislation. Since the Board has already certificated each of the local service airlines at least twice and is presumably familiar with their pattern of operations, the Congress can be confident that the proviso will not delay the implementation of the legislation and it can be further confident that the 13 local service airlines will all have their permanent certificates by the end of the calendar year 1955. I certainly expect the Board to proceed, and the Congress may expect it to proceed, on a schedule that will make that date a liberal one.

This bill is specifically for the benefit of local-service airlines. It is not meant to include within its purview trunk airlines which happen to be operating local service type routes. In a few cases the Civil Aeronautics Board has awarded typical local service type routes to the trunk airlines. The policy of the Congress has been and the intent of this legislation is to establish strong, permanent, local service type carriers. It is not our intent by this legislation to approve of the past or future award of permanent certificates of local-service routes to trunk-line carriers.

Permanent certification of these airlines does not mean permanent subsidy payments. On the contrary, this permanent certification will be the biggest single step taken so far toward reducing subsidies. The economies inherent in operating on a permanent, rather than temporary, basis will help accelerate the rate of reduction of subsidy per unit of service rendered along the favorable curve on which the local service airline industry has been driving it ever since its birth as an industry.

Likewise, there need be no fear that possession of a permanent certificate entitles the possessor as a matter of law to expect that every segment of his route should be permanently subsidized. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 provides in section 406 (b) for the payment of "need" mail pay to enable the air carrier in question "under honest, economical, and efficient management to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense."

This provision is the one under which the Board determines whether a particular route or segment should be subsidized. If the Board should find, after adequate experience in actual operation, that a particular route or segment is so weak that it does not contribute to the development of air transportation as provided in section 406 (b), under the act the Board must cut off subsidy for that particular route or segment. In that event the carrier could either operate the route at his own expense or, with the permission of the Board, suspend or abandon his operation there.

In 1938 the Congress gave grandfather rights to the domestic trunk airlines by enacting the Civil Aeronautics Act. That legislation has been the foundation for the development of the world's finest system of civil air transportation and for the development and manufacture of the world's finest civil air transports. I am confident that the passage of S. 651 will similarly serve both as a foundation for the development of local air service beyond the capacity of our imaginations presently to envisage and also as a foundation for the development of local service type aircraft that will likewise lead the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a resolution adopted by the Western States Council, an association of chamber of commerce executives of 11 Western States.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WESTERN STATES COUNCIL IN ANNUAL SESSION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MARCH 22, 1955

PERMANANT CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL SERVICE AIR CARRIERS

Be it resolved, That the conference of the Western States Council, meeting in annual session in San Francisco, hereby unanimously

endorses the principle of permanent certification legislation in Congress for the local service air carriers of the United States and hereby urges its entire membership to actively support such endorsement by vigorously seeking the unqualified support of their appropriate congressional delegations for Senate bill 651 and House bill 2225 (84th Cong.), or their equivalent.

The principle of permanent certification of local service air carriers is endorsed for these and other reasons:

A. Such action is directly related to the public interest.

B. The Nation, and especially the Western States, have a need for improved transportation and communications facilities.

C. Individual communities and areas should not have to stand the expense and effort of showing need for service over and over again.

D. Carriers and their backers are entitled to investment security.

E. Better service would be the result of an assured future.

(The Western States Council is an association of chamber of commerce executives of the 11 Western States banded together for the mutual exchange of helpful information that will develop the West.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appropriate place in the RECORD some remarks which I have prepared concerning Senate bill 651.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE ON S. 651, PERMANENT LOCAL SERVICE CARRIER CERTIFICATION BILL

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma who put in long hours conducting hearings into this important bill in his capacity as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I should like to address myself to S. 651 for several minutes. I believe this bill points up important aspects of the progress of air transportation in this country. Some years ago when feeder airlines trudged the hard row of developing air service over areas not served by the larger trunklines, these feeders served as pioneers in this industry.

Today this country is served by 14 local service carriers operating under temporary certificates. They face the time and expense of going before the Civil Aeronautics Board to carry on protracted proceedings to insure the continuance of their operations. It seems to me that any feeder airline which has met the good business and experience test is deserving of permanent certification.

It cannot be disputed that the Civil Aeronautics Board in granting temporary certificates to local service carriers believed that the progress of the Nation required the extension of the benefits of air transportation to a greater and greater segment of this country. Certainly, the main difference between feeder service and the trunkline service lies in the number of persons using such service and not in the character or the need of the people themselves for such service.

I would venture the opinion that today the vast majority of people traveling by airplane expect the same service whether they are traveling in a trunkline carrier or in a local service carrier. However, the local service carrier does not have the business potential of the trunks which serve the big metropolitan areas.

As a westerner, I can truly appreciate the desirability of air transportation when great distances must be covered. In the areas of the West where feeder airlines serve a most important purpose of interconnections with trunk lines, the necessity of local service carriers cannot be overestimated.

The State of Nevada itself brought into existence in 1945 one of the country's most successful local service carriers, Bonanza Airlines. Today, this airline has daily flights into 17 cities in Nevada, Arizona, and California. Its growth has been a healthy one shown by an increase from 908,000 revenue miles in 1950 to 17,400,000 revenue passenger-miles in 1954. The contribution this airline and its president, Edmund Converse, have made to the march of progress in Nevada business life has indeed been outstanding.

This airline holds a most important place in the transportation industry of the three States it serves. Certainly, if its business progress has been healthy, it is deserving of permanent certification so that its continued growth can be built on a more solid foundation.

The local service airline industry has proved its value to the Nation. It is here to stay. Any industry which provides good air transportation to 444 cities is one that the American public deserves to keep.

The progress of air transportation cannot be halted and it seems to me that it behooves the Congress to lend a helping hand by authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant permanent operating certificates to this important segment of the American civil-aviation industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appropriate place in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared with reference to Senate bill 651.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held 2 days of hearings on S. 651 and in the course of those hearings I believe that all the arguments for and against the principle of S. 651 were forcefully and clearly presented to the subcommittee. There is no doubt in the minds of the members of the subcommittee, Mr. President, as evidenced by their unanimous vote in favor of S. 651, and as confirmed by the unanimous vote of the full committee in favor of that bill, that S. 651 will be a major step forward in strengthening the system of civil air transportation in the United States.

The 13 local-service airlines have been in business for periods varying from 5½ to 10 years. This is a short life as transportation industries go, but their record of progress during that short life has been phenomenal. The local-service industry was conceived right after World War II as an experiment to test whether the American people would support scheduled air transportation of passengers, mail, and cargo to, from, and between the small and intermediate size cities of the United States, and the steady and rapid rate of increase of utilization of facilities of the local service carriers has eloquently proved that the experiment has been as successful as it was foresighted.

The fact that 2½ million Americans rode in local-service airplanes in calendar year 1954 is itself a dramatic argument in support of the public acceptance of this system of transportation. The fact that 2 out of every 3 of these passengers was either coming from or going to a trunk airline has proved the wisdom of the feeder concept and has earned the strong support of the trunk airlines for the local carriers. The fact that these small airlines transported over a million and a quarter ton-miles of airmail and over a million ton-miles of express, and another million ton-miles of freight in calendar year 1954 is further evidence of the acceptance of this element of the air-transport industry. There can be no doubt, Mr. President, that local airline service is here to stay, and that the support of the public will increase the extent of the service which the feeder airlines render to the public.

The growth of local airline service and the degree of its public acceptance is evident in the fact that in 1950 they carried fewer than 1 million passengers as compared to 2½ million last year. Likewise, in 1950 their commercial revenues were approximately $10 million whereas last year they were nearly $28 million. The air mail ton-miles have increased from approximately one-half million in 1950 to 1¼ million in 1954 and air express and air freight have approximately doubled in the same period. At the same time 1955 gives every indication of being by far the best year in the local-service airline industry. Just as 1954 reflected in general a 20 percent improvement in the local-service airline picture over 1953, so 1955 to date evidences about a one-third improvement over 1954.

This public acceptance has another happy byproduct in that it has reduced substantially the amount of Federal subsidy per unit of service rendered. This is a young industry and will undoubtedly need the sympathetic assistance of the Congress for a few more years in the matter of subsidies, but whereas mail pay per aircraft-mile in 1948 was twice the amount of commercial revenues of the local-service industry, commercial revenues caught up with mail pay in 1951, passed mail pay in 1953, and today are substantially ahead of mail pay as the principal source of revenue to the local service industry.

In the State which I in part represent the local-service airlines serve 15 cities and 9 of these cities get their air service exclusively from a local-service carrier. These 9 cities have an average population of 18,000. obviously no trunk airline would be interested in serving towns of this size and yet I believe that my constituents should not be penalized in the matter of air transportation just because they have chosen to spend their lives in the small towns which are the backbone of American strength.

While the services of the local airlines have been greatly increased in quality and quantity in the past few years, the gross subsidy bill has been approximately stable for the fiscal years 1954, 1955, and projected for 1956 at about $25 million. Even if this figure could be considered a net expenditure to the Government, I would submit that it was a small price tag for this country to place on scheduled air service to the 444 cities in 42 States served by the feeder airlines, 264 of those cities exclusively by those airlines. This $25 million is really not a subsidy to the local-service airlines as such but is actually a subsidy to the 47 million American citizens who live in the 42 States served by the local carriers.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that this figure is not in any sense a net expenditure to the Federal Government for a major part of it is returned to the Government in the form of revenue. The local service airlines collect Federal excise taxes on transportation on the order of $3 million. They pay oil and gasoline taxes on the order of $1 million. They provide an annual payroll of nearly $30 million subject to Federal income taxes and on which the employers pay payroll taxes of over $600,000, a figure matched by the social security taxes paid by the employees. They generate mail revenues to the Federal Government of nearly $9 million. Thus, some $14 million, plus the unknown amount of the Federal income taxes paid by their employees, is returned to the Federal Treasury by the local service airlines and may properly be considered in diminution of the gross subsidy bill.

Likewise, the subcommittee was greatly impressed by the defense potential of the feeder airlines. These small companies have 160 aircraft in service and they employ about 430 flight crews. Likewise, they have about 1,000 mechanics and approximately 1,000 other skilled personnel, as well as maintenance and operating bases, all in a state of readiness and immediate availability to face any defense emergency. This is certainly a multi-million-dollar asset to the national defense and one which would be considerably more expensive to maintain in its state of readiness and availability if it were supported by the Government exclusively as a defense asset rather than principally by the commercial customers who use it.

I would like to stress two specific points with respect to the bill itself. One is that it is the intention of the subcommittee that the routes being operated by the local service carriers whether by the terms of their temporary certificates or by exemption, as of the date that this law becomes effective are the ones that are to be permanently certificated—not the routes they were operating on January 1, 1953. The other point is that the committee intended this bill to be for the benefit of the local carriers as such and not for the benefit of trunk airlines that happen at the moment to be operating local service type routes. The committee intends to support the policy of having local service type routes operated by local service type carriers, and this legislation is not intended to permanentize any trunk carrier in their current temporary operation of feeder routes.

Many advantages will flow to the system of national air transportation from this legislation. The temporary certification and recertification proceedings which have been the rule heretofore have cost the local service airlines from 50 to 100 thousand dollars each time a line had to go through the proceedings. The subcommittee heard repeated testimony showing that the cost of a temporary recertification was equal to the amount of many months, if not more than a whole year, of the advertising budget of some of the local carriers. It is the subcommittee's feeling that the money heretofore spent on temporary certification proceedings could much better be spent on the development and improvement of the services rendered by the feeder airlines. Likewise, the expense to States and municipalities and the inconvenience to them has been comparable to that of the feeder airlines themselves. The economy of avoiding such proceedings in the future will be welcome to States and municipalities, and those local governments will be further fortified in the knowledge that their past investments in aviation facilities have been foresighted rather than merely speculative. Likewise, they will be encouraged to make future expenditures so that the quality of local air service will be improved and its scope broadened.

The temporary status of the local service carriers has in the past discouraged financial sources from investing in the feeder airlines and has likewise discouraged aircraft manufacturers from designing an aircraft tailored to the requirements of local service. A business that has a life expectancy of 3 years can neither be considered a very promising investment nor a valued customer. This legislation will remove at least a major psychological difficulty that has faced investors and aircraft manufacturers because it will assure them that the airline in question can make long-range plans for the future.

Likewise, the economies inherent in long-term arrangements for hangars, navigational equipment and maintenance facilities will be available to the local service carriers on terms comparable to those available to the trunks. Heretofore the penalties inherent to short-term leases have contributed to increasing the operating expenses of the local carriers, and we may expect an improvement in that regard.

In 1938 the Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act permanently certificated the trunk airlines of the United States. On the basis of their permanency and of the public demand for their services, those airlines have expanded into the greatest system of national air transportation in the world. Aviation has progressed since 1938 to the point where we can consider local air service in the same practical fashion as we then considered trunk air service. I confidently predict that on the basis of S. 651 the local service airlines of the United States will enjoy a growth and prosperity and will render a continued public service comparable to the experience of the trunk airlines.

Our local service airlines are an integral part of the Nation's air transport network. I cannot conceive of an air transport system without them any more than I can conceive of a railroad system made up only of transcontinental lines or a highway system made up only of through super highways. I believe that local air service is just as surely here to stay as the small and intermediate-size city of the United States is here to stay, and I further believe that the Congress should pass S. 651 so as to make permanent the status of our system of local air transportation so that the carriers themselves may get on with their job and increase the quality and value of their services to the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read, "An act to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

CONSTRUCTION OF A MODERN OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 206, S. 1722.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

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.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

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

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. In granting money to be paid for earned subsidies, may I ask if all the money is to be paid to domestic air carriers now operating within the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. I should explain that the Senate estimated that it would cost $15,200,000 to pay all the carriers, both the carriers operating within the United States and those operating internationally. The House appropriated only $5 million. The best figure we could arrive at, which would take care of the carriers in the United States only, was $11,200,000. We were able to raise the House figure to $8,900,000. In other words, we increased the House figure by $3,900,000. The House committee in its report states:

> The funds appropriated under this head are to be used to pay subsidy claims due for local-service carriers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Those are the carriers within the United States, not strictly the feeder lines we have been talking about in connection with the bill the Senate passed a few minutes ago. In other words, these are trunk lines as well as feeder lines within the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The reason for that is stated in the House Committee report on the bill:

> The committee is of the opinion that the Supreme Court decision, if properly adhered to, will result in a substantial reduction in the amount of subsidy, and that the amount allowed by the committee will be sufficient to make payments during the remainder of the fiscal year to domestic lines and international carriers who are not affected by the Supreme Court offset decision.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona.

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

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4903, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
April 20, 1955.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, 64, and 66 to the bill (H. R. 4903) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $258,000 named in said amendment insert: "$200,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $21,000 named in said amendment insert: "$15,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of $125,000 named in said amendment insert: "$100,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 19, and 23.

Amendment No. 18 provides $200,000 for expenses of the general supply fund under the General Services Administration. The Senate amendment provided $258,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to $200,000.

Amendment No. 19 provides an appropriation of $15,000 for the Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission. The Senate amendment provided $21,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to $15,000.

Amendment No. 23 provides an appropriation of $100,000 for Indian health activities. The Senate amendment provided $125,000, and in conference the amount was reduced to $100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR MUTUAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 144)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that there is at the desk a message from the President of the United States which has been read in the House earlier today. I ask that it be laid before the Senate and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. Without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished majority leader may have made an announcement earlier in the day with reference to a call of the calendar. Is it correct that there will be a call of the calendar next Monday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. Our plan is, Mr. President, to have the Senate meet tomorrow for a short routine session, and then recess or adjourn until next Monday and have a calendar call on Monday. If the Committee on Appropriations has reported the Agricultural appropriation bill in time to have it considered, we expect to take it up on either Tuesday or Wednesday. We are hopeful that we shall have another appropriation bill during the week, which will be followed by the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act.

There is a resolution which we expect will be reported from the Banking and Currency Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and if it is reported, we expect to take it up also. I think it will be noncontroversial.

JOHN DAY DAM PLANNING FUNDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most valuable power sites in the country is that at John Day on the Columbia River. The present budget calls for only $500,000 in appropriations to make possible the plans and engineering for this vital structure. My distinguished colleague, Senator MORSE, and I are working with the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase this sum to $1,500,000, if it can humanly be done.

John Day Dam would provide low-cost hydroelectricity at approximately 2.5 mills a kilowatt-hour, as contrasted with the 6-mill power which the administration is pushing so aggressively in the upper Colorado Basin.

I urge that the funds for the planning and eventually erection of John Day Dam be increased by the Congress, because the administration's budget is not ample in this respect.

A cogent editorial from the Oregonian of Portland, for April 14, 1955, serves to illuminate the need for John Day planning funds. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOHN DAY PLANNING FUNDS

One item on which the Democratic and Republican Members of Congress from the Northwest can and must joint forces is an appropriation for planning funds for John Day Dam. This dam, the next logical structure in the Columbia Basin timetable, has been authorized by Congress. Whether it shall be built by the Federal Government alone or by the Government in combination financing with local utilities, immediate funds for planning are essential.

The Inland Empire Waterways Association is urging appropriation of at least $750,000 for first-year planning. Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregan, have announced they will work for $1,500,000.

"Under an accelerated planning schedule, the Corps of Army Engineers could effectively use up to $1,500,000 during the first year," writes Herbert G. West, executive vice president of the waterways association. "The additional amount of planning funds would reduce preconstruction planning time to 16 to 18 months at a total cost of $2,500,000 as compared to 24 months and a cost of about $2 million."

Since it will require almost 6 years to get the first generating units on the line after start of construction, and from 8 to 9 years to complete the power installation, obviously the sooner the planning can be done the better. The Northwest, by all reliable estimates, will be seriously short of power before John Day can be completed, even with accelerated planning and earliest construction.

INVESTIGATION OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Resolution 33 providing for an investigation of the administration of the Civil Service Commission.

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

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, April 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for the term expiring December 31, 1957.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Viet-Nam.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Wayne M. Sweetland, Salome.
Floy M. Martin, Thatcher.

ARKANSAS

Calvin O. Stevens, Biscoe.
James S. Rollins, Cotter.
Alfred T. Smith, Hindsville.
William C. Baker, Lowell.
William E. Hodge, Jr., Mineral Springs.
Arvle H. West, Mountainburg.
Icy M. Wood, Pangburn.

CALIFORNIA

Josephine D. Bloching, Clayton.
Arthur H. Morgenstern, Hermosa Beach.
Katie B. Smith, Oro Grande.
Lester P. Frost, Placerville.
John J. Shanahan, St. Mary's College.
Thurston C. Jordan, Skyforest.
Louis K. Fies, Tulelake.
Gladys E. Beard, Veterans' Home.

FLORIDA

Bonita R. Swann, Wauchula.

INDIANA

Reuben Leon Ridenour, Angola.
Ruth L. Wilson, Hartsville.
Lester J. Britton, Hillsdale.
Rex E. Daugherty, Merom.
Arthur Heiny, Noblesville.

IOWA

Robert E. Lathrum, St. Charles.
Homer I. Stearns, Sutherland.

KANSAS

Paul H. Turnbull, Bushton.
Henry Clay Davis, Colby.
John J. Keener, Rush Center.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ray D. Adams, Great Barrington.

MINNESOTA

Clair N. Lund, Byron.
James E. Avenson, Cohasset.
Albert H. Temanson, Grand Meadow.
George M. Freking, Heron Lake.
Lester W. Kamholz, Morgan.
Edmond L. Farrell, Slayton.
Walter A. Lienke, Windom.

MISSISSIPPI

James K. Baker, Jr., Aberdeen.
Melvin G. Nesbit, Ecru.
Charles D. Davis, Northcarrollton.
James D. Burch, Pattison.
Lowrey T. Martin, Smithdale.
Dan Reece Monroe, Taylorsville.

MISSOURI

Gene D. Callison, Barnett.
George W. Lowrance, Golden City.
Cyrenius J. Jones, Jonesburg.
William H. Adams, Memphis.

NEBRASKA

Virgil W. Benson, Upland.
Raymond E. Paulson, Wakefield.

NEW JERSEY

Marian T. Killoran, Almonesson.
Francis C. Monks, Harvey Cedars.

NEW MEXICO

Byron C. Withers, Fort Sumner.

OHIO

Keith W. Lowery, Buckeye Lake.
Homer E. Charleston, Byesville.
Richard H. Mikesell, Cadiz.
David H. Reynolds, Cedarville.
Jean Ray Swihart, Eldorado.
Jack Richard Turner, Forest.
Helen M. Hall, Fredericksburg.
Clarence E. Felker, Gibsonburg.
Earl G. Golliver, Grover Hill.
Olive G. Spangler, Harrisburg.
Walter Thomas Woolard, Hebron.
Wayne F. Grosse, Hiram.
Adolph F. Raab, Lancaster.
Verne A. Miner, Lodi.
Robert H. Shafer, McComb.
Billy A. Calendine, McConnelsville.
Stanley L. Hartman, Medina.
Veryl D. Rodocker, Mount Eaton.
Dale A. Parker, North Bloomfield.
Harold E. Zornes, South Webster.
Barras George Birkbeck, Wadsworth.
Ben S. Daniels, Willoughby.
Marjorie A. Sine, Zanesfield.

PENNSYLVANIA

Donald C. Reese, Berwick.
Stanley A. Dubos, Chestnut Ridge.
Edna D. Lennon, Churchville.
Edward R. Quinn, Clifton Heights.
Blair E. Goodlin, Clymer.
Clair W. Wood, Conneautville.
Glenn P. Whelan, Croydon.
Karl W. Schempp, Jr., Donora.
Norman L. Bender, Dry Run.
Dorothy G. Fritz, Garrett.
Fred M. Ganoe, Heilwood.
Angelo P. Cellini, Midland.
Neil J. O'Brien, Renovo.
Gerald E. Ray, Rouseville.
Arthur B. Coulter, Saltsburg.
John P. Withers, Jr., West Elizabeth.
Arthur V. Gridley, Westfield.

RHODE ISLAND

Charles J. Butler, Westerly.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John T. Mabry, Abbeville.
Herbert G. McGraw, Clemson.
James R. Chitty, Jr., Olar.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Glen L. Engwall, Vermillion.

UTAH

Douglas R. Jensen, Redmond.

VERMONT

John H. Northrop, Enosburg Falls.

VIRGINIA

Roger D. Clark, Alexandria.
Sylvia M. Goad, Dugspur.
Paul P. Jones, Fancy Gap.
John H. Brown, Holland.
Mary M. Blaydes, Spotsylvania.

WASHINGTON

Daun Ringer, Bridgeport.
Gilbert E. Manuel, College Place.
Loring E. Bundy, Edwall.
Willis E. Goodwin, Houghton.
Samuel E. Edwards, Ritzville.
George A. Morrison, Vashon.
Bertha L. Mills, Vaughn.

WEST VIRGINIA

Lawrence E. Crow, Cameron.
Ivan E. Stewart, Ceredo.
Harold A. Buchanan, Gilbert.
Hayden K. Wolfe, Glen Rogers.
Frances L. Spencer, Hastings.
Robert Bruce Cooke, Iaeger.
Vernon Squires, Newburg.
Margaret G. Billings, Thorpe.

WISCONSIN

Sister M. Lenora Stein, Sinsinawa.
Minard F. Gaulke, Wisconsin Rapids.

WYOMING

Charles F. Hessenthaler, Byron.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Floyd C. Hammond to be postmaster at Myrtle Beach, in the State of South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. W. Warren Filkin, Jr., professor of Christian education, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bow before Thee humbly today in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who came that we might have life and have it more abundantly. We thank Thee for blessings innumerable that we take for granted, so unaware that they come from Thy bountiful store.

We pray for the President of the United States, and for the Speaker, and those who labor faithfully with him today in the affairs of state. Give us the blessing of Thy presence today. Give insight to know Thy will and courage and grace to do it.

We pray for peace. May there be a great turning toward the Prince of Peace in America and throughout the world. Bless these men and bless this Nation, and help us each one to live more and more for the honor and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, for we pray in His blessed name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 426)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4903) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, 13, 17, 25, 27, 60 and 61.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 29, 30, 33, 34, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 65, 67 and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$95,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"For an additional amount for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, $7,500,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT"

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, 64 and 66.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
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. 4903) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $650,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Agricultural Research Service," instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $7,000,000 additional for "School-lunch program."

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $8,900,000 for "Payments to air carriers, Civil Aeronautics Board," instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $15,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this head are to be used to pay subsidy claims due for local service carriers.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $50,000,000 for "Operating-differential subsidies, maritime activities," instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8: Provides a limitation of $225,000 on the amount that may be advanced to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities" from "Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization)," as proposed by the House instead of $250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $95,000,000 for "Federal-aid highways" instead of $90,000,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $3,500,000 for "Forest highways" instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $875,000 for "Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)", instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Defense—Civil Functions

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $230,000 for "Operating expenses, Canal Zone Government", as proposed by the House instead of $338,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

Foreign Operations

Amendment No. 15: Provides, by transfer, $6,500,000 for "Contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance" instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Increases limitation on administrative expenses for the Export-Import Bank of Washington to $1,125,000 instead of $1,110,000 as proposed by the House and $1,140,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Independent offices

Amendment No. 17: Deletes item of $12,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration proposed by the Senate. The conferees gave serious consideration to this item, but deferred action to permit the House to give consideration to the program in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill, 1956.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $7,500,000 for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees" instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 21: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Increases authorization to $80,020,000 for "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance" instead of $79,400,000 as proposed by the House and $80,640,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes item for Office of the Secretary proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendment No. 26: Provides $750,000 additional for "Salaries and expenses" to be derived by transfer, instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate. These funds are for home leave only.

Amendment No. 27: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate to make available not to exceed $75,000 from "Contributions to international organizations" for the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

Amendment No. 28: Provides transfer of $100,000 to "International contingencies" instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $500,000 for "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," as proposed by the Senate instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House.

The Judiciary

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $13,300 for "Salaries and expenses, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $900,000 for "Salaries of Judges," instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $914,500 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 32: Corrects title.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $85,000 for the Bureau of Accounts as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Inserts title.

Amendments Nos. 35–37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $63,000 for the Tax Court of the United States as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 40: Inserts title.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $650,300 for "Department of Public Health" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $152,900 for "Department of Public Welfare" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $28,008 for "Settlement of Claims and Suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XII

Legislative branch

Amendments Nos. 47–51: Make provision for Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 54–59: Make provision for Senate activities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Eliminates amendment to Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Eliminates item for House of Representatives, Salaries, Officers and Employees, Office of the Clerk, proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates $21,139 for fiscal year 1954 and $38,972 for fiscal year 1955 for "Capitol Police Board" as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,420 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 65: Eliminates language as proposed by Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIII

Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments

Amendment No. 67: Inserts document number.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates $9,504,219 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,269,842 as proposed by the House.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
JOHN TABER,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the pending conference report is the unanimous report of both the House and Senate conferees.

There are a number of technical amendments which under the rules must be submitted for separate vote but the committee of conference reports with a unanimous recommendation.

The three remaining amendments are submitted with modifications agreed on in conference which will be submitted to both the House and the other body in identical form.

It is a very satisfactory report in that it is $53,196,843 below the budget estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has gone to conference and is now back for our consideration. The other body placed increases in the bill totaling in the neighborhood of $98 million. We finally had to agree to an increase of $41,618,000 of the $98 million. Frankly, considering everything, I think the House conferees did as well as could be done in working the bill out. We have not included in this bill any more money than was absolutely necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc the amendments which are reported in technical disagreement and on which the House managers will move to recede and concur, as follows: 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 46, 52, 53, 63, 64, and 66.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The amendments are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 2, insert: *"Provided further,* That said funds may be used to reimburse the emergency fund of the President authorized by Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1855), for such funds as have been allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture for payments for the specific purposes authorized herein."

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 7, insert:

"CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

"Claims, Federal Airport Act

"For an additional amount for 'Claims, Federal Airport Act,' to remain available until expended as follows: Mercer County Airport, Trenton, N. J., not to exceed $110,854; to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of amounts heretofore appropriated for 'Claims, Federal Airport Act'."

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 5, line 1, insert:

"Repair of reserve fleet facilities

"For expenses of repair and installation of mooring facilities and restoration of cathodic installations at reserve fleet locations, $970,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 12, insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $400,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for Reserve Fleet expenses is increased from '$6,460,000' to '$6,860,000'."

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 7, line 3, strike out all of line 3 down to and including line 11, and insert:

"INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES

"Claims

"For an additional amount for 'Claims,' $4,320,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Military personnel, Navy,' fiscal year 1955.

"Retired pay

"For an additional amount for 'Retired pay,' $8,000,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Military personnel, Navy,' fiscal year 1955.

"For additional amounts for the following appropriations of not to exceed the respective amounts stated:

" 'Claims,' Department of Defense, $4,320,000;

" 'Retired pay,' Department of Defense, $22,000,000;

" 'Military personnel, Army,' $150,000,000;

" 'Military personnel, Air Force,' $110,000,000; the foregoing amounts under this head to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation only during the fiscal year 1955 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 15, line 10, insert:

"Assistance to States, general

"The limitation under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1955, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from '$2,400,000' to '$2,418,000'."

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 22, line 2, insert:

"Operating expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses,' $1,100,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Acquisition, construction, and improvements'."

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 22, line 6, insert:

"Retired pay

"For an additional amount for 'Retired pay,' $584,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Acquisition, construction, and improvements'."

Senate amendment No. 37: Page 22, line 10, insert:

"Reserve training

"For an additional amount for 'Reserve training,' $46,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Acuisition, construction and improvements'."

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 23, line 3, insert:

"OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL

"The limitation of $10,000 for the settlement of claims not in excess of $250 each in accordance with the act of February 11, 1929, as amended, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, is increased to $12,500."

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 23, line 10, insert:

"Metropolitan police

"The appropriation for 'Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention),' contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available for payment at basic salary rates for services performed from August 25 to September 7, 1954, both inclusive, by members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department in excess of their regular tour of duty (but not to exceed a total of 12 hours overtime pay to any individual member performing service within such period)."

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 24, line 14, insert:

"JUDGMENTS

"For the payment of final judgments rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Cong.), $10,587, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment."

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 25, line 1, insert:

"AUDITED CLAIMS

"For an additional amount for the payment of claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia as provided by law (D. C. Code, title 47, sec. 130a), being for the service of the fiscal year 1952 and prior fiscal years, as set forth in Senate Document No. 28 (84th Cong.), $155,095, together with such further sums as may be necessary to pay the interest on audited claims for refunds at not exceeding 4 percent per annum as provided by law (act of July 10, 1952, 66 Stat. 546, sec. 14d)."

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 26, line 18, insert:

"Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $3,905, to be available, effective April 1, 1955, for the compensation of 1 director of photography, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of $5,100, and 1 laboratory technician, joint recording facility at the basic annual rate of $4,020."

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 27, line 1, insert:

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an additional amount for the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $140: *Provided,* That effective April 1, 1955, the basic rate of compensation of

the chief cabinetmaker shall be $3,540 in lieu of $3,200."

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 29, line 8, insert:

"Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for 'Capitol Buildings,' $16,000, of which $12,500 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Capitol Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination, including related architectural treatment."

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 30, line 1, insert:

"Senate Office Building

"For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Building,' $53,000, of which $10,000 shall be available for such expenditures, including personal and other services, as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to make a survey and study of the illumination of the Senate Office Building and to submit recommendations and estimates of cost for improved illumination."

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 32, line 7, insert:

"CHAPTER XII A

"ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

"SEC. 1201. There is hereby authorized to be constructed on a site approved by the House Office Building Commission, in accordance with plans to be prepared by or under direction of the Architect of the Capitol and to be submitted to, and approved by, such Commission, an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary equipment, such necessary connections with the Capitol Power Plant and other utilities, such necessary access facilities over or under public streets, such other appurtenant or necessary facilities, such changes in the present House Office Buildings and mechanical and other changes necessitated thereby, and such changes in or additions to the present subway systems, as may be approved by such Commission.

"SEC. 1202. (a) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, such publicly or privately owned real property in the District of Columbia (including streets, avenues, roads, highways, alleys, or parts thereof) located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Grounds as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for the purposes of section 1201 of this chapter or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any street, avenue, road, highway, alley, or part thereof, acquired pursuant to this subsection shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of the House Office Building Commission. Square numbered 636 in the District of Columbia (which is now part of the new House of Representatives Office Building site) shall be available for the purposes of this chapter. Any real property owned by the United States and located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds shall upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the House Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol without reimbursement or transfer of funds. At such time or times as may be fixed by order of the House Office Building Commission, (1) any real property acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter shall become part of the United States Capitol Grounds and subject to the act entitled 'An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes,' approved July 31, 1946 (40 U. S. C., secs. 193a–193m, 212a, and 212b), and (2) the building and all facilities constructed pursuant to section 1201 of this chapter shall become subject to such act approved July 31, 1946, and to the provisions of law relating to the control, supervision, and care of the House Office Building contained in the act approved May 4, 1907, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 175).

"(b) Any proceeding for condemnation brought under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled 'An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States,' approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619–644).

"(c) When any real property has been acquired under, or made available for the purposes of, this chapter the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to provide for the demolition and removal as expeditiously as possible of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

"SEC. 1203. For carrying out the purposes of this chapter there is hereby appropriated $5 million, to remain available until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be determined by the House Office Building Commission to be required for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol under the direction of such Commission is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

"SEC. 1204. This chapter may be cited as the 'Additional House Office Building Act of 1955'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement with Senate amendments Nos. 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 22, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 45, 52, 53, 63, 64, and 66, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18 page 10, line 15, insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Expenses, general supply fund

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses, general suply fund,' $258,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Defense public works, community facilities'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$258,000" named in said amendment insert "$200,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19, page 11, line 1, insert:

"Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission

"For necessary expenses of the Commission in preparing, in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 19, 1949 (63 Stat. 620), a comprehensive plan for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the building of the Soo Locks, including 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, and transportation and not to exceed $20 per diem in lieu of subsistence for members serving without compensation, $21,000, to remain available until June 30, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$21,000" named in said amendment insert "$15,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23: Page 15, line 15, insert:

"Indian health activities

"For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); hire of passenger motor vehicles; and the purposes set forth in sections 321 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; $125,000, to be derived by transfer from 'Retired pay of commissioned officers,' fiscal year 1955."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$125,000" named in said amendment insert "$100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. CANNON, and by unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the votes on the various amendments in disagreement was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 144)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress authorize, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, the program for mutual security outlined in this message. The program reflects the greatly improved conditions in Europe and provides for the critical

needs of Asia. It encourages private overseas investment and private enterprise abroad, fosters an increase in cooperative effort, emphasizes loans rather than grants wherever possible. I consider the program an indispensable part of a realistic and enlightened national policy.

The fixed, unwavering objective of that policy is a just, prosperous, enduring peace. On this fundamental position we base our broad approach toward our world trade, our military alliances, our exchange of information and of persons, our partnership with free nations through the mutual security program. This partnership is rooted in the facts of economic and defense interdependence and also in the understanding and respect of each partner for the cultural and national aspirations of the other.

The recommendations in this message are an essential complement to the foreign economic program outlined in my message of January 10, 1955. That program is designed to develop the economic strength and the security of the free world through healthy trade expansion among the free nations and through an increased flow of investment capital particularly to underdeveloped areas. The lessening of barriers to trade in the free world is a vital component for the successful implementation of our national policy for security and peace.

We must recognize, however, that certain free world countries, because of the aftermath of war and its continuing threat or because of less developed economies, require assistance which will help them achieve stable national health and essential defensive strength. The mutual security program is designed to deal with these specific problems in the national interest and in the cause of peace. The program stands on its demonstrated worth.

Its cumulative success is especially evident in Western Europe today. The free nations there have attained new levels of production, larger volumes of trade, expanded employment, and rising standards of living. They have established strong defense forces which, although deficient in some respects, now constitute a significant deterrent to aggression and add substantially to the free world's defensive power. Their own national efforts and their cooperation with each other are the prime reasons for their success. However, the United States mutual security program and its predecessor, the European recovery program, deserve an important portion of the credit.

The program I now recommend to you for fiscal year 1956 proposes no economic aid for the original Marshall plan countries in Western Europe. These nations are capable of meeting current defense goals without such support. Deliveries of arms from previous appropriations will continue under constant review to insure that the latest weapon developments and strategic thinking are taken into account. Our initial contribution toward the arming of German forces is already funded by previous congressional action.

In Spain and Yugoslavia, which were not in the Marshall plan, defense programs can be successful only with further strengthening of their economic base. New appropriations are needed to continue our cooperation with them. Likewise the special circumstances of the city of Berlin require continued support for that outpost of freedom.

But the immediate threats to world security and stability are now centered in Asia. The preponderance of funds requested of the Congress will be used to meet the threat there. Within the vast arc of free Asia, which extends from the Republic of Korea and Japan to the Middle East, 770 million people, one-third of the world's population, reside. Most of them are citizens of newly independent states. Some have been engaged in recent war against the Communists. All are threatened. Capital is very scarce. Technical and administrative skill is limited. Within the area, however, abundant resources and fertile lands are ready for development.

Now is the time for accelerated development of the nations along the arc. The major responsibility must necessarily lie with the countries themselves. At best, foreign capital as well as foreign aid can only launch or stimulate the process of creating dynamic economies. In this light, the United States has the capacity, the desire, the concern to take the lead in friendly help for free Asia.

For example, we can assist in providing and mobilizing capital for useful and constructive development. We can encourage our successful private industry to join with the people of free Asia in building their private industry and facilitate the way. We can consult and advise on the means by which a free nation builds upon the initiative of independent farmers to achieve a steady advance toward better standards of living, in contrast to the mounting failures of collectivist agriculture.

It is clear that most of the nations of free Asia prefer to quicken their cooperative march toward these objectives through the Colombo plan consultative group which was established in 1950 to promote mutual economic development. We welcome this initiative. As a member of the group, we shall continue to work in strengthening its cooperative efforts.

The varied nature of national situations requires that our cooperation be essentially bilateral. Some of the nations are members of the Manila Pact and their treaty obligations give rise to special economic problems. Most are members of the Colombo plan. Most, except for Japan, have very little industrial capacity.

The requested authorization includes substantial funds to further our mutual objectives in this area. Of these funds I suggest that we can achieve the maximum return if $200 million is set aside for the establishment of a President's fund for Asian economic development, with broad rules enacted by Congress for its use through loans and grants, and with adequate latitude to meet changing circumstances and to take advantage of constructive opportunities.

To help assure the most effective use of these funds, this appropriation should be available for use over a period of years. Wisdom and economy in their use cannot be achieved through speed. A small, firm, annual commitment out of this $200 million may prove in many instances to be the most fruitful method.

Because of the continuing threat of aggression and subversion in Asia, a large part of the amounts requested for military assistance and direct forces support is to build and maintain the defensive forces of our allies there. This includes the substantial costs of maintaining and improving the defenses of the Nationalist Government of China in Formosa and provides for military equipment and supplies for Korea.

The newly achieved stability in Iran has decreased the Communist threat and has opened the way to the use of oil resources. These eventually will bring revenues to the nation for the further development of the land and the opening of new opportunities for its people. Pending resumption of sufficient revenues from oil, however, limited defense and economic support must be provided.

In the Near East, our stalwart North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, Greece and Turkey, are both making significant progress. But neither of them can alone support the substantial armed forces which they maintain for their own defense and for the NATO force goals in that area. Their initiative in promoting security arrangements in the Balkans, and Turkey's vigorous efforts for Middle East defense, reinforce the need for continued support of their efforts. Iraq's action in joining with Turkey in a defensive security arrangement is another favorable development.

The continuing tension between the Arab States and Israel handicaps the peoples of all Near East nations. We should continue to work with the governments and peoples on both sides to improve their economic status and accelerate their progress toward lasting peace between them. Our cooperation is beginning to bring results, particularly in the development of water resources. Such developments in the Palestine area can go far to remove present causes of tension.

In the vast continent of Africa the long-range effect of our cooperation is extremely significant. This continent and its resources, the progress of its people and their relationship to the free world are of growing importance. Requested appropriations for this area are needed in the effort to promote welfare and growth for the peoples of Africa.

In Latin America, I recommend intensification of our technical cooperation program. In this area more than a decade ago, technical cooperation was first undertaken in a systematic manner. The programs have proved their high value in many of our sister republics. No international programs have ever had such widespread welcome and support. Indispensable to the economic development of many free nations, they also reflect the deep humanitarian spirit of the American people.

Technical cooperation programs have contributed effectively to the efforts of the other American Republics to strengthen and expand their national economies. These efforts have likewise been aided by our very large inter-American trade, substantial private investment, more extensive lending by the Export-Import Bank, and credits by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. As a result, Latin America has achieved a remarkable rate of economic development. In addition to the technical cooperation programs for Latin America, I recommend a continuation of our modest contribution to the Organization of American States and further economic support to meet the critical situations in Guatemala and Bolivia.

Our programs of national action are not in any manner a substitute for United Nations action in similar fields. Every instance of effective measures taken through the United Nations on a human problem improves the ultimate prospect of peace in the world. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the United Nations technical assistance program, in which 60 governments participate and which is carried out by the United Nations and its specialized agencies be supported in a continuing and adequate manner. The United Nations Children's Fund has carried out an especially appealing and significant work. We have done our full share to make this work possible. We should continue to do so.

Persons who have escaped from totalitarian oppression, often at great peril, and refugees uprooted by war and disaster deserve further support in 1956 through programs administered by the United States, the United Nations, and the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

One of the unique, least expensive, and most fruitful aspects of the mutual security program is the participation, largely in humanitarian projects, of 47 voluntary organizations representing many millions of our citizens. These organizations do an exceptionally effective work in helping the escapees and refugees become self-supporting. They distribute large quantities of food on a people-to-people basis. But certain costs for transporting food, and for supplies beyond their own voluntary resources, are needed and should be provided.

In total, for fiscal year 1956, I recommend that the Congress approve funds totaling $3,530,000,000 for the mutual security program, as proposed in the budget message. Of this amount, $712,500,000 is for economic programs, including $172 million for a continuation of technical cooperation programs; $175,500,000 for special programs; $165 million for development assistance; $200 million for the special President's fund; $100 million is for a worldwide contingency fund. I request $1,000,300,000 million for defense support, which serves both economic and defense purposes by supplementing the efforts of countries, particularly in Asia, carrying out defensive measures beyond their current financial capacity; $1,717,200,000 is for military assistance and direct forces support. Included in this amount is $500 million to cover expected losses to present military-assistance programs by operation of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955.

The Foreign Operations Administration has proved to be an effective and efficient instrument for conducting the Mutual Security Program. An able and devoted group of men and women have successfully conducted the program under direct line authority from the President.

The Congress provided in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 for the termination of the Foreign Operations Administration by June 30 of this year. As I indicated in my letter to the Secretary of State of April 15, I shall issue an Executive order effective June 30, 1955, transferring the affairs of the Foreign Operations Administration to the Department of State, except for certain military aspects which will be transferred to the Department of Defense.

This transfer to permanent Departments of the Government will reflect the significance of this program as an integral part of our foreign policy. In the implementation of the program, the facilities of all agencies of the executive branch will be used where appropriate, and to the maximum possible extent on a contract basis. However, it is essential that responsibility for the nonmilitary operations continue unified; to fragment this responsibility among several agencies would seriously detract from their effectiveness. The reorganization will continue the role of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in carrying out cooperative programs for the advancement of the well-being of the peoples in the other American Republics.

The continuity of operations and the adjustments of internal relationships within the Department of State after June 30, 1955, will require a period of transition. I recommend that the Mutual Security Act of 1955 include broad authority to revise the organization during a period of 6 months following June 30, 1955.

The International Cooperation Administration will be a new semiautonomous unit within the Department of State. Its Director will report directly to the Secretary of State and will, on the Secretary's behalf, give supervision and direction to the mutual-security operations performed within the Department of State.

This responsibility will require that the International Cooperation Administration have the capacity to make and carry out operating decisions within broad policy guides established by the Secretary of State. It will likewise require that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration have his own complement of supporting staff and program personnel, both in Washington and in the field. It will be his responsibility to assure that appropriate policy guidelines are secured from the Secretary of State, and within those guidelines he will issue the necessary instructions to the field to carry out its policy.

Based on the experience of the past 2 years, 3 out of every 4 dollars appropriated for the entire mutual security program will be immediately spent within the United States for commodities, services, machinery, and other items. Insofar as feasible and consistent with the effective meeting of our goals overseas, the commodities will include food, cotton, coal, and other goods for which our capacity or surplus supply most readily matches requirements. Approximately $350 million of agricultural products are expected to be used in the fiscal year 1955. This includes a significant export of major surplus crops. Shipments under the mutual security program will be in addition to but coordinated with sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

The other 25 percent of the dollars will be spent overseas in a manner that will add directly to the accomplishments of the mutual security program. For example, the offshore procurement contracts assist in establishing a defense production base in key points in the free world. In addition, these expenditures will indirectly add to the power of other nations subsequently to purchase with these dollars other needed goods from the United States.

I recommend continuance of the authority in the present Mutual Security Act to meet unexpected events by transfer of funds, appropriated for one geographic area or purpose, to another geographic area or purpose. Experience in recent years has demonstrated that flexible authority is highly desirable to move with dispatch to meet new circumstances, to overcome new dangers, or to capitalize upon favorable developments.

New procedures approved by the Congress last year now make possible maximum integration of domestic procurement of military equipment for our own and allied forces, increased flexibility in the flow of military equipment to our allies and greatly simplified procurement and accounting arrangements. Under the new procedures, the military departments procure most of the equipment for this program as a part of their regular procurement operations, with military assistance funds reserved to repay the services at the time the equipment is delivered. Under present law, military assistance funds which are reserved remain available for obligation and expenditure until June 30, 1957. To further improve the present arrangements, I recommend that current and proposed military assistance funds be made available until expended, as is now provided in the case of most Department of Defense appropriations for procurement.

In conclusion, I wish again to emphasize the essential role of the mutual security program. The program for the arc of free Asia has had a thorough review by all the departments of the Government concerned, and it has been recommended to me by the Council on Foreign Economic Policy and the National Security Council after extensive study.

We are making renewed and intensified efforts to develop a successful basic policy on the question of disarmament and we will persist in this effort. But

until success is assured beyond doubt, the best prospects of peace and the grim essentials of security together demand the continuance of both our national and mutual defense programs.

The other free nations need the United States, and we need them, if all are to be secure. Here is a clear case of interwoven self-interest. The necessary expenditures to equip and maintain United States Armed Forces of air and land and sea at strategic points beyond our borders are never called aid. The necessary expenditures to enable other free nations associated with us to equip and maintain vital armed forces at these same strategic points beyond our borders should not be considered as aid. These, in fact, are defense alliance expenditures clearly safeguarding in the most desirable manner, and at times in the only possible way, the security of the United States and of other free nations.

Our economy cannot be strong and continue to expand without the development of healthy economic conditions in other free nations, and without a continuous expansion of international trade. Neither can we be secure in our freedom unless, elsewhere in the world, we help to build the conditions under which freedom can flourish by destroying the conditions under which totalitarianism grows—poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and disease. Nor can we hope for enduring peace until the spiritual aspirations of mankind for liberty and opportunity and growth are recognized as prior to and paramount to the material appetites which communism exploits.

Apart from any obstacles created by the Communists, this is a long-term process. Patience, resourcefulness and dedication are required as well as the creative application of knowledge, skill and material resources to the solution of fundamental human problems, ancient in their origin. In that spirit, the mutual security program is designed for the benefit of all free nations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 20, 1955.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR OWN NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, aid to bolster the economy of a foreign country and to assist business, big and little, in a foreign country are worthy of consideration. The President's request will receive careful consideration, I know, by Congress. However, I believe that Congress should put its foot down on any further aid to bolster the economy of a foreign nation until we have made available at least $1 billion a year in the United States for water and soil conservation, flood control, hydroelectric dams, navigation, and the development of other natural resources. We have a backlog of 300 projects already approved by the Corps of Engineers that could be commenced right away.

The World Bank is cooking up another international RFC for foreigners and foreign countries. It does not seem to concern our representatives in this bank that they are proposing to give in foreign assistance with United States credit valuable aid that is not available to the citizens of the United States.

POLIO VACCINE

Mr. SAYLOR. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of appearing unfair to stockholders of a very great and important American industry, I should like to ask our pharmaceutical companies to join in the spirit which made development of the Salk polio vaccine possible. This they can do by rejecting all profits from the sale of the vaccine until it is no longer in critically short supply and can be placed on the market on a competitive basis.

I realize that the six commercial firms now producing polio vaccine have already made a great contribution to humanity by vast investments in an experiment whose practicability did not become established until last week. Without their faith in Dr. Salk and their willingness to make enormous capital outlays in a product that was yet to be proved, mass production of the vaccine might not have become a reality for many months hence. I salute these drug manufacturers for their foresight and courage.

In addition to these invaluable contributions, however, perhaps it would be possible for these companies to forego profit on the vaccine at least until the end of this year so that no semblance of financial gain can in any way be attached to the development and introduction of the Salk polio vaccine. Studies which led to the successful discovery of the vaccine were made possible through the contributions of a generous public. Dr. Salk himself has rejected monetary remuneration. President Eisenhower has announced that complete information on the polio preventive will be made available on a gratis basis to every nation desiring it. To complete the picture, manufacturers of the vaccine need only to renounce any profit motive so long as demand remains so far out of supply's reach.

Last week, the Wall Street Journal quoted two pharmaceutical companies with the prediction that sales of the vaccine would have a marked effect on earnings. A spokesman for one concern said that his company had a large investment in the vaccine and expects a sizable return. I believe that most of us found this statement somewhat disturbing; it could be counteracted with an announcement to the effect that there will be no profit realized on polio vaccine, at least for the time being.

According to the Washington Sunday Star, the manufacturers of the vaccine have announced a commercial price of $6 for a quantity sufficient to take care of the three injections recommended by Dr. Salk, with a special rate to the medical profession of $4.20 for the series. Assuming that the latter rate is within range of the actual production cost, the differential would stand as the base of a huge profit as millions of the Nation's children are treated with the vaccine. If manufacturers were to reject this profit and explain that the vaccine is being produced at cost as another contribution to America's campaign for better health, I believe that the public would respond by giving even more generously to the fight against cancer and other crippling and killing diseases.

Let me say in conclusion that I believe such a move should be entirely voluntary on the part of pharmaceutical concerns. There have been suggestions that distribution of the vaccine be handled exclusively by the Government. I cannot concur with this view. The Government did not develop the vaccine, and bureaucrats are not the proper ones to oversee its production, distribution, or supply. Dr. Salk's discovery was made possible through public contribution, and a voluntary refusal of profit by the manufacturers is all that is necessary to round out the story of this glorious medical miracle.

THE DESTRUCTION OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RADWAN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to the Hungarian people and their many American descendants, I want to take this opportunity to engage the attention of the House.

Europe in 1848 was a continent in ferment. The pillars of the old order, founded upon autocracy and despotism, were shaken by the powerful forces of liberalism and nationalism. These forces, earlier fostered by the American and French revolutions, found renewed expression at this time in Eastern and Western Euprope. Hungary was a storm center of the conflict.

In Hungary, the forces of freedom were led by Louis Kossuth. A man dedicated to the ideals of democracy, Kossuth momentarily broke the shackles that bound his country, and together with his compatriots proclaimed the independence of Hungary on March 15, 1848.

Hungarian independence had thus become a reality. At long last the people of Hungary were free, but not for long.

Fate had ruled otherwise. Imperial Russia, the most formidable autocracy in Eastern Europe, intervened to put an end to Hungarian democracy.

A curious parallel to the Hungarian experience in 1848 was the experience she had following World War II; for again Russia, still the most formidable autocracy in the world, intervened, imposing a severe occupation which ultimately created the conditions that resulted in the loss of Hungarian freedom. Upon Hungary the Soviets imposed a new type of tyranny which enveloped the entire national life of the Hungarian people. No longer were the Hungarians politically free. No longer was their society to be a society acting in the rich historic traditions of Hungary. No longer was there to be intellectual freedom. No longer was there to be religious freedom. Thus, in Hungary we behold a nation in bondage.

All America laments the destruction of Hungarian independence, just as she laments the destruction of independence throughout all Eastern Europe. For us and all the free world Hungary has become a symbol of two things: It has become a symbol of Soviet tyranny. For we have seen in Hungary Soviet Communist oppression at its harshest. Secondly, Hungary has become a symbol of man's desire to be free. For all mankind there is in Hungary an example of a type of heroism, courage, and forbearance that inspires emulation. Hungary is today a nation in bondage, but it is a nation determined to live again and in that hope all the free world abundantly shares.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

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.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Powell
Blatnik	Eberharter	Reed, Ill.
Blitch	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Herlong	Roberts
Canfield	Holt	Scott
Carlyle	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Cooley	Kilday	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	
	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 211) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill, except that it shall be in order for any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to offer any of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California, Mr. Moss, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. 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.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and at this time I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the very controversial bill on the pay of postal employees. I am taking this time to speak on the rule because it is a somewhat unusual rule, and I think the Members of the House would like to understand quite clearly what the rule does.

I would like to give you an explanation of the rule and what the issues involved are. I do not know how other Members, who are not members of the committee, have felt about this whole situation, but I am frank to say I have been very much confused. I think that this rule we are presenting to you pinpoints the issues involved between those who want the Murray bill and those who want a more liberal bill.

I had thought there was a great deal of controversy about the subject of reclassification, to begin with. I found in the discussion before the Committee on Rules on yesterday that reclassification apparently is not as much of an issue as has been discussed, because it was stated positively by both factions that under this reclassification provision, which runs throughout this bill, the Postmaster General could not demote anybody; that he could not reduce the pay of anybody; that he could not do anybody any harm. The only thing is that he can promote. He cannot demote. So far as the appearances before the Committee on Rules were concerned, that was not disputed. So apparently there is not very much merit in the discussions we have heard about reclassification. What those who oppose the Murray bill wanted and what they are asking for and all that they have asked for was an opportunity to vote on three amendments which they have proposed. You will find those three amendments, which will be offered by Mr. Moss, set out at length at page 4721 of the RECORD of yesterday. I want to discuss those briefly with you. Before doing so, I would like to make this statement:

Everybody seems to agree that the postal employees as a whole should receive an increase. The dispute is about how much the increase shall be. That same question came up last year, and the dispute about more increase resulted in the postal employees receiving no increase. I do not think anybody wants to see that happen again this year.

The differences in these amendments, as I see them, are comparatively small. If this bill had been passed last year the postal employees would have received more money by now than they would lose by the little differences that exist between them.

It has been said pretty generally, but of course nobody can speak for the President of the United States, and certainly I would be the last person who would undertake to speak for him, but it is generally thought and believed that if this increase goes above the increase recommended by the committee bill there will be a veto, and that if there is a veto it will be sustained. I think the question, when you brush aside all the discussion and argument, resolves itself to this one thing: Whether you would rather give them the moderate increase provided in the committee bill or take a chance of a repetition of what happened last year in which the whole of the postal employees will be deprived of any increase. That is just about what it is going to come down to.

Let me explain to you these amendments. This is an unusual rule, but it is what both sides were willing to have apparently, that is, that this should be a closed rule with the right of the minority, represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] to offer three amendments which would be in order for a vote by the House. These three amendments are printed on page 4721 of the RECORD.

The amendments are these:

No. 1 provides that the Postmaster General shall make a report to the Congress the first of next year on his actions under this bill. Nobody objects to that; I think the committee would be willing to concede it.

No. 2: That this pay increase shall date as of March 1; in other words, it makes it retroactive to March 1. I do not think there is a great deal of discussion or controversy about that because of the fact that for over a year this matter has been pending with everybody believing that the postal employees are entitled to a moderate increase. That would not be too expensive; it would cost $10 million a month until the

bill becomes effective, but it seems to me that in fairness there should be no objection to letting this increase date retroactively to March 1. So that brings us to amendment No. 3, which is really the important issue in controversy.

It has been generally stated that the President will accept a pay bill which has a 7.6 percent increase. If the Moss amendment is adopted the raise will be increased to 8.3 percent. That difference may be the straw that breaks the camel's back so far as the veto is concerned, and the question that this House must consider is whether your interest in the postal employees is such that you would rather take the increase recommended by the committee or take the chance of no increase by reason of a Presidential veto. That is, frankly, the situation as I see it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time, if the gentleman please.

While that is the percentage of increase, it applies only to a limited group of personnel. There is a classification known as No. 5 in the schedule set up by the committee, and the Moss amendment will increase the pay for schedule No. 5 which consists of postal clerks, postal carriers, and the motor-vehicle operators. That is just about all there is to the situation. So I think you can pinpoint the controversy that will arise today in this bill on whether you shall grant to this class of employees the additional compensation which they ask which will bring the general increase of pay up to 8.3 percent. That is about all there is in controversy, as far as I can see.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say whether the chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee asked for an open rule or for a closed rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They were willing to consent to this type of rule.

Mr. GROSS. They were willing to consent to this type of rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. To the type of rule that is presented.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman say how much time will be permitted for debate upon the amendments that will be offered under this rule?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is a matter under the rules of the House. General debate is 2 hours, as provided in the resolution.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the ranking minority member of the committee agreed to the type of rule that is being brought up today?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I said I did not think they objected to it. Did the gentleman object to it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly. We asked for an open rule. The chairman of our committee and I asked for an open rule on this bill. I went to the House floor after making the request to look after legislation in which I was interested. This matter transpired after I left the committee room.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry I was mistaken about that.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. It is my belief at the time of discussion before the Rules Committee that we agreed to 2 of the 3 Moss amendments. We were only $40 out of the way on agreement to the third amendment. I felt quite sure that the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Kansas were in agreement while we were discussing that before the committee, before coming to a final decision.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thought so. We were trying to get the warring factions together.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Do I understand that under this rule, if adopted, the membership will not have an opportunity to vote for a 10-percent raise, the increase provided by the Senate bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; they will not.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I do not believe that the question was clearly understood. What we would like to know is, when the amendments are offered, will they be subject to discussion under the 5-minute rule or will they be limited to one speech for and against?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I imagine that the House will be lenient about that.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me say to the gentleman that from a strictly parliamentary standpoint there would only be 10 minutes, 5 on one side and 5 on the other. Whether you can get unanimous consent or not I do not know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such times as I might require.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise the question, if this rule is adopted, and when the amendments are presented, whether or not the amendments will be open to discussion under the 5-minute rule or we will be limited to one 5-minute speech for and one 5-minute speech against the amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules, there will be one 5-minutes for and one 5-minutes against. No pro forma amendments will be in order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as always, the able chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has presented the rule in a most logical manner. He has explained the provisions of the rule and he has also spoken with reference to the three amendments that will be offered. Therefore, there will be no necessity for me going into that particular matter. However, I want to make a few brief observations and I make them with the knowledge that in my 22 or 23 years as a Member of this House I have supported every bill that has been presented for the benefit of the postal workers. I believe I am correct in saying that since 1945 the postal workers of this country have received a 92-percent increase in salary. In addition, they have received many other benefits. As I say, I have always supported the increase, but now, Mr. Speaker, I expect to support the findings of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Servce. Since that committee, from a nonpartisan standpoint, Republicans and Democrats alike, has come in and by a vote of 17 to 6 reported this bill, it behooves every Member of this Congress, whichever side of the aisle he is on, to support the committee. We have a legislative responsibility. After a committee holds extensive hearings and has a rule reported allowing only 1 Member, the gentleman from California, to offer 3 amendments which affects 59 changes, I say that it is incumbent upon us to support the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

With regard to the rule, I may say that we did have an unusual situation in the Committee on Rules. During the many years that I have served on the Committee on Rules, I cannot recollect one instance when the chairman of a legislative committee and the ranking minority member of that same committee have come before the Committee on Rules asking for an open rule which was denied. Whereupon the Committee on Rules then gave 1 member of the minority group, just 1 member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 1 Member of this great body consisting of 435 Members, the privilege of offering amendments. This is the first time to my knowledge when the Committee on Rules has turned to one individual and said, "No one else, just you, solely, alone, are the only one that can offer amendments in this instance." So, I say that was a most unusual thing. I know that when we have considered bills under suspension of the rules, many Members have said that was an unusual procedure. But to me this is far more than unusual. If the time comes when only 1 Member and 1 Member solely can offer 3 amendments while the other 434 Members are denied that privilege, I say that certainly is not proper legislative procedure.

As the able gentleman from Virginia has stated, every Member here without exception is for a reasonable amount of increase. What is a reasonable amount? Hw can we gage it? This bill provides for a 7.6 percent increase for all postal workers. According to the best information that came before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as well as the Committee on Rules, the cost of living has risen only 3.4 percent since the last postal raise back in 1951. I have had letters within this last year from postal organizations saying that we gave the military men, the ones that have done the fighting and will do the fighting when the time comes, an increase of only 6.7 percent to meet the higher cost of living.

We also gave the old people a raise of 5 percent. So when it comes to the question of what is a reasonable amount of increase, when we gave the military only 6.7 percent and the old people 5 percent, and we are offering here 7.6 percent, how can any Member argue against that and say that it is not a reasonable amount?

We have heard much about a Presidential veto. We heard that last year and we have heard it again this year. Some who have not, perhaps, read the Constitution as recently as I have, may fail to realize that the Constitution provides the right of veto to the President. That is his responsibility. Our forefathers put that in the Constitution for a purpose. The right of the President to veto is as much the law as any other part of the Constitution. We must abide by it. If I were President of the United States and felt in my own conscience that Congress had done wrong in passing a certain bill, I should not hesitate 1 minute to veto that bill. I think that is what was in the minds of Thomas Jefferson and Madison and the others who wrote the Constitution.

We have heard something about a compromise. When this bill was first mentioned, I think Members will agree that the administration was for a 5 percent increase. Certain others were for 7 percent or 8 percent or 10 percent. A 10 percent increase was provided in the Senate. But up until that time it was a question whether it would be 5 percent or 7 percent.

It is my understanding that the administration has accepted what I say is a fair compromise, which raised the percentage from 5 percent to 7.6 percent. I do not see why anyone should consider that that was not a fair compromise.

I should like to say further that I feel we should quit fooling around. Last year, because of the bickering that was indulged in, the postal workers did not receive a deserved and a rightful increase, did not receive what they were entitled to receive. It would have amounted to about $200. They have lost that $200. They will never receive it.

We have before us today a bill which, if it is vetoed by the President, I believe the veto will be sustained. We know that the key vote in the Senate was 52 to 41. So that the postal workers, after having lost two or three hundred dollars last year as a result of indecision and as a result of some trying to get them a little more, may lose three or four hundred dollars this time. All caused by a few insisting that some, not all postal employees, receive but an additional sixteenths of 1 percent increase.

There is one other thing I might add, that out of 503,000 postal workers, the proposed amendment affects only a little more than 300,000. The proposed amendment that is causing all the trouble does not affect the rural carriers, and several other postal organizations. It does not affect 200,000 postal workers. Still they will suffer if we do not pass an increase in salary bill this session.

It is said that some of these increases are too high for certain positions. We know that in business those who have responsible jobs get higher pay and larger raises.

We know that if people in the classified part of the Government service show outstanding ability they go up in grade and receive a raise. We know that the men who go into the Army and advance in rank get higher rates of pay than the privates and the corporals. We know that right here in Congress when we raise the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Doorkeeper or the Sergeant at Arms we give them, because of their extra responsibilities and extra duties, more of a raise than we give the pages and the guards. Recognition of ability and outstanding achievements has made our Nation great and will keep our Nation great.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, let us forget about the small differences. Let us pass this bill in order that all of the 503,000 postal workers may receive additional pay immediately. As far as I am concerned individually, I am willing to accept the amendment in the report making the salary increase retroactive to March 1. If it has any bearing on the case, I am willing personally to accept the March 1 deadline, so that these workers can get a 7.6-percent raise starting March 1. Otherwise, it is possible that through lengthy conferences between the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, by reason of a possible veto, that again this year the postal workers will again be denied a deserved reasonable increase to which all agree they are entitled, because a certain number insist on an additional increase of $1 or $2 per month.

Therefore, I respectfully urge that today this body pass the bill before us that was recommended by a nonpartisan vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, that will give every man and woman in the postal service an average of 7.6-percent raise in salary and other benefits.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I first wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the present chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and the former distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], for the great interest they have always taken in postal employees. The responsibility they have is tremendous, and I am sure all of the postal employees in the country recognize that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke and voted against a gag rule when this bill first came up on March 21. This bill affects more than 500,000 postal employees. A great many of these employees are opposed to the bill in its present form and would like the opportunity to present proper amendments. If we are to legislate for all postal employees, and I believe that to be our duty, then we cannot deny the right of any group of employees to submit their case to the Congress.

I know everybody here is trying to do the right thing. In my opinion, the right thing is to discuss this bill under an open rule. This way no set of employees will feel they have been discriminated against.

I firmly believe that in matters of this sort we must not yield to pressure, we must not yield to insults, we must not yield to threats of veto, but rather be guided by our consciences. My conscience would not permit me to sleep if I voted for this closed rule knowing that approximately 200,000 postal clerks had the feeling that they had been left out in the cold.

I also feel that we can still get a 10-percent increase as passed by the Senate, and that this in reality is what all postal employees want and are entitled to.

So I urge upon all Members to be fair to all the employees. When you vote against this gag rule, you are favoring all of them and not discriminating against any single group. I believe then the case can be properly presented to the people, and I believe the people will credit you for having done a good day's work.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman's idea is to vote down the rule and then have the Rules Committee bring in a rule which would permit us to vote on an amendment providing for a 10-percent increase?

Mr. ANFUSO. That is exactly right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may require to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachuetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, it would appear as if there was little need of either bitter feeling or political controversy in the consideration of this bill. We are confronted with an unusual situation. Practically everybody recognizes the need of the postal workers for an increase in salary to compensate them for increased cost of living and to keep them moving forward with the rest of labor.

We are divided because of two bills presented, and we are asked to determine which shall be passed.

First, we have the committee bill; a bill overwhelmingly supported in the committee after weeks of careful study. It provides an estimated general increase of 7.6 percent, and it endeavors to bring about a reclassification which is said to be an improvement.

Then we have a second proposal, submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. His bill, it is estimated, would bring about an average increase of 8.2 percent. It would make changes in the classification which are controversial. This bill is without any formal committee endorsement.

In reaching our determination as to which proposal to accept, we must take into consideration what we think will insure the postal workers getting what the majority believes they should have—an increase in pay.

President Eisenhower has let it be known that he favors the committee bill; the one which calls for 7.6 percent. His views are so well known and expressed so clearly in the letter to Chairman MURRAY and in his talks with me that I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, the Moss bill will bring about a presidential veto.

This puts it squarely up to us. Do we want to give the postal workers an increase in pay or do we want to fool them by passing a bill which cannot become a law? No one, I am sure, believes the measure would become a law over a veto.

There is, of course, as one might expect, serious disagreement as to the right decision between the several labor groups. There are five major labor organizations in the postal field. Three groups have decided it is best to take the committee bill and secure the increased pay. Two other groups are classified as being in the opposition, although many of their members have privately said they would prefer to pass the bill which has approval of the administration.

Certainly there need be no reason for playing politics with the measure. At best, it would be doubtful politics.

The chairman of the committee is TOM MURRAY, of Tennessee. He is a Democrat and through the years has been a stalwart champion of the Democratic Party. He and his committee are for the bill they have reported because they believe in it. They believe the committee bill represents the best possible compromise of what has been a perplexing problem. And they believe it is good judgment to support a measure they know can win the approval of the administration, which shares in the responsibility of the problem.

Therefore, my colleagues, I oppose the Moss amendment and favor the bill brought out by the committee. Its passage will give the postal workers a substantial increase in wages at an early date, and I believe we owe it to them to do this.

In conclusion, may I say our responsibility is not only to the postal workers but we have a responsibility as well to hundreds of thousands of Government workers in the classified service who are weekly losing increased pay while we quarrel over this particular bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Several Members have asked me about this rule. As I understand it, there was minority opposition on the committee. The minority position is found substantially in what are referred to as the Moss amendments. Is it not true that the rule we are now being asked to adopt, and which I shall certainly vote for, gives the House a clear choice between those two positions; first, the bill as reported by an overwhelming majority of the committee; and, second, the position taken by the minority members of the committee in respect to the proposals that they seek to have adopted as against the original bill?

Mr. MARTIN. There is no question but that the rule gives an optional choice between the two questions in dispute.

Mr. HALLECK. So that, as far as this rule is concerned, its adoption permits a choice by Members of the House as between the majority position of the committee and the minority position of the committee?

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he would not be averse to the enactment of retroactive features on the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. I said that the adoption of the 7.6 bill would not bring any personal objection from me in dating the bill back to March 1. I know there are many who do object, but I do not.

Mr. HESELTON. But if we pass the 7.6, the gentleman would feel justified in making it retroactive to March 1?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think that would be objectionable.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman; certainly.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman has adverted to the possibility of a veto by the President. Are we not an independent body, and shall we be men or mice? Should we be cowered by the threat of a Presidential veto, or should we vote on the merits of the legislation?

Mr. MARTIN. I would say to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that I never knew a person to ever lose anything by taking advantage of all information that he could secure.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Surely.

Mr. KLEIN. In the colloquy just a moment ago with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the gentleman pointed out two conditions that we have if this rule is adopted.

Mr. MARTIN. That is right.

Mr. KLEIN. Am I correct in saying that those of us who feel that the postal employees should have a straight 10-percent increase, similar to Senate bill 1, would not have any opportunity under this rule to offer such an amendment?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not also a fact that if this rule is adopted in its present form we will not have an opportunity to vote on whether or not the reclassification provisions of this bill should be stricken from the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman knows that motion would not be in order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is obvious to all of us that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House will find themselves in one camp or the other; that is, for the committee bill or for the additional recommendations of the minority of the committee.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Knowing the great respect and admiration the membership of this House has for the gentleman from Massachusetts, his judgment, and his thinking, he is, I gather, definitely of the opinion that anything other than a 7.6-percent increase may meet with a veto by the President. Is that right?

Mr. MARTIN. I would not make that statement unless I believed it.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. It is also true, then, that a 10-percent amendment cannot be voted on, and that no amendment other than the Moss amendments can be offered under the present rule.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are the jury; we should act accordingly. As far as we are concerned the only difference is that instead of representing our own respective viewpoints we represent those of the people back home.

We have before us three alternatives: To support the rule and the three amendments to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] which have been explained previously; to vote down the rule which would bring in an open rule which might permit amendments for 10, 15, or even 20 percent increase; or to bring back the original Murray bill which gives a 5 to 58 percent increase to postal employees or average of 6.5 percent. Let us make up our minds.

This puts us in a very involved position to support the rule and support the three amendments to be offered by the gentleman from California, the very amendments the minority agreed upon of the committee. What we would like is what we intended originally to get, at least a 10 percent increase. We would also like to put in other amendments, but due to the parliamentary situation under which the bill will be considered only three amendments will be in order. We know that by going further than that we get into great difficulty. The 10 percent increase provided in Senate bill No. 1 is threatened with a veto, and we know we have not sufficient votes to override the veto. We also know that the reason the bill was vetoed last year was because it did not contain a reclassification provision. Basically there are still some inequities in the reclassification bill we have reported out. We have eliminated

many of them, but not sufficient in the thinking of many of the people affected, especially the clerks.

I would like to see the present bill adopted with a 10 percent increase at least, but under the parliamentary situation we will not be able to accomplish that.

I would like to clear up a few points that have been mentioned. The original bill, the Murray bill, called for an increase of from 5 percent to 58 percent. The bill made in order by the rule provides a 6.9 percent increase for the majority of the employees, and 7.6 percent for the overall which the committee reported out. Do not be misled because portion of the bill goes as high as 58 percent.

The Department estimates that increases in the bill as reported by the committee will cost in the neighborhood of $153 million. The Moss amendment increase in the first, second, and fifth grades will add an additional $12 million, making the total cost $165 million.

The big difficulty here today is this pressure from the Department upon the respective Members of Congress to hold this bill down. The Department is more interested in saving dollars at the expense of the employees than giving them a justified pay increase.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Rules Committee said, this is indeed an unusual rule. It is unusual in that it grants to one individual, the gentleman from California, a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the right to offer amendments; at the same time, it denies to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] the right to offer the provisions of the Senate bill which provides for a 10 percent increase. The same thing would apply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

It is unusual in another respect. Some weeks ago I had occasion to appear before the Rules Committee on H. R. No. 1 and made an impassioned plea to the Rules Committee to grant me a modified rule that would allow me to offer 5 amendments to the proposal to renew our Trade Agreements Act. I was given to understand that was too much favor to grant to a single Member. Yet, we find the committee coming in here with the same kind of rule I asked for and was denied less than a month ago. It is indeed an unusual situation.

It is generally understood on the floor of this House that I am opposed to gag rules and to closed rules. It will be a pleasure for me, if there is opportunity to do so, to vote against this rule, because I am convinced that there is no piece of legislation so controversial that it cannot be brought to the floor of the House and the Members allowed without discrimination in favor of some Members to work their will on that legislation. I will be perfectly willing to accept whatever their decision is, but I do not think we should be denied the opportunity to offer any kind of amendment we desire.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the bill before us. It is highly prejudicial to those in the upper as against those in the lower echelons in the postal service. The hewers of stone and the bearers of water—that is those who do the hard work in the postal service are discriminated against. Under the facade of reclassification, there are huge salary increases. In some instances, the increases range as high as 50 percent or more, especially to supervisors and postmasters. In contrast, the rank and file—using words in common parlance—are given the dirty end of the stick. Their increases are meager. There are at least 15 positions or classifications in which immediate increases of 10 to 34 percent have been allotted. As we stated in the minority report:

There are only 7 positions for which the increases average less than 7 percent. In these latter positions are the regular city carriers and clerks—the very warp and woof of the basic fabric of our postal service—motor vehicle operators, automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers. These carriers, clerks and motor vehicle operators will average only a 6.9-percent increase, and many thousands of them will get barely over 6 percent. Automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers will get well under the average for all employees. Thousands of rural carriers will receive only 6 percent. The remainder of the officers and employees will average 8.1-percent increases.

I cannot conscientiously vote for a bill of this type with such disproportionate, unfair, and inadequate increases. The Senate passed the bill for a 10-percent overall increase and with no provisions for reclassification. The bill must be drastically amended. We, today, on the Floor of the House, hear tell that if we pass such an amended bill, it would be vetoed by the President. Well, my answer to that threat is that we should be as independent in our legislative functions as the President is in his executive functions. If he vetoes the bill, that is his responsibility, not ours. We should not be cowed by a threatened veto. We are men and not mice and I think we should act like men and not crawl supinely before such a threat. Furthermore, I think our leadership is missing the boat. Here is an issue which we should seize and do all and sundry to indicate by word and deed that we are for a decent living wage scale for postal employees. Let us make the issue clear cut. We are for the proper increases. Let the administration oppose them. Such opposition is full of political dynamite which should burst in Republican faces.

I am told I should vote for the rule because a half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. The bill doesn't even provide for one-tenth of a loaf. I would stultify myself if I voted for the rule, making in order, a bill which I violently oppose.

This obnoxious bill contains provisions for reclassification of postal-field-service positions. It gives the broadest grant of administrative authority to the Postmaster General—a politically minded Postmaster General. His free-booting methods will make mincemeat of civil-service rules and regulations and laws. He will ride roughshod over seniority rights in order to fill as many positions as possible with deserving Republicans. It is true that mandatorily under one of the proposed Moss amendments he shall report his activities vis-a-vis reclassification within 6 months to the Congress. But what good will such a report be? The political dirty work will have been done. Congress will be confronted with a fait accompli. All we could do would be to protest in the event of injustices or impartialities, but our protests would be as effectual as trying to stem the tides with a groan. To my mind, one of the most inequitable provisions is just this reclassification provision, especially in the hands of an antilabor bureaucrat like the present Postmaster General. The whole business is a travesty. Furthermore, the rule before us is a gag rule. This so-called deliberative body is supposed to dispose of 3 important amendments with only 10 minutes debate for each amendment—5 minutes for each side. If one contemplates that the salaries of the postal employees depends upon such debate, then one realizes how inadequate is the time for deliberation. Just think of it—10 minutes is to be given for debate on salary increases as provided for in one of the so-called Moss amendments which would increase the average rate from 6.8 percent to 8.275 percent.

Assuredly, the productivity of the employee should have some effect upon the salary, but no monetary recognition is given to postal employees for the greatly increased productivity that they have achieved in recent years. All the administration thinks of is the budget. Certainly, workers' productivity should be just as much a factor in salary determination as budget goals. No real consideration is given to the increases and fluctuations in living costs. The cost of food, clothing, and shelter has mounted in geometrical progression—not so salary increases. The minority report states as follows:

From 1946 on, the workload per man-year, based on pounds of mail handled, moved irregularly upward. The workload per man-year, based on the number of pieces handled, which is probably a more accurate measure, moved consistently upward.

The overall picture, comparing 1938 to 1952, has been one of increased employment, increased volume, and increased productivity. From 1938 to 1952, employment increased 59 percent, while volume in pieces went up 92 percent. The great increase in volume handled over employment, meant that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938.

The report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, showed a 6.04-percent increase in mail volume over 1951 and only a 1.3-percent increase in hours of employment. This report also showed that over the previous 5 years' volume had increased by 33 percent and weight had increased by 29 percent, but that hours of employment had increased by only 9 percent.

This increase of more than 20 percent in productivity was not created by machines, as often is the case in private industry, but, by reason of the extraordinary nature of per-

sonal services required to move the mails, is almost wholly attributable to greater efforts by the postal employees.

The salaries of the postal employees have not kept up with the salaries of private industry. For example, 15 years ago, the earnings of postal clerks and carriers were on a par with employees of General Motors Corp. In 1953, however, the General Motors Corp. employees averaged $92.27 a week, or an 8.4 percent increase over 1952. Postal employees got an average of $78.27 per week for 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Many comparisons could be made between salaries of postal employees and salaries of large corporate entities and the disparity between the wages paid would be clearly manifest.

It requires no recitation to show that the purchasing power of the dollar and the purchasing power of the postal worker's dollar has declined significantly during and after the World War II period, but the bill takes little heed of this consideration of declining purchasing power. No indeed. The administration is only worried about fiscal budgetary objectives. Making the salary of the postal employees sufficiently large so as to permit the worker to live in dignity and decency is, apparently, of little concern to the administration. Throughout the hearings, we could hear the thumping of only one theme—that was the need to balance the budget. We heard, for example, nothing of the vast costs involved in the granting of huge mailing privileges to large publishing outfits like Life, Time, Fortune, Saturday Evening Post, Collier's, Look, Newsweek, and so forth. Maybe if these publishing houses would actually pay in dollars and cents what they should pay for the postal services rendered them, the Government might be on the way toward balancing the postal budget. But no—the Postmaster General in this administration would not dare ask these publishers for higher rates. They contribute very handsomely to the Republican campaign chest. The administration says that the little fellow should sweat it out. Let the postal employee bear the burden.

My point of view is as follows:

First. I vote against the rule.

Second. If the rule passes, I vote for the Moss amendments.

Third. If the Moss amendments prevail, I shall vote for the bill although I would prefer to be given the privilege of offering an average 10-percent increase—something I cannot do under this semiclosed rule. One of the Moss amendments would provide for an average increase of 8.2 percent. I will take that as the best to be gained under the circumstances.

Fourth. If the Moss amendments do not prevail, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is again true that the Rules Committee has deliberately in its deliberations decided that the greatest deliberative body in the world cannot deliberate on legislation. I want to confine my remarks strictly to the rule. As has been pointed out, this rule is not only unusual in the fact that three amendments only can be introduced which amendments have been carefully outlined in specific language, but we are not even able to debate those amendments more than 5 minutes on a side.

I may say that apart from any of the considerations regarding the total amount of salary that shall be paid in any of the steps or at any of the levels, there are many features of this bill which should be subject to amendment.

I might enumerate that the provisions dealing with promotions in this bill are not satisfactory or entirely clear. The provisions dealing with the anniversary dates as to when the employee shall fit in the various schedules are not very satisfactory. The matter regarding the classification of certain of the clerks in level 3 certainly ought to be debated and given full consideration. So, we could go on with many features of this long, involved bill and make a clear point that there should be amendments and debate on the floor of this House.

Let us recognize further that when this bill goes to conference, the conferees on the part of the Senate, in fact, the entire Senate committee and the entire membership of the Senate, have had no opportunity whatsoever to study and debate the very involved and complex features of the Classification Act. We are going to be meeting with them—I wrongly use the pronoun "we" because I fully expect to be carefully excluded from the conference despite my ranking on the Post Office Committee—when those conferees meet we are going to have the situation where 1 of the 2 bodies is going to have had no legislative experience or consideration dealing with classification. So, if there are things in this bill which are bad, things which ought to be corrected, there is going to be no chance for the conferees to correct them. Consequently, regardless of the merits of the various amounts of money proposed in this controversy, I believe that we have here an example of too much restriction on the membership of this great deliberative body, and I believe that this rule ought to be defeated and we ought to have a chance to deliberate a little bit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to some of the practical aspects of this situation. I am a member of the committee, and I am one of those who signed the minority report, and I am one of those who wanted an open rule, but I am here a little longer now and I am getting a little wiser, if not thinner, as time goes on. Every member of the committee who signed the minority report wanted a 10 percent raise, but during the course of the proceedings it became quite clear to the distinguished chairman, for whom we have the highest regard, and who was most fair throughout this entire proceeding, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that if we become too generous in our aspirations to please those who are asking for money, we might not get anything. So we thought that we could accomplish something. All of us could have had our favorite amendments, but we felt that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] who studied it most thoroughly and was most familiar with it, had a solution that we could agree to. Now, we were concerned with the practical proposition that if we were to play politics with this thing and say, "Sure, pass 10 percent and let the President veto it," the warnings given us were honest ones. However, we could take 8.2 and not have the straw which broke the camel's back. Even with this proposition, we are risking the fate of these people. Now, all of the various labor groups knew that this compromise was in the making, and one of them later broke from it. While I want to be as generous as anyone else—and coming from Jersey City, I can play politics as well as anybody else—I do not want these men to go home and say, "If those smart guys in the House pass a 10 percent raise, sure, the President will veto it." Maybe he will be blamed, and maybe he will not. That is why I joined with the Moss amendment, and I say that with great respect to the minority members, because I appreciate their viewpoint, but we are a little more daring than they are. We think the President will not veto an 8.2 percent raise when he is willing to grant 7.6, and we are willing to take our chance. But, to you Members who are proposing the 10 percent raise only, I say this: That is your right and your privilege, but who will suffer? It will be the women and the children of these employees who will suffer. That is why I stand here today doing something I do not want to do; but the rules of this House permit this procedure, and I believe that the rules of this House were born and distilled out of experience, and there must be good reason for them.

Early in this session I got into an argument with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and I twitted him, because he had given us words of wisdom on the subject. I found out that I should have listened to him. However, I am not at all ashamed to say that I have learned something from him and I speak in support of the rule, to let him know that. So that those of the Members who want to be generous with other people's money may go right ahead and vote the rule down. But it is interesting to note that those who want to be generous and those who want to be parsimonious are on the same side. There is something funny in that picture. Somebody is playing politics. I will not say who. But I am perfectly willing to go along with this measure because I am thinking that it is about time that we put money into the pockets of these people instead of arguments into their heads.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules. But when he made the statement in opening debate that this was a rather unusual rule, in my opinion he was making one of the understatements of the year. This is an unbelievable rule. If this rule is

adopted, we shall be setting a precedent that Members of the House prepare amendments, go to the Committee on Rules, ask that they be screened and approved by the Committee on Rules before they can be introduced. This rule is discriminatory. This rule is more unfair and more discriminatory than a suspension of the rules or a closed rule, because under either of these procedures all Members would be on the same basis for none could offer amendments to the bill.

This provides that one Member and one Member only may introduce amendments, or that some other Member who may gain preferential recognition may offer the amendments which this one Member has proposed. And the pending amendments cannot be amended.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule without regard to any other provisions of the bill, because we would set a dangerous precedent if we adopt the proposed rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. The point has been raised that there will be only 10 minutes of debate on this very controversial amendment on the pay question, which is to be found at page 82 of the bill. I should like to state frankly that I did not notice that. I believe that we should provide time for pro forma amendments, to any amendment that is offered. It was not my purpose to restrict the debate in this way. This was not called to my attention until this morning.

After consultation with the minority I ask unanimous consent that debate under the 5-minute rule on the amendment which will be offered at page 82 of the bill relating to the pay schedule, be extended for 30 additional minutes, which will provide 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that mean that we will have the usual 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against, on the other two amendments that may be offered?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. SADLAK. The significance of the gentleman't request that the rule as originally introduced would provide only 5 minutes of debate on each amendment to each side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As to the other two amendments, that is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia that the time for debate on the amendment which the gentleman identified be extended 30 minutes?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, who will have control of the time under that procedure?

The SPEAKER. It will be up to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to recognize Members under the 5-minute rule.

Mr .MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, I think we can have assurance that both sides will be equally recognized in the 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I assume everybody will be fair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] on the courageous remarks they made on the floor today. I thoroughly agree with the remarks both of them made. I agree with them in that I personally would like to see a 10-percent increase for postal employees. However, we are faced with a very practical situation. For responsible legislators to fail to recognize a practical situation would result only in harm to the employees of the Post Office Department, as I project my mind ahead.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has been very frank. He knows there will be a veto on the 10-percent increase, and so does everybody else. He knows, and so does everybody else, that a 10-percent bill presented to the President would undoubtedly be vetoed, and that such a veto would be sustained.

Then where would the postal employees be? Let us project our minds ahead a few weeks and see where they would be. The chances are that no better bill than the bill that came out of the committee would go through the Congress. That would mean a 6.91-percent increase for the regular clerks and carriers instead of an 8.2-percent increase if the Moss amendment is adopted.

The situation is a very practical one. Whether or not the President will sign a bill along the lines of the House measure, if that is the one that goes to him, is something that I cannot say. But I will say that if a bill along that line goes to the President he would have extreme difficulty in vetoing it, and if he did veto it, we would have an excellent opportunity of passing it over his veto in both branches of the Congress.

Therefore those of us who want to have a really effective pay raise bill put through, and through as quickly as possible, are faced with the problem of not what we would like to do ourselves but from a practical viewpoint what is the best thing we can do.

As a result of the failure to suspend the rules, the amendment making the effective date March 1 will be put into the bill. If the suspension had not been defeated, that amendment would not have been put into the bill, because the bill would have gone to conference with the Senate bill setting no date and the House bill setting no date, and the conferees would have had no discretion. That question would not have been in conference, and whatever increase went through and finally became law would be prospective instead of retroactive to March 1.

Furthermore, we have to realize when we are voting for the rule and voting for the Moss amendments, and passing the bill, that the bill will go to conference. In the conference, there will be the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. There is a wide latitude for the House and Senate conferees to work out some of the differences that will exist. So in voting for the rule and for the bill today, as I see it, and in voting for the Moss amendments without sacrificing any of our views, but viewing it from a practical angle, those of us who want to see a really effective pay raise bill go through as quickly as possible, are doing the best we can under the circumstances. Because if a 10-percent raise goes through and it is vetoed, and the veto is sustained, they will not get any more than is contained in the present bill, and there is a chance that they will get less. So in view of the situation, my colleagues, those of us who want to see a really effective bill go through, ought to vote for the rule and for the Moss amendments. If I were against the Moss amendments, and I would want the 10-percent raise to go through, I know it would be vetoed, and I know that the veto would be sustained. But there is no guaranty that there will be a veto of the bill that goes through, which is along the lines of the Moss amendments, and if it is vetoed, we have an excellent chance of passing it over the veto, whereas, our commonsense tells us that a 10-percent bill cannot pass over the veto of the President.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule will be adopted and that the Moss amendments will be adopted.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the minority have an opportunity under any circumstances to recommit this bill with instructions to include the bill, S. 1?

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is in order under the pending rule.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 269, noes 17.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were ayes 259, noes 32.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. 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. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Comittee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4644, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 1 hour; and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of this legislation to provide an increase in the compensation of postal employees and, at the same time, bring about correction of serious inequities in the salary schedule by the adoption of an improved method of classifying postal employees for salary purposes.

Under this bill, all postal employees will receive a minimum increase of 6 percent on their basic salaries and will then be fitted into a salary schedule providing for a pay scale establishing a more realistic relationship between their salaries, their duties, and responsibilities. The adjustment to the new salary schedule will result in a payroll increase of approximately 1.6 percent.

On January 11, 1955, the President of the United States forwarded to the Congress a special message concerning the rates of pay of postal employees. He recommended that postal employees be given a 5-percent increase in their basic salary and that the increase must be accompanied by a salary plan which will place the compensation for postal field-service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed. Legislation in conformance with this recommendation of the President was submitted by the Postmaster General and introduced as H. R. 2987.

The committee held extensive hearings—15 sessions—on this subject, and testimony was received relating to the need for an increase in postal salaries as well as the various features of the Postmaster General's reclassification plan. Representatives of the employee groups, including those affected by the amendment to be offered today, testified to the need for a reclassification of positions in the postal service. I refer you to pages 157, 178, 185, 190, 192, 195, 240, and 244 of the printed hearings.

Following these hearings the committee recommended its own bill, H. R. 4644, which is now before the House. This new bill adopts substantially the reclassification features of the bill recommended by the Postmaster General. However, it contains 21 basic changes representing the views of the committee based upon testimony received. This bill contains the safeguards and other favorable conditions requested by the employees, including a guaranty against reduction in salary, and provision for other benefits. I will now give you the basic changes that we made in the present bill from the first bill introduced.

First, the bill sent down by the Postmaster General provided for a 5 percent minimum increase. The bill here before you provides for a 6 percent minimum increase.

Second, the committee bill before you today provides for a new salary level to be known as No. 5, for clerks, carriers, and motor vehicle operators, raising the amount of salary increase for carriers and motor vehicle operators and for window clerks and distribution clerks about $65 over the Postmaster General's bill or in a total amount of over $20 million.

This bill also allows for an increase of shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this legislation, whereas the Postmaster General's bill provided that it should take effect 6 months after enactment

This bill also allows for an increase of 50 percent in the travel of postal transportation employees. Railway mail clerks or postal transportation clerks are raised from $6 to $9 a day.

This new bill removes over 100 grants of power and authority to the Postmaster General.

It provides appeal rights to all employees to the Civil Service Commission which the first bill did not.

It removes from the first bill the blanket repealer which would have repealed all existing postal laws.

It also has an express provision against downgrading of any employee in the service. It also provides higher pay for temporary higher level work which was not included in the first bill.

It further provides that employees may be detailed or assigned between the field service and the departmental service only with the employee's consent.

It also provides that the employment of persons now outside the postal service shall be limited to professional and scientific positions and to positions in the district and regional offices.

It continues the present law requiring compensatory time for Saturday or Sunday work except in the month of December.

It provides also that there shall be 1 substitute for every 5 regular employees.

It limits assistant postmasterships to one in each office.

It provides credit authorization for time served toward automatic increments of increase.

It further takes care of senior clerks by providing that senior clerks must be favored over junior clerks for promotion.

It continues the longevity rights and protects the anniversary dates of the employees in consideration of their longevity steps.

This legislation adopts substantially the reclassification features of the bill recommended by the Postmaster General. However, it contains several major changes representing the views of the committee based upon testimony received. This bill contains the safeguards and other favorable provisions requested by employees including a guaranty against reduction in salary, appropriate provision for appeals, and other benefits.

APPEALS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The bill provides that an aggrieved employee may appeal to the United States Civil Service Commission any administrative action taken or decisions made with respect to, first, the ranking of positions not described as "key positions" in the proper salary level, and, second, the placing of an employee in a "key position" on the basis of and in accordance with the description of the duties and responsibilities of such position. The appeal will be for the purpose of determining whether his position has been properly allocated. The decision of the Civil Service Commission is made mandatory on the Postmaster General.

NO DOWNGRADING OR REDUCTION IN SALARY OF PRESENT EMPLOYEES AND SUBSTITUTES

The bill contains prohibitions against downgrading of individuals and assures employees they will continue to receive their present salary plus the 6 percent added during the process of conversion to the salary schedules contained in the bill.

It also provides that nothing in this act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of the postal field service schedule, the rural carrier schedule, or fourth-class office schedule to an amount less than his basic compensation immediately prior to adjustment to such schedules—present rate plus 6 percent. It would not preclude reduction due to voluntary acceptance of a lower level position in lieu of separation from the service, or due to a change in salary level required because of a subsequent reduction in mail volume or receipts of a post office or because of the adjustment of a rural route.

HIGHER LEVEL FOR CARRIERS AND CLERKS

The committee bill also contains an additional salary level added between levels 4 and 5 of the postal-field-service schedule proposed by the Postmaster General. In this level will be placed motor-vehicle operators, city carriers, distribution clerks, and window clerks. This provision is the only change in the salary schedules contained in the committee bill when compared with H. R. 2987. This change will result in an additional increase in payroll costs of $20,144,900 which will go to motor-vehicle operators, city carriers, distribution clerks, and window clerks. This will increase the starting rate for clerks and carriers from $3,270 at present to $3,640, an increase of $370 or 11.3 percent. The maximum rate will go from the present of $4,070 to $4,360. In addition, many of the clerks and carriers at the top are eligible for the additional longevity grades of $100 each at 13, 18, and 25 years' service, making a top rate of $4,660.

LONGEVITY PAY FOR SUBSTITUTES

The bill will provide longevity for substitutes for the first time. In some post offices, and this will be particularly important now that the number of automatic steps have been reduced in the case of the large clerk-carrier group from 9 to 7, many substitutes have been

at the top of their automatic steps and not eligible for longevity promotions until they become regulars. This bill will permit substitutes to receive longevity pay on the same basis as regular employees, that is, at the end of 13, 18, and 25 years of service.

LARGER ANNUAL INCREASES

Under the provisions of the bill, movement of each clerk and carrier to the top steps of his salary level will be accelerated. This is done by reducing the number of steps from 9 to 7 and increasing the amount of each step.

AUTOMATIC STEP INCREASES FOR POSTMASTERS AND SUPERVISORS

Under present law, postmasters and supervisors are paid single per annum rates, whereas the rank and file employees are given annual automatic increases. The postal field service, rural carriers, and fourth-class office schedules in H. R. 4644—designated as PFS, RCS, and FOS schedules, respectively—provide that all employees, including postmasters and supervisors, shall be placed in a seven-step level, except for PFS-20 and PFS-21 employees, for whom seven-step levels are precluded by the present $14,800 maximum. This opportunity for salary increases as skills and responsibilities increase is an important incentive factor and should apply to all employees.

SALARY INCREASE ON PROMOTIONS GUARANTEED

The bill provides that when an employee is promoted to a higher salary level in the PFS schedule, he shall receive as a minimum increase the amount of difference between the first step of the salary level from which promoted and the first step of the next higher salary level. Thus, an employee who assumes more responsible duties receives a substantial increase in pay rather than a token increase or no increase at all, which is commonly the case under Public Law 134.

GREATER PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

There will be greater opportunity for promotion. The establishment of 21 salary levels in the PFS schedule in H. R. 4644 will permit the classification of many positions at salary levels above, as well as between, the rates established in Public Law 134. Under that law, the Post Office Department has been able to pay employees only on the basis of job titles and the pay rates established in the law for those titles. The number of certain supervisory titles which an office might have also was prescribed.

Thus, for example, an employee serving as a substitute for a superintendent of mails who is on extended sick leave may not be compensated for the added responsibility because the title and salary structure of Public Law 134 does not permit it. This bill will permit proper salary payments in such cases.

There are many positions, both supervisory and nonsupervisory, whose duties and responsibilities warrant a pay differential which is not provided in present law. Under H. R. 4644 the greater responsibilities of these positions can now be reflected in greater compensation. The effect is that upon enactment of the legislation the incumbents of these positions will receive pay adjustments which are tantamount to promotions. As vacancies occur there will be these additional higher paying positions to which others can be promoted.

The inclusion of regional and district office positions in the same salary schedule with other postal field service positions will make possible the establishment of orderly promotion lines from other positions in the postal field service to positions in the regional and district offices.

RESTRICTIONS ON APPOINTMENTS FROM OUTSIDE THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

The provisions of section 501 of H. R. 4644 limit the authority of the Postmaster General to appoint to a salary rate higher than the entrance rate. It is limited to the appointment of persons who have been employed in a civilian capacity in other branches of the Government and to positions in the district or regional offices or to professional or scientific positions.

BIWEEKLY PAY PERIOD

In place of the present semimonthly pay period, the pay period for postal employees under H. R. 4644 will be biweekly providing 26 paydays per year and thereby granting an extra day's pay in the year for these employees. Another advantage in the biweekly pay period is that it permits standardization of the payday so that it will occur on the same day of each alternate week throughout the year.

RATIO OF SUBSTITUTES TO REGULARS

The authorization of 1 classified substitute for each 5 regular employees—rather than the 1 for 6 ratio now in effect—will permit the conversion to career tenure of several thousand employees who cannot presently be converted from indefinite or temporary tenure.

RURAL CARRIER SUBSTITUTES

The bill also provides a new method for computing the per diem rate of rural carrier substitutes, using a 312 days' basis instead of a 360 days' basis. The change in the pay period will permit the compensation of substitute rural carriers on the same basis as the regular carriers.

SUNDAY AND HOLIDAY WORK

Representatives of the clerks and carriers organizations objected to authorizing postmasters to pay time and a half for service performed on Sundays and holidays throughout the year as recommended by the Postmaster General. They recommended that it be restricted as at present to Sundays and holidays in the month of December with compensatory time allowed in the months other than December. The committee has included an appropriate provision covering this in the bill.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZED TRAVEL ALLOWANCE

The bill also increases the authorized travel allowance of postal transportation clerks from the present rate of $6 per day to $9 per day.

NEED FOR RECLASSIFICATION IN THE POSTAL FIELD SERVICE

Congressional committees, as well as the task force of the Hoover Commission, have repeatedly directed the attention of the Congress to the need for a more realistic appraisal of salaries in the postal field service. They have pointed out that the present postal salary system completely ignores the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and makes no provision for recognition of substantial differences in the difficulty of the work to be performed, the degree of responsibility to be exercised, the scope and variety of tasks involved, and the conditions of performance.

USE OF KEY POSITIONS

H. R. 4644 contains descriptions of 50 representative positions which are occupied by over 90 percent of the postal field service employees other than those paid under the FOS and RCS schedules. Each key position is assigned in the bill to its proper salary level.

These key positions serve two purposes:

First. They determine the specific salary levels for the great majority of postal employees by direct congressional action;

Second. They serve as benchmarks for the Post Office Department in determining the appropriate salary levels for the positions occupied by the remaining employees, who constitute less than 10 percent of the total force.

To illustrate the effect on employees occupying key positions: The Department will identify the position of an employee as falling within the description of 1 of the 50 key positions. The salary level of the employee then becomes the salary level set forth in the law for that key position. The basic salary of the employee will be converted to the proper step of that salary level in accordance with the conversion rules of sections 304 and 306.

The process of determining the proper salary level for employees in positions other than the key positions is set forth in section 201 of the bill. It consists of, first, comparing the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the position occupied by an employee with the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the key positions described in section 203; and, second, ranking the position in relation to the key position most closely comparable in terms of the level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements.

Determinations made or actions taken in both of the above illustrations are appealable to the Civil Service Commission, whose decisions are mandatory on the Postmaster General.

NEED FOR A REVISION OF THE SALARY SCHEDULES

Employees in the postal field service are now paid upon salary schedules set forth in Public Law 134 of the 79th Congress. This law has been amended almost 200 times in order to meet situations that have occurred requiring adjustments in the salaries and in the relationships between the salaries of variour positions in the postal field service. Public Law 134 in itself represented a great advance in the pay system of the postal field service. It was the first major revision of postal employees' salaries since 1926—nearly 20 years.

During the committee hearings of this Congress on postal pay and classification nearly every employee representative commended the action of the Congress in its initiation and approval of Public Law 134. Since the passage of Public Law 134, which gave all employees on the rolls an increase in salary, salary increases have been based upon a need for keeping pace with the increase in the cost of living. Since Public Law 134 was effective July 31, 1945, there has been a general increase in the level of postal employees' salaries which has raised the average salary for postal employees from $2,049 in 1945—just prior to Public Law 134—to the present average annual salary of $3,928. In 1945, after the enactment of Public Law 134, the average annual salary of postal field service employees was $2,267. At present it is $3,928—this represents a 91.7 percent increase since 1945. After the enactment of this bill, H. R. 4644, it is estimated that the average annual salary for postal field service employees will be $4,243. This represents an average increase since 1945 of over $2,000 per employee, or 96.6 percent. During this same period the increase in the cost of living was 48.7 percent.

As another illustration, a postal clerk or carrier who entered the service prior to January 1946 would have entered at $1,700 a year and would not be in the top automatic grade drawing a salary of $4,070. Under the bill his salary will become $4,360 a year, or a total increase of 156.5 percent.

It is interesting to note, also, that on July 1, 1951, the effective date of the last salary increase, the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was 110.9; in January 1955 the index was 114.3. This represents an increase of only 3.4 points, or 3.07 percent. H. R. 4644 grants a minimum salary increase of 6 percent to every employee.

Some groups of employees have, since 1945, received larger increases than other employees. This is occasioned, in part, by the manner in which salary increases for postal employees have been brought about. For example, some employees have received advantage by the elimination of the first two grades by Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress. The entrance grades for clerks and carriers, as set by Public Law 134, was $1,700. Intervening increases, together with the proposed increase in this bill, will bring the entrance grade for clerks and carriers to $3,640, an increase of 114.1 percent.

In summary, this bill will provide a minimum 6-percent increase for all postal employees and a new salary schedule which is designed to place the wages for postal-field-service positions in proper relationship to each other so that inequities will be eliminated, incentive for advancement offered, and the principle of higher pay for more difficult and responsible work followed.

The Post Office Department estimates the cost of this bill at $160,382,000 annually.

Your committee labored long, hard, and faithfully on this legislation, and we endeavored to bring out the best possible bill, a fair, a just, and an equitable bill. This present bill was approved by the committee by a vote of 17 to 6.

We are confident that after this bill is once enacted, the postal employees as a whole will be thoroughly satisfied with this legislation.

It is true at the present time that the postal groups are divided into several camps, some supporting the pending bill (H. R. 4644) without amendment, some supporting the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], while others, including the organizations of city clerks, are opposed to both the bill and the Moss amendments.

This bill is supported by the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association. I have here and insert at this point a letter addressed to me by the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association under date of April 4, 1955.

The letter referred to follows:

NATIONAL RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The rural letter carriers of the Nation are becoming increasingly concerned over the present postal pay controversy. This letter is to urge your support of H. R. 4644 as a compromise solution. We are particularly alarmed over the possibility that legislation may be enacted which would exceed the limitation announced as acceptable by the White House; thereby resulting in a veto and thus delay a deserved raise for an indefinite period and/or conceivably preclude the enactment of pay legislation in this session of Congress.

On behalf of the 36,000 members of this organization, I express profound gratitude for your sincere interest in and support of our efforts to obtain a much-needed salary increase. Speaking for rural carriers, I can assure you that they are reasonable and expect nothing more than fair and honorable treatment as loyal employees. The delay in enactment of pay legislation is a travesty on justice and, knowing full well that further delay will have a devastating effect on morale, we earnestly and in good conscience seek speedy enactment of salary increase provisions provided for in S. 1489 and H. R. 4644.

It is reliably reported—and we believe—that the President would approve this legislation. To fail to act, in consideration of the fact that each day of delay is depriving postal employees of the Nation of $500,000—or approximately $1 per day per employee—is indeed nothing more than denial of an increase which is truly deserved and sorely needed for the economic well-being of postal personnel.

We appreciate and respect the difference of opinion in the Congress. The freedom and diversification of thought thus represented is truly the safeguard of our freedom, our Government, and our way of life. Likewise, this cornerstone of democracy in action has been the refuge and board of appeal for postal employees to seek corrective action on conditions of employment. We know that the Congress has never failed to heed the problems of employees, or act in a constructive manner to improve the terms, conditions, and benefits of employment, including a fair pay scale for the work performed. We highly commend the Congress as a body for the faith they have kept with the postal employee.

We feel that you will agree that the welfare of the employee is more important than a complete meeting of minds on the amount of increase that is proper, justifiable and deserved. Sincerely feeling that this will also be your personal thought, we respectfully urge your every effort to speed enactment of the 7.6 percent pay proposal.

This association has acted independently in arriving at the conclusion that this compromise is a must if we are to accomplish our mutual endeavors of putting needed pay in the pockets of postal people. Our position in respect to this legislation parallels that of four other postal organizations: National Association of Postmasters, National League of Postmasters, National Association of Postal Supervisors and National Association of Special Delivery Messengers. These four organizations together with ourselves represent approximately 125,000 of the 500,000 postal employees.

We feel that H. R. 4644, the 7.6 percent pay proposal reported out by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee after adoption of 21 amendments to the original bill, and now before you, represents a compromise on the part of both the employee organizations and the Post Office Department; and that this proposal reflects a midpoint meeting ground which, in our opinion, is definitely compromise from the original positions of employee organizations and the Department.

In view of this, and in consideration of the urgency of action, we most earnestly and respectfully urge that you exercise your important influence and support this compromise solution which is possible by passage of H. R. 4644.

Most sincerely yours,
WARREN B. BLEDSOE,
President.

We have also an endorsement of H. R. 4644 from the National Association of Postal Supervisors. Their letter, signed by Mr. M. C. Nave, president, is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Member of Congress,
Jackson, Tenn.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The confused situation which has arisen concerning the pending postal pay legislation has become a matter of serious concern to the 21,000 postal supervisors in post offices throughout the Nation, and the purpose of this letter is to briefly analyze and clarify conflicting views on a just and equitable solution. This association sincerely believes that H. R. 4644, presently on the House Calendar, would treat all employees fairly and justly.

In his message to Congress on January 11, 1955, the President recommended legislation to provide a 5-percent general pay raise, with reclassification to adjust long-standing inequities. On January 25, Chairman MURRAY, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, introduced H. R. 2987 based on those principles, the estimated cost of which was $129 million. Following extensive hearings, the committee made more than 50 liberalizations and changes in the salary and reclassification provisions of the bill to meet desires expressed by all employee groups and it was reintroduced as H. R. 4644, with an increased cost of $32 million, all of which would go to employees in the 5 lower salary levels, predominantly to the clerks and carriers in level 5.

As now before the House, H. R. 4644 is definitely a compromise between the original administration proposal and the expressed desires of all employee groups. The reclassification provisions of the bill have been generally agreed to by all employee groups, but those groups who would be in level 5 are still urging a further increase above the 7.6-percent average now in the bill to 8.3 percent, which would further raise the cost by more than $15 million, all of which would go to only 2 of the 9 major groups of employees.

Reliable administration sources have assured that any further increase in cost above the 7.6 percent now provided in H. R. 4644 would invite a certain veto, and rather than action which could result in no pay raise this year, we earnestly urge your support of H. R. 4644 as a reasonable and proper compromise.

This association has consistently supported this measure since its presentation to Congress last January and joins with the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Association of Postmasters, the National League of Postmasters, and the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, with a combined total membership of 125,000 of the 500,000 postal employees in mutual support of H. R. 4644.

Sincerely yours,

M. C. NAVE,
President, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

I also have a letter from the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, signed by Mr. George L. Warfel, president, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SPECIAL DELIVERY MESSENGERS,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is an appeal for your support of the postal pay-classification bill H. R. 4644, without amendment. The bill as it now stands is a compromise bill drawn up by the committee and embodies 21 major liberalizing amendments to the bill as originally introduced.

The Department's recommendation to the Congress sought to eliminate many existing inequities. One of these objectives was to upgrade the position of special delivery messenger to that of city carrier level as merited by the duties and responsibilities of the job. Therefore, both positions were placed in salary level 4 of the original bill, which action was publicly endorsed by the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers. One of the compromises worked out in the committee was the creation of a new salary level 5, ranging from $50 to $80 per annum higher than level 4, then because of off-the-record objection by the city carriers to the upgrading of special delivery messengers to city carrier level the committee, as a means of arriving at the compromise, left special delivery messengers in level 4 while city carriers, clerks, and motor-vehicle drivers were placed in level 5.

Our membership is greatly concerned over the present legislative situation. Although justice demands that special delivery messengers be placed in the same pay level as city carriers, yet we are apprehensive that further amendments to H. R. 4644 might result in either 1 of 2 things: (1) No pay increase this year, or (2) eventual enactment of less desirable legislation than would be provided by H. R. 4644.

For the reasons above stated we are in complete agreement with the position taken by the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, the National League of Postmasters, and the National Association of Postmasters, and join them in earnestly soliciting your support of H. R. 4644 in its present form.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE L. WARFEL,
President.

A letter from the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, dated April 2, 1955, urges the adoption of H. R. 4644, and their letter, signed by Mr. Raymond V. McNamara, president, is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 2, 1955.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM 34,000 POSTMASTERS

The 34,000 members of the National Association of Postmasters are deeply disturbed because they are convinced that failure by Congress to pass H. R. 4644 will result in no pay raise this year for the deserving postal employees of the country.

H. R. 4644 represents an intelligent compromise. It contains 21 provisions which were placed in the bill at the request of the postal organizations. It will give postal employees $30 million more than was provided by the original Murray bill. All of this additional money will go to the rank-and-file employees, predominantly clerks and carriers.

In view of the fact that every day of delay is costing the postal employees of the country $600,000—or more than $1 a day per employee—we feel that it is very harmful to the interests of the postal service to haggle over a fraction of 1 percent, particularly since any further addition to the 7.6 percent pay bill will almost certainly result in Presidential disapproval and further delay.

The National Association of Postmasters in taking this stand parallels the thinking and the action of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers, the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, and the National League of Postmasters. These 5 organizations, representing almost 30 percent of the entire working force of the Nation's post offices, make up a significant cross-section of all postal employees. We are united in the belief that H. R. 4644 is the best possible bill that can be passed at this time to benefit every segment of the postal employee force.

It is our understanding that all but one of the postal organizations opposing H. R. 4644 have agreed to a salary increase within one-half of 1 percent of the increase provided in that bill. This area of disagreement, which is also the margin between probable Presidential approval and probable Presidential disapproval, seems to us far too small to justify the unconscionable delay that has been generated by the resistance of a few objectors.

Your support of H. R. 4644 in its present form, without amendment, will be greatly appreciated by the postmasters of the Nation.

Yours respectfully,

RAYMOND V. MCNAMARA,
President.

The National League of Postmasters of the United States, representing more than 26,000 members, requests support of H. R. 4644. Their letter, signed by Mr. C. B. Gravitt, Jr., secretary-representative, is as follows:

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF POSTMASTERS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The National League of Postmasters, representing more than 26,000 members, unanimously requests your support of the postal classification bill, H. R. 4644. We are greatly concerned over the confusion and the unnecessary delay in granting a pay raise to the faithful, loyal, and hard-working postal employees. We are losing more than $500,000 in raises for every working day that passage of H. R. 4644 is delayed.

This bill, which was reported out of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by a bipartisan majority of 17 to 6, represents a compromise between the original recommendations of the President and other proposals which were made to the Congress and would result in an average increase of 7.6 percent for all postal employees. The President has made it clear that a larger raise or a raise without elimination of inequities is not acceptable.

The Congress has enacted a 6.7-percent raise for the military. We believe that H. R. 4644 with an average raise of 7.6 percent is the best compromise that can be made at this time for postal employees.

The National League of Postmasters joins with the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, the National Association of Postmasters, and the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, in mutual support of H. R. 4644, and respectfully asks that you use your influence to expedite its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

C. B. GRAVITT, Jr.,
Secretary-Representative.

Mr. Chairman, I have done the best I can about this legislation. I am the oldest Member in point of service on the old Post Office Committee and the new Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. When I became a Member of this distinguished body in 1943, I was assigned to the old Post Office Committee. I guess I was assigned there because I had enjoyed some experience in the postal service. For nine years I was associated with the Post Office Department in Washington under Postmaster Generals James A. Farley and Frank C. Walker. During my sojourn in the Post Office Department I learned something about the postal laws and about postal needs.

I realized at that time that there was an urgent need for a reclassification of the entire postal structure. So in 1943 when I became a Member I began urging the chairman of the committee, who was then the Honorable Thomas G. Burch, who later went to the Senate, and who has now passed away, to give time and attention to drafting a sound salary reclassification structure for the postal service.

The late chairman, Mr. Burch, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and I were on a special committee to draft Public Law 134 which was passed in 1945. This was the first reclassification bill the postal service ever had and it gave the postal employees their first increase in salary since 1923.

At that time some of the employees did not like the measure, but later all of them favored it and now refer to it as the bill of rights for the postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I have always had the interest of the postal employees at heart. I do not believe any member of the committee during my service at least has sponsored more beneficial or more helpful legislation on behalf of postal employees than I have. I try to go along with them as long as they are fair and reasonable. Of course, sometimes their demands become unreasonable, and then I cannot agree with them, but I can assure you that I have done my best to

bring out a bill that I expect will be approved by the President if it is not further amended and the cost increased.

The bill sent down here by the Postmaster General would have cost $129 million. Your committee bill will cost $160 million, $31 million more than the President recommended.

I am sure all of you who were here when we tried to pass this bill under suspension of the rules heard me read my letter to the President, sending copy of my bill, H. R. 4644, and his reply.

The following is my letter to the President and his reply:

MARCH 17, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted for your information and reference is a copy of our committee report on H. R. 4644, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. This report has just been received from the printer.

I am sure that you are aware that within the next few days this legislation will be considered by the House and Senate. Our committee has recommended favorably H. R. 4644 which would provide a minimum of a 6-percent increase for postal employees and a proper reclassification of positions very similar to those recommended by the Postmaster General and in line with your message of January 11.

The pay provisions, of course, are somewhat higher than you recommended but appear to the committee, after careful consideration, to be reasonable. There are many Members of the House, I am sure, who would prefer to give an even higher salary increase. At the same time, I do not believe they would want to amend the committee bill to the point that it might be disapproved with the result that there would be no salary increase for postal employees.

Because I am aware of your deep and continuing interest in this legislation, I thought you might like to have this information as to its current status.

Respectfully yours,

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 18, 1955.

The Honorable TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your letter respecting H. R. 4644, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, and am interested to learn of your committee's action on this important legislation.

My special message to Congress on January 11 emphasized the need for fair adjustments in postal pay and long overdue reclassifications of postal positions. To accomplish these purposes, I recommended an increase of 5 percent in the compensation of postal employees and also a reclassification of postal positions and compensation adjustments to bring about proper wage relationships among new classifications. The combined increases of pay adjustments and reclassification amount to an overall 6½ percent salary increase in the postal service. These modifications, in my judgment, would be equitable to all postal employees.

I am gratified by the committee's action on reclassification. As to the compensation of postal employees, I note that your committee has approved an increase higher than I recommended. This gives me concern not only because of the fiscal impact of such increases, but also because of the close relationship between this legislation and legislation now pending in the Congress affecting the compensation of other Federal employees.

Of course, in the consideration of such legislation as this there can be reasonable differences of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. Although I shall carefully consider this factor when the time comes for me to act on this legislation, in fairness to you and your colleagues I must make it clear that any additional increases in postal salaries above your committee's action would give me the gravest apprehension.

With kind regard,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I take it from the President's letter, of course, that if we increase the cost through this bill by any amendments then undoubtedly and unquestionably the President will send this bill back with his disapproval. I do not believe either the House or the Senate will override the President's veto. I feel certain if we cannot get this bill approved without amendment then we cannot get it approved by the President.

Now, later on I wish to discuss the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California. I have no objection to the amendment requiring the Postmaster General to file a report. That is amendment No. 1. I have no objection to amendment No. 3 which would make the pay increase effective retroactive to March 1st instead of the first payday after the enactment of this legislation, provided the second amendment which distorts and destroys the proper balance and relationship of positions in the salary reclassification schedule is not adopted, and I want to discuss that amendment later on in the debate as I think it will wreck and ruin the salary schedule set forth in the bill. I hope the Members will vote down amendment No. 2 to be offered by the gentleman from California, because it will throw out of balance and out of kilter the proper relationship between the 21 schedules. I would regret to vote against my own bill but I would be compelled to do so out of self-respect for my own honest convictions and judgment if this obnoxious amendment is approved or made a part of my bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are discussing today a piece of legislation that affects the livelihoods of half a million people, employees of the postal service, fine, splendid citizens for whom we all have the highest respect. I have always had high regard for them, and I trust they have the same respect for me. On some occasions we do differ. I have always supported legislation on their behalf that was fair and reasonable. I am today supporting legislation that I believe to be fair and which I hope will become law.

Let me say at the outset that the legislation we are bringing before you today has had the careful consideration of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I know of no committee that works harder and more diligently with respect to legislation that comes before it than this committee of which I have the honor of being a member.

I would like to address myself briefly, to the rule under which you brought this legislation to the floor of the House. I have been here for quite a number of years now. I took my share of the lambasting a few weeks ago, because we brought a similar bill to the floor of the House under what is known as suspension of the rules. It was proper procedure. It came in order on a suspension day. There was no special privilege about it. Some Members said it was a gag rule. All we asked you to do was to vote for or against the bill. If you liked it, all right; if you did not, all right. The big complaint was there was no chance to amend it. Members said there should be an open rule and a chance for anyone to amend where and when it was in order.

During the years I have been a Member of this body, I have never witnessed the adoption of a rule quite like this one. The Rules Committee has said the House will be permitted to consider only three amendments proposed by one Member of this body. Yes, some other Member may submit one or more of them. But we are restricted to consider three amendments that one Member has proposed. Remember they are not committee amendments. So one man holds in his hand the proposals we are to consider.

There has been discussion about 10 percent across the board. Or 15 percent. You cannot do that under this rule. This Member did not include that in this request.

I admit the Member who has been authorized to offer amendments, is a strong man. He is my good friend. He is studious. He attends committee meetings regularly. But look what you have done in the adoption of this rule. You have said that none of the other 434 Members of this body may even offer an amendment, if he wants to do so. Where are those who have 10-percent proposals? They are out and that is all there is to that. It would have been much fairer to permit no amendments than to follow this procedure. This may be described as a sort of gag rule and favoritism put together.

Until a little while ago the Committee on Rules told us we could have only 10 minutes of debate on any one of the amendments. One involves the expenditure of $10 million. Now, I understand 30 minutes will be permitted to discuss this amendment.

It is at least rather interesting. We are making history, I think, so far as procedure is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be very glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. Let me say that I have highest respect for the gentleman. He is truly one of the great Members of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is generally a prelude to the gentleman's jumping on me.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not do that for the world. I have just said the gentleman is a great man. He is sincere. My criticism is in respect to the

action of the Rules Committee of which he is the honored chairman.

The House approved the rule, so the gentleman is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I should like to say that the feeling is entirely mutual. I have great respect for the gentleman. But I know the gentleman does not want to be misunderstood, does not want to make a misstatement. As a matter of fact, the rule merely identifies the proposed amendment as the Moss amendment; but it provides that any Member of the House may offer any one of those three amendments which are identified in that way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the procedure the only amendments that may be considered are those already submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Either he or anybody else. The gentleman will find that in the rule. It is not restricted to any one Member. Whoever gets the floor first may offer the amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But it must be the amendment that has been proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], which he has printed in the RECORD. So, it does not make any real difference. In other words, the amendment must be one of those that the gentleman from California has proposed and only these.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So there is not much difference.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wanted to make that little correction. I have enough faults and enough of the criticisms made of me are justifiable that when I get the opportunity to correct the gentleman, I like to do so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And I want the gentleman to do so, too.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I should be glad to yield briefly to a member of that great Committee on Rules. I do not differ with the right of the committee to do as they see fit. But I do disagree with what the committee has done, in taking this action because I think it is wrong. I want to say that I did appear before the Committee on Rules and asked for an open rule, as did the distinguished chairman of our committee. But we were overruled. We understand that the committee has the right to overrule us. That is the committee's power and authority.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield briefly to me at this point?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately, I was not present when this matter came up. Personally, frankly, while I supported the rule, I should have preferred an open rule, because I thought that was possibly the best procedure. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question. Did the gentleman object to this type of rule when he appeared before the committee? I was not there, so I am asking the gentleman just for the information.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The answer, briefly, is this. The chairman of our committee and I appeared before the committee. We presented our views. We said we thought we ought to have an open rule, and made request for an open rule. Our chairman explained the bill quite carefully. We both requested a rule that is nearly always granted in cases. It was my view that since the House was unwilling to accept the legislation under suspension, we should go before the Rules Committee and ask for the usual rule. When we were through presenting the matter, the chairman of the Rules Committee asked how much time should be allotted for debate. As I recall the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] suggested 2 or 3 hours.

Mr. SMITH, chairman of your committee, asked if anyone else would like to be heard. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] asked to be heard. I believe he said he was appearing on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] who could not be present. He read, or rather had a member of the staff, read some proposed changes in the measure. Nothing was said in my presence about a restricted rule. The House was in session. I went to the House floor. I was informed your committee met in the afternoon and agreed to this rule. I was not invited to the afternoon meeting of the Committee on Rules. I did not expect to be invited. I was surprised at the action taken.

Mr. COLMER. As I said, I was away that day, unfortunately. But what I was asking the gentleman was whether he had knowledge that that type of rule was pending or was being advocated, and whether or not he protested it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman mean after the committee decided on it?

Mr. COLMER. I mean before the committee acted on it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not go back. I came down to the floor of the House because the House was in session and I had a bill pending and had to come down and look after it. I am informed your committee recessed until some time in the afternoon and took action in the afternoon meeting. I was not invited to the afternoon meeting. I am not complaining about that. I was quite surprised of the action taken. If any one knows of precedent for this kind of action, I would like to have someone cite it to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is important and far-reaching legislation. It has been carefully prepared. It is the result of a considerable amount of study on the part of our committee. It is a major revision of Public Law 134 that has been greatly applauded by the Members of this House, postal employees, and people across the country.

The last Congress had 24 sessions dealing with the question of pay and other benefits for postal employees. During this Congress our committee held 15 long sessions on this proposed legislation.

Members may be interested to know that before this bill was finally submitted the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and I as minority member, conferred with representatives of the postal employees with regard to it. We made several changes, as the chairman has told you, because of their suggestions. The bill is a fair approach. It provides a minimum increase of 6 percent and an adjustment and realinement of the pay structure which adds an additional 1.6 percent.

The bill in my judgment is the best that can be worked out in the consideration of the interests of the Government and of keeping salaries and salary increases within reasonable bounds.

Let me say this to you. You have heard and talked about a 10 percent proposal.

The facts are that no member of our committee proposed that we consider the recommendation of a so-called 10 percent bill, even though such bills were pending before our committee. Yes, there was, as I remember it, and I went over the testimony for a 10 percent across-the-board increase, but no one proposed a vote on any of those 10 percent bills.

The original bills did provide a minimum of 5 percent in base salaries. I suggested a minimum of 6 percent. It was approved with little objection, if any at all.

Let me suggest again, that these three amendments you are going to consider in a while were not considered by our committee as they are now proposed. They are not exactly as they were proposed before our committee, and there was plenty of time to propose them at that time.

A great deal has been stated to the effect that the Postmaster General is likely to manipulate and move individuals around in their positions. That is entirely incorrect. Ninety percent of them are classified right under this bill and only with respect to 10 percent or less, if the Postmaster General wanted to, could he do any reclassification, because the duties of 90 percent of them are written here in the bill itself.

This legislation has been carefully prepared and is the result of a considerable amount of study on the part of our committee. This legislation has been studied as far back as the 80th Congress. It is really a major revision of Public Law 134, that has been greatly applauded by Members of this House at various times. This legislation has been grossly misinterpreted. During the hearings all members of the committee agreed there must be reclassification. That, of course, includes those who have submitted minority views. This measure includes a tremendous amount of work, effort, and research. It is really a committee bill.

The last Congress held 24 sessions dealing with the question of pay and other benefits for postal employees. During this Congress, our committee held 15 sessions on this proposed legislation. Members may be interested to know that before this bill was finally submitted, the chairman of this committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and I, as ranking minority leader, conferred with representatives of postal employees. These were representatives who had already testified before our committee. We included a number of their suggestions in this proposal.

This bill is a fair approach. It provides for a minimum increase of 6 percent and an adjustment and realinement

in the pay structure which adds an additional 1.6 percent. This bill, in my judgment, is the best that can be worked out in consideration of the interest of the Government and in keeping salaries and salary increases within reasonable bounds.

Complaints and suggestions are bound to develop when you deal with personnel problems affecting more than 500,000 employees. I challenge anyone to deal with matters affecting more than half a million individuals and not have some dissent. I want to emphasize that if there is going to be an increase in postal salaries, it must be accomplished by a salary plan. It should be equally clear that the plan included in this legislation has been pushed to a breaking point. Our committee has complied with practically all of the criticisms that were leveled against this legislation by representatives of postal organizations.

Basically, this bill provides a minimum of 6 percent salary increase, and, at the same time, will bring about a reclassification of postal employees' salaries through the establishment of a new salary plan for the postal field service.

Under the bill, 90 percent of the employees are covered by positions specifically defined in the bill and are assigned to appropriate salary levels. Only 10 percent will be assigned by the Postmaster General, and these must be assigned in accordance with strict standards and subject to an appeal to the Civil Service Commission by the employee concerned. This meets the criticism leveled against this measure that the Postmaster General has power to push these people around in their jobs.

The descriptions of duties, responsibilities, and relationships of 50 positions, covering more than 90 percent of the postal employees, and the establishment of salary levels, are made a matter of law by section 203 of the bill.

The detailed procedure for the establishment of salary levels for the remaining less than 10 percent are made a matter of law by section 201.

Section 202 authorizes the employee to appeal to the Civil Service Commission any action taken by the Post Office Department in the assignment of a job to a key position or to a salary level. It also makes the decisions of the Civil Service Commission mandatory on the Postmaster General.

It has been erroneously stated the salary of employees can be reduced merely by assignment to lower levels. I ask you to look at section 204 which allows the assignment of employees to other duties, but provides (a) that the salary of no employee be reduced as a result of such action, and (b) that assignment of an employee to higher duties for more than 30 days in a calendar year shall be paid for at the higher rate of pay.

The minority report would have you believe that the Postmaster General can make unlimited appointments to supervisory positions from outside the postal field. Section 501 limits this authority to appointment of persons who have been civilian employees in any branch of the Government and to positions in the regional and district offices and positions in the professional and scientific fields.

They also claim that this legislation permits the appointment of an unlimited number of substitutes. This is not correct. The committee recognized that there was some desirability of eliminating the regular-substitute ratio in the interest of flexibility of administration. Section 606 (c) takes care of that.

Some of those who criticize this legislation would have you believe that this proposal would allow the Post Office Department to downgrade all positions. The fact is that H. R. 4644 establishes by law the grade and salary of over 90 percent of the positions and provides a mandatory procedure for establishing the salary level of all others.

It has been suggested that great increases go for higher paid workers. This statement would be true if you are going to ignore the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and responsibility. The ranking of positions and salary levels as set forth in title II and III of the bill, H. R. 4644, recognizes this principle. There are some 1,100 employees in positions such as assistant postmasters, superintendents of mails, superintendent of transportation, and a few others who for some 10 years have been grossly underpaid. For instance, the postmaster at New York is paid $13,770 while the assistant postmaster is paid $8,470. This is a difference of $5,300 between the postmaster and his first deputy. The provisions of H. R. 4644 will bring these salary rates into more reasonable alinement and will, for the first time, recognize the duties and responsibilities of the assistant postmaster.

The committee also recognized that the clerks and carriers in post offices in the first and second class have greater responsibilities than reflected in the salary level proposal by the administration. A new salary level 5—section 301—which provides higher salaries for these groups of employees was approved by the committee. The additional cost resulting from the insertion of this new level is estimated at over $20 million.

Those who criticize the bill say that the proposed effective dates delay increases for 6 months. The fact is this bill establishes the first pay period after the date of enactment as the effective date of both the 6 percent minimum pay increase and that resulting from reclassification. The bill allows a maximum of 180 days in which to effect the assignment of all positions to salary levels. Once the assignment is made, the employee will receive a retroactive payment for the amount of this gross increase as of the first pay period after date of enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the starting rate for clerks and carriers. The present starting rate of clerks and carriers is $3,270 a year. This bill increases that amount $370, which makes a total of $3,740. Clerks and carriers comprise about 60 percent of employees in Government. The average increase for clerks and carriers is 8.2 percent and not 6.2 percent as claimed by the minority. The minority neglected to include premium pay for overtime and night work which really brings the increase to 8.2 percent.

This bill provides too that clerks and carriers reach a top salary in 7 years instead of 9 years.

The question now is whether the bill is right. If it is right, you will vote for it. If you do not think it is right, then you will vote against it. I think it is fair. I am anxious to get a bill through the House and through the other body that will become law. In my view this bill is the one most likely to become law and I think that when the postal people really know what the measure contains, they will not only favor it, but will support it. I would like to say that I have at all times supported legislation that I thought was fair and beneficial to postal employees. This bill is fair. It is right. It ought to pass.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First I want to commend the gentleman and likewise the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee, on the very fine work they have done on this very difficult proposition. It is quite obvious that you understand the subject and that all the way through you have tried to be fair and are being fair. May I ask the gentleman this question. Is it not true that this measure, as reported by the committee, represents a very substantial compromise in the way of increased expenditure of the taxpayers' money as against the administration proposal originally sent up here?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, certainly, that is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And is it not true the amendments and changes which have been made have added $30 million annually to the cost that will follow the enactment of this legislation as against the original proposal of the administration?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is correct. There were 21 amendments added to the bill and many changes made in the bill after it was first introduced. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, a new, clean bill is before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious to do the thing that is fair and right for the rank and file, yes, all postal people of this country. They are doing a great service. They are good men and women. They are patriotic in every respect. I do not think the action some of you propose in supporting the controversial amendment before us today, it will be for the best interests of all postal employees. As I said before, I want to do the right thing. I know you do.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair that the Members of the House should be informed of the compelling reasons why I am opposed to H. R. 4644, the postal pay legislation, as reported by the Post Office Civil Service Committee, and supporting the 8.2 percent increase.

In my judgment—and I think it is amply supported by the record—our postal employees have clearly established a right to at least a 10 percent increase in their present salaries. I introduced a bill which would have provided such a richly deserved increase of 10 percent. I still think that it would be only right and proper. However, at the same time I recognize that there are other factors which have been injected into consideration of postal pay legislation and which undoubtedly will require a settlement of some lower figure. I just want to make it clear that my principles remain unchanged, but I am willing in a spirit of compromise to try to reach a reasonable settlement. That is why I support the 8.2 percent increase. I would like to see the House adopt the Senate bill of 10-percent increase.

Year after year I have seen our postal employees forced to come before our committee and literally beg for fair pay standards. Year after year I have seen them go away with half a loaf or—as in the case last year—nothing at all. Yet, year after year they have striven to report to Congress the facts with respect to their problems and their work. I think it is a sad commentary that once more this House is being asked to consider a bill which provides pay adjustments far below that which is justified for these postal employees. The Senate passed a straight 10 percent increase for postal and classified workers with no reclassification. I prefer this.

As I said, notwithstanding this I have been willing to accept and support a reasonable compromise. I have been willing to meet those who disagree with my view on a reasonable compromise. That is why I signed the minority report on this legislation in favor of an 8.2-percent increase. The proposal in the minority report, while still less than I believe warranted, will go a long way to answering the problems of postal employees beyond what is provided in the reported bill.

This bill is discriminatory among classes of employees and should be amended. It provides an average increase of less than 7 percent for over 200,000 regular city carriers and clerks. For some supervisory employees or postmasters the immediate increase can run as high as 40 percent or more, with maximum possible increases for this preferred group ranging as high as 74 percent. This is a manifest travesty on justice.

Nor is this bill any compromise at all. The administration recommended a 5-percent immediate increase, plus 1½ percent extra as the cost of reclassification. This bill will provide only a 6-percent increase. Anything more represents the cost of reclassification desired by the Post Office Department. It is almost wholly a one-way compromise—with the employees yielding.

Speaking of the clerks and carriers, they are placed under this bill, into a salary level which is barely above the next lower salary level, and is far below the next highest salary level. This is a serious distortion which should be corrected. Moreover, the increase in this level recommended in the minority report—ranging from $40 to $70 a year for the various steps—would provide a more adequate compensation for the actual duties of these clerks and carriers and would cost—according to the Department's own estimate—$10 million additional.

The record of increased productivity of postal employees is one of the finest accomplishments in Government in recent years. It is one in which both management and workers take pride. This is another reason for not being niggardly in adjusting salaries of these employees.

Increases in salaries and wages of comparable workers in private industry have far surpassed increases for postal workers since World War II. A comparison of postal salaries with national income and with the average of all postal incomes is even more unfavorable to the postal workers. Millions of employees in other lines of work who but a few years ago were in the same bracket as postal employees now have moved on upward, far above. The postal employee finds himself relegated to a status at or near the lowest major income level.

These are some of the reasons why I oppose H. R. 4644 as reported, and urge approval of the 8.2 percent increase recommended in the minority report on this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make perfectly clear one rather important fact. The amendments which I propose offering at the conclusion of the debate represent not the individual effort of one member of the committee, but the combined thinking and efforts of all the members who signed the minority report. When I offer them, I offer them on their behalf, and they have shared equally in the efforts to bring about their enactment here by the House.

I think it well to tell you exactly what we propose by these amendments. The first one to be offered will give to the Congress the right to take a very careful and searching look at the classification actions taken by the Postmaster General under the rather broad grants of authority which will be made by the passage of this legislation. I am not going to tell you that this is wholly as good a bill as the distinguished chairman and the distinguished ranking minority Member would have you believe, and neither am I going to tell you that it is as bad or as vicious as others might lead you to believe. It is a bill which, if properly and sympathetically administered, could be very beneficial. But without proper administration, and without a sincere effort for fairness, it can become a very vicious bill—one which will be highly destructive of the morale of the postal workers. It is deficient in many respects. There is not a sufficient number of benchmark positions as provided in the classification of supervisory and clerical workers. There is substantial grounds for fear on the part of many employees, but I, for one, am convinced that we cannot legislate solely against fear. If the things they anticipate finally take place, then most assuredly this Congress next January should take steps to enact remedial legislation to prevent abuses which are clearly possible under this legislation. That is why the amendment proposes to require a most detailed report from the Postmaster General to the committees of the House and the Senate.

The second amendment, and the one around which the greatest controversy arises, is very simple. It provides in level one for a $20 increase for each person working in that level. In level two we provide a meager increase for those workers by increasing the step rate by $5 a step. The total cost for those two levels is approximately $168,000, but they are dollars which go into the pockets of the poorest paid people in our Government, and I think they are entitled to that extra measure of consideration.

The highly controversial group is level five. You have been told that it affects just one group. One group, yes, where about 60 percent of the total working force of the Post Office Department is employed; one group which, under the bill H. R. 4644, would receive an average increase of approximately 6.7 percent. While those who still support the committee bill as written are trying to say it is 7.6, it is not, and will not be unless my amendment is adopted, because under that amendment we do raise employees, clerks, and carriers, to a figure between 7.6 and 8.25, depending upon their length of service and the level into which they will be fitted upon conversion when this present factor is brought into play. In other words, it provides a degree of equality of treatment for about 60 percent of the employees, to give them the minimum level of the bill, as opposed to the 40-percent group who receive all the way from 15 to as high as 58 percent, under this legislation. If we simply measure the additional cost, I believe the Department's figures are $10 million, although the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Rees] said it was $11 million, but in order not to underestimate, I say the cost will be approximately $12 million. It will bring the cost of payroll up to 8.278 percent—almost 8.3 percent. But that additional cost, that additional $12 million, goes into the pockets of people who need it now and need it most desperately. It only brings them to an average of the overall cost of the bill.

Now let us concern ourselves with the charge that I propose to take away from somebody in this bill, through a change in the levels 14 through 20——

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making, although, as he understands, I am not in complete agreement. The gentleman has spoken of the people in the lower grades who need help most. Is it not fair to say that in recent years we have had these across-the-board increases of $400, and in the 80th Congress $450? Is it not fair to say that the people in the lower grades proportionately profit much more by these across-the-board raises than the people in the higher grades?

Mr. MOSS. I would say that the history of the legislation would indicate that that is the truth. The fact, however, that the Department itself came before the committee this year and advocated an additional increase indicates they felt that these people did not get too much.

I am convinced that we are trying to work under a too-low scale for our Federal workers, not only in the Post Office Department but in the classified service as well. We have an effective maximum of $14,800 and from that we go on down and have 20 or 21 levels. It cannot properly reflect responsibility, and sometime we should realistically set the higher salaries. They most certainly are entitled to what they would receive under my amendment and even if we gave them 10 percent we would not by giving them more than they are entitled to have.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. MOSS. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. When the pay bill was considered in 1951 the Postmaster General, at that time Mr. Donaldson, and the head of the Civil Service Commission Mr. Ramspeck, testified before our committee that a 21 percent increase was justifiable. They got less than 10 percent in 1951. Since then the cost of living has gone up. If the gentleman from Indiana would like to check a little, I have before me here a statement released a few days ago, on Monday, showing the cost of living and how it has gone up. In it are included these words: "With no net drop in food."

I wish to emphasize that point.

Mr. MOSS. I wish to thank the gentleman for that information. I would like now to get to the money I am proposing to take away in this revised salary schedule. I have been accused, and I notice today in the Washington Post and Times Herald that there is some reflection there that certain people in the administration feel that perhaps my amendments would bring about distortion and certain inconsistencies.

The only reason I am proposing the bill with the step increases for levels 14 through 20 is to assure consistency. In the classified schedule employees we have a maximum step increase of $250. Under this bill as reported by the committee it was proposed to go up as high as $400. I believe that we should give more uniformity in the Federal service both as it relates to postal salaries and classified salaries if we were to increase executive salaries, and I think we should. Let us do it properly and let us maintain a consistent policy for all Federal workers. That is all in the world my amendment proposes to do in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MOSS. Could the gentleman from Tennessee let me have 2 more minutes?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MOSS. I want to explain in this 1 minute the final amendment, that of retroactivity. It will make retroactive a 6-percent increase, which is the conversion factor for consideration in this new schedule, make it retroactive to March 1. I picked the date March 1 because we had delayed, I believe, unnecessarily in bringing this bill to the floor, and I felt it was not the fault of the individual postal worker. That also was the date on which our salaries were increased and the date on which the judiciary received an increase. I think it is a very fair proposition, and I am pleased that the chairman has indicated that he agrees with that amendment.

I sincerely hope we adopt these three amendments. We will have a better bill. It will then go to conference and represent the minimum fair consensus of this body.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it is already abundantly clear that the members of this committee, and I believe also all Members of the House, are most anxious to bring out a bill that will give equitable and proper pay raises to our postal employees. We are all agreed on that. The only questions now are as to amount.

This bill is being brought out here, it seems to me, under a rather remarkably strange rule. It is a rule that in my years of service in the Congress I have never seen brought in before, and I have yet to find anyone who ever has. It may not be a closed rule, it certainly is a personalized rule, to say the least.

Of the three amendments that are to be offered, I think two are not very controversial, in fact, I would say they were not controversial at all. For that reason, I am only going to address myself to the second amendment. I am not aware of how these amendments are to be presented, whether they are to be presented in the order, 1, 2, and 3, but I am taking this as the second amendment, the one which would raise the salary schedules.

I have said on the floor of this House before, and I repeat, I do not believe that anybody can go into a classification bill on the floor of this House and try to correct it without throwing a monkey wrench into the whole business. To my way of thinking it is exactly as though we were to take a valuable antique clock and allow a child to try to make it go. It just cannot be done. Classification is a very technical matter. The minute you touch one piece in the mechanism you throw the whole thing out of gear. For that reason I would like to suggest that we accept the bill as written, especially the classification feature, that we try to make it work, and that, then, at the end of a little while, probably, as the gentleman from California has well pointed out, by next January, we can come back and reconsider this legislation.

Regardless of what we do here today, we are not going to write the final word on classification or salary legislation. Some people who have been here a shorter time may believe these things can be done once and for all. But fortunately our form of government does not work that way and we come back year after year, amending old laws, improving them, we hope, but, at any rate, changing them.

The proposal to limit step increases in the top levels to $250 would compress the schedule at the top for no valid reason. Initially, it would create additional cases where the savings clause would be effective and for many new appointees it would result in their working for several years before attaining the earnings which present employees now receive for the same work. In other words, that completely destroys the theory of equal pay for equal work. The proponents of this limitation appear to have overlooked two facts, one that H. R. 4644 represents a reduction in the starting rates for many positions in the higher levels and, two, that step increases above level 10 will not be automatic beyond step 4.

I am told that the reason for this limitation in salary schedules is to bring it into conformity with that of the Classification Act of 1949. It seems strange that the proponents of this amendment would in this case recognize the Classification Act, yet in the changes they propose in levels 1, 2, and 5 they entirely ignore any relationship which these positions may have to similar positions in the Classification Act. I do not believe that the $50,000 which will be saved by this amendment is worth the dislocation of the schedules, hardships, and administrative difficulties which it will cause.

Mr. Chairman, another consideration is that while our committee labored long, hard, and may I say very patiently on this legislation, these three amendments were never at any time proposed in the committee. We made many concessions and many compromises. When we established a new level 5, we felt that we had gone a long way and that without dislocating the Classification Act we had a pretty good bill. Now we have a complete change in a great many other classifications under this amendment. We have not studied it. We have not heard testimony on it, and it seems to me that after 4 months of work this committee has brought out as good a bill as it can and one that most certainly should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, when I go home, I always visit with my postal employees. I talk to them. I tell them what I believe and what I think, frankly and openly. We do not always agree, but we always come away from those interviews, I am happy to tell you, with mutual respect and trust. Of course, the employees want more money, and I do not blame them. They want a lot more money. They will not be satisfied with 8.3 percent, and do not let anybody tell you that they will. They want at least 10 percent. Under this rule, they cannot get it. Therefore, let us give them the best bill we know how to give them, and that is the bill that has been worked out in this committee, a highly technical bill, a very difficult bill for various Members on the floor who have never seen it before to understand.

May I also say that those of us who worked on this bill deplore the fact that so few Members have read the report. The report gives you the answers to a

great many things in this bill that you cannot possibly understand in any other way.

Now, under this proposed amendment, it is likewise said that a few people will get less money. Well, actually, 47,926 employees will get less money, and I think that is quite a goodly number. There are about 54 different changes in classification which will automatically take effect under this amendment which will also help to dislocate the whole bill.

It has also been said that it seems strange the President should remain adamant for 7.5 percent. I have asked my postal employees what they consider the difference is, the compromise between 5 percent and 10 percent, and they immediately reply 7.5. Of course it is a compromise. Of course this bill is not perfection, but it is a good bill, and most of you will be here next January, no doubt, to improve it some more. Finally, after we are all dead and gone, there may be a perfect classification postal pay raise bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I will reluctantly support the amendments of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] to this bill. I would much prefer to vote for a 10-percent raise, the amount set forth in the Senate bill, but I am realistic enough to know that that would be an empty gesture, because we are told on good authority that the President will veto a 10-percent raise and that we cannot pass that 10-percent raise over his veto. I think the 8-percent raise is inadequate. We are again lagging in paying our faithful postal workers. They are entitled to 10 percent, and they should have it. But I am going to be realistic and support the Moss amendments and urge you to do likewise.

Let me call your attention to the fact that quite recently in this House we passed a pay-raise bill for the uniformed services costing over $750 million a year.

It was passed by a vote of approximately 400 to 1. It had the stanch support of the President of the United States. It was a good bill. It was a bill long overdue. Out of his long experience in the armed services, he knew the problems of those services intimately, and he threw his weight behind that bill. I am certain, had the President of the United States had the same experience in the civil functions of the Government, he would understand the problems of the civil employees of the Government as he does those of the armed services. He would not take the adamant stand that it is reported to us by the leadership he has taken on this bill. I have great respect for him, but I am sorry that part of his long service in the Government was not spent away from the military services.

There is no question but that a 10-percent pay raise is justified for postal employees. As usual, we never quite catch up with the cost of living as far as these people are concerned. Being unable to get 10 percent, I shall settle for the next highest percentage that I feel can be gotten, and I shall leave the responsibility of the final approval of this measure to the President. I am sure that 8.2 percent, while inadequate, while not filling the gap, will at least help these faithful postal workers over the dark period ahead.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the maximum possible increase obtainable for the postal employees. We have been deliberating this problem for almost a year and a half now. During the past year and a half we have had serious disagreement, bitter debate, jockeying for political position, charges and countercharges. We have had attempts on the part of some groups to set themselves up as special friends of the postal employees and other groups have been referred to as not as good friends of the postal employees. I think we must admit here today that we are all friends of the postal employees and that all of us want to do everything we can to increase their income and their standard of living as much as possible.

I think there is practically unanimous agreement that an increase in their income is justified in order to compensate them for the increase in the cost of living. But, as I said before, we have been deliberating this problem for a year and a half. We have had a difficult time agreeing upon the exact amount of the increase and how it should be distributed among the various grades. We have arrived at a bill that is a compromise. We have heard that many times today. Certainly, in any compromise there has got to be a sacrifice on the part of all groups, or it is not a compromise. This bill is not completely satisfactory to me. I should like at least a 10-percent increase, and I think we will have to have an average of at least a 10-percent increase in order to meet the increase in the cost of living of the past 10 or 15 years.

We have coming up here today an amendment to increase the salaries of some of the employees, by raising the bill to an overall increase of 8.3 percent. That is going to be a very difficult vote for some of the Members to cast. On the surface it looks rather simple. On the one hand we have an increase of approximately 7.6 percent and on the other hand an increase of approximately 8.3 percent. If that were all there was to it, it would be quite obvious that the overwhelming majority would vote for the increase of 8.3 percent. It would be the politically smart thing to vote for the maximum increase that is before you.

However, as you look further into it, it is not quite that simple. First of all, I am convinced that a vote for the 8.3 increase will not result in getting any increase into the pockets of the employees we are trying to help. We heard several statements made today, or rather, everybody has admitted that a 10-percent increase does not stand a chance of being enacted into law. We have heard from authoritative sources that a 10-percent increase will be vetoed. We have from the same authoritative sources heard that an 8.3-percent increase will be vetoed. So if you are not offering an amendment for 10 percent because you are afraid it will be vetoed and the veto will be sustained, then for the same reason you should not offer an increase of 8.3 percent.

One reason I am going to oppose it is that I am confident this increase will not reach the pockets of the employees we want it to reach. That is where I want the increase to go, not just to be on record as having voted for an 8.3 increase.

Furthermore, if we increase all postal employees by 8.3 percent we jeopardize the increase for 1,200,000 classified employees. All we have heard about the last year and a half was the 500,000 postal employees, yet we have 1,200,000 classified employees that are affected by all this controversy. We do not hear any dickering back and forth fighting for a higher increase for them. The only thing we have heard is a general agreement that they would be entitled to 6 percent. During the past 10 or 15 years the classified employees have received a 14 percent less increase than the postal employees. That has been admitted by all who have looked into the question. The reason is that the postal employees are distributed all throughout the country, and the Members of Congress are familiar with their problems. Also, they have more political influence by being distributed throughout the country.

I think in all fairness we must grant the same increase for the classified employees that we are trying to get for the postal employees. I feel that if we adopt this 8.3 amendment today we are jeopardizing the chances of getting a further increase for the classified employees. I hope and plead with you here today that you will support my efforts to obtain at least a 7.5 increase for the classified employees as enthusiastically as you are trying to increase this 7.6 bill for the postal employees.

Another reason why we should oppose the amendment is that it is an improper amendment. If the amendment provided for an increase across the board, as the 7.6 bill does, or if it went up to at least 10 percent so we could justify the gamble of running into a veto and overriding the veto, I would be willing to support it. However, as the gentlewoman from New York stated, this does throw the whole bill completely out of kilter. Regardless of what the gentleman from California stated, we are taking from one group and giving it to another. We are jeopardizing the overall program to give $1.12 a week to one group of employees. We are actually pulling the people down that are in the upper grade as well as those right in Grade 5.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] stated the other day in answer to remarks of mine, to the effect that I felt the Republican Party has followed the principles of Jefferson throughout the years more than the Democratic Party, that if Abraham Lincoln were living today he would be a Democrat. One of the many remarks of wisdom uttered by Abraham Lincoln was that he believed in equal opportunity for all, not limited opportunity for some. He believed in every individual having the right and the opportunity to rise as far

and as high as he could, but not to pull the other fellow down in getting there.

I believe that if Lincoln were here today he would try to help all of the employees as much as possible and provide for them equal opportunity. But he would certainly vote against pulling some of the employees down for the gain of a few others.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that I favor the maximum pay raise possible for our postal employees. In view of the limited rule under which the House is considering the bill, however, this body will not even have an opportunity to vote on a 10 percent increase. Therefore I hope each and every Member of the House will support the amendments that will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] in which all Members who signed the minority report concur.

These amendments are very similar to those offered previously in committee but which were voted down. I say this notwithstanding a statement to the contrary made by another member of the committee.

Three weeks ago this body voted against considering the postal pay-raise bill under suspension of rules. The best way now to make that vote count is to support the three amendments which will be offered later today.

In my opinion, voting for these amendments is the only means this body has of justifying to the postal worker the long wait he has had for his pay raise. By so doing we will make it possible for the bill to go to the conference committee from which I hope a fair bill will emerge.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the House Members would have the privilege of voting on a 10 percent pay boost. I am convinced the postal worker not only needs but deserves such a raise. The Senate evidently thought so, too.

We House Members, however, have been denied the opportunity to vote on a 10 percent increase, and instead we are to be allowed to vote only on the three Moss amendments. I do not see how any Member who has the welfare of the postal employee and his family at heart can do less than vote for these amendments.

The amendments are reasonable. They make small but significant improvements. They will not add enormously to the cost of the bill, but they will add greatly to the comfort and self-respect of the postal employees and their families.

One of the amendments will make the postal pay raise retroactive to March 1. This means the postal employee and his family will not be penalized because H. R. 4644 was held up while some of us have been fighting for a better deal for him. In fact the retroactive feature will make an additional $20 million available to the 503,000 postal workers for the months of March and April of this year.

Another amendment directs the Postmaster General to make a comprehensive report to the Congress next January on what he has done under the bill's reclassification features. I am sure the Postmaster General would be happy to do this—even without a request.

The third, and most important, increases the average pay raise from 7.6 percent to 8.2 percent, and squeezes out some of the inequities in the bill between grade levels. This means an extra 10 to 12 million dollars each year to the more than 320,000 postal clerks, carriers and motor vehicle operators—the very core of the nonsupervisory postal workers.

If this amendment is not adopted, the bill will give raises of over 50 percent to some of the field officials and raises of barely 6 percent to many of the postal workers at the bottom of the pay scale. The officials well deserve their raise; they have long been underpaid. But after all, a sack of potatoes or a quart of milk costs the same whether it is bought by a postal supervisor's wife or the wife of the post officer janitor. And a few more pennies in the janitor's pay envelope might mean the difference between having some of the necessities of life of going without them.

Adopting this amendment to give rank and file postal workers just a little better deal will help repay them for the fact that they were deprived of their pay raise last year by a Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, I have been firmly in favor of at least a 10 percent pay raise for postal workers down through the weeks this bill has been under consideration by the House Post Office Committee and by the House itself. The cost of living is sky-high. I do not see how those with slim pocketbooks are making ends meet. A postal worker in the lower pay brackets, who is trying to raise a family, cannot possibly maintain the standard of living that we Americans so proudly boast we have in this country.

I was most disappointed when it developed during House committee hearings that the administration would not support a 10-percent pay raise. I joined with some of the other members of the committee to try to perfect a bill that the President would not veto, but we found ourselves up against a this-is-it attitude that was very disheartening. Just as it takes two to make an argument, it takes two to make a compromise. The administration was unwilling to yield even a yard. It was partly as a protest against the administration's unyielding attitude that the minority report was drawn up and signed.

When the attempt was made to bring this above-and-beyond-compromise bill up under suspension of rules, preventing the House from either debating it or amending it, I voted against the move, as did the vast majority of the Members of this body. I think we were all agreed that consideration under suspension of rules was not only discourteous but unjust and unfair to the almost half a million Americans whose economic future was at stake.

I regret that an open rule was not granted on this bill. Those of us who went before the Rules Committee earlier this week made it clear that we considered an open rule the only satisfactory way to handle this bill. The rule permitting the three amendments was offered as a second-best method, and certainly preferable to a completely closed rule. I shall always be sorry that the House was not given an opportunity to vote, under an open rule, on an amendment to give the postal employees a 10-percent raise. I think it would have been passed.

Mr. Chairman, I know this administration wants to cut Government expenses. So do I. But I do not believe denying postal employees and their families a decent standard of living is the way we should start to economize.

I am confident that my colleagues will join today to amend this bill, and give the postal employees a little better deal than would have been possible had we not fought this battle to a finish.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there has been plenty of evidence, I believe, to all of us that a substantial pay increase for postal and Federal workers is justified. If we just look at the increased productivity of the Nation, we will find it is advancing much faster than the purchasing power of our Federal employees. Federal pay has not kept pace with rising living standards or increased productivity. Naturally, all postal employees as well as other Federal employees want more money. But, I can assure you money is not the only thing involved in this question today. Ever since this legislation has been before our committee, I have opposed the reclassification provision. During the debate today on the rule, little mention was made of the question of reclassification, and yet I feel that this is a crucial issue so far as the opponents of this bill are concerned. In my opinion, this is not a good reclassification bill. You cannot set proper reclassifications in the postal service unless first you determine what is a proper minimum and what is a proper maximum for salaries. When that is done, then it is possible to work out the proper rates in between. That has not been done. I believe this bill gives entirely too much authority to the Postmaster General. Let me say this is not a partisan matter so far as I am concerned.

It is true no matter who the Postmaster General may be or what political label he may carry. There are some very good reasons for the post-office clerks to be concerned because they are the ones who would be hurt most if the powers granted under this bill were used for shortsighted political purposes and advantages or to punish those postal employees who dared to hold an honest opinion which is in conflict with the thinking of those who head the Post Office Department. There seems to be plenty of ground for such fears because of some of the incidents that have already happened. I believe it is necessary to have proper discipline in the postal service and, as a matter of fact, wherever people may be employed, but I do not think there is anything good that can come out of something like this if the result is going to be discrimination and punishment under the guise of inefficiency. It could have a disastrous

effect on the morale, and result in the weakening of the civil service and merit system. In all fairness, I want to say that substantial improvements have been made since this bill was first introduced. Improvements were made in the committee with the adoption of a meritorious amendment by Congressman Moss which sets up better procedures for the handling of grievances. I believe the Moss amendment which will be before you for your consideration today when the bill is read for amendment, and which asks for a comprehensive report by the Postmaster General on next January 1, with reference to the action he takes to make effective the job classification provisions of this bill, would be another improvement. I believe there are loopholes which would permit grave injustices. That is why I think we should accept this Moss amendment when it is offered. My first preference in connection with this legislation is S. 1 because it does not contain the reclassification provisions.

Some of us have been very suspicious as to the real objective behind the reclassification desires of the Post Office Department. In accepting it, even with some of the improvements which were made, indicates the willingness to compromise by those of us who took a minority stand in the committee. There will be an opportunity to vote on a motion to recommit, and under certain conditions we do have a chance to vote on S. 1, which will give a 10-percent increase and also eliminate the reclassification provision.

If the compromise suggested by the Moss amendments is not accepted it is my intention to vote to recommit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, we are today dealing with the welfare of a great group of men and women who are representative of the Federal Government and who daily come in contact with the citizens of our country. The postman or the rural carrier is the first representative of Government to the schoolboy. In our rural areas the postmaster at the village office is often the only agent of the Government that the people see from year to year. They pay their taxes and they hear wonderful things about slum clearance and public housing and Federal legislation, but to them the Government is exemplified by the post office, and I am sure it is a refreshing thing today that we are bringing up this important subject.

The bill before us today is really of twofold importance.

First, it undertakes to do a job that has been long needed, that of classification of employees of the postal service. The enactment of this part of the bill will do much to improve the efficiency of our Post Office Department. It will tend more nearly to assure the principle of equal pay for equal work, a principle which has long found favor with employment in industry and in Government employment.

I should like to point out that the reclassification feature, with the appropriate pay schedule for each category, has been enunciated in H. R. 4644, after many months of deliberation and study by experts in the field. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee then approached the subject from the legislative viewpoint, and after several weeks of intensive study suggested several refinements, some of which were, after consultation with authorities, found to be unworkable and were discarded. Others were able to be dovetailed into the framework of the legislation, and were included in the bill as it comes before this body. This legislation is now presented as a matter not of perfect legislation, but of one which is the product of thought and study by a department of Government and by a committee of this House. Alterations to it would tend to disregard and destroy the balance and the delicate quality of the classification mechanism. We here, as a deliberative group, are called upon to determine policy. Shall there be classification or not? We, the 435 of us, cannot hope to write the formula for that classification. The result would be unworkable confusion, and a vast majority of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service realized that as they approved this legislation, while at the same time they regretted that it was not possible to make specific changes which would have permitted even greater benefits to certain groups of individuals.

This bill should receive the unanimous support of everyone, if for no other reason than the important goal we attain in enacting the reclassification feature.

But as representatives of the people, we are interested too in the welfare of our postal employees, of granting them an appropriate increase in wages. It has been several years since the postal workers have received an increase, while their neighbors in private industry have, many of them, been benefited by a boost now and then. Thus we have the second reason for the enactment of this legislation. It would indeed be wonderful, and we would obtain the undying gratitude of the postal workers everywhere if we could greatly increase their salaries, many times over what they are presently receiving. I am sure each of them would welcome it and would put the increase to good use. But that is not possible. There are three reasons why the pay scale of this bill has been determined at the present figure.

First, it is a figure which I feel the taxpayers will willingly agree to pay. Remember, they are paying the bill.

Second, being a realistic pay increase it would be in keeping with the conduct of the postal establishment. Do you suppose for 1 minute the Postmaster General would have objected to a greater increase if it had been to the best interests of the Department?

Third, it is in line with the cost of living index and comparable wages in private industry.

But in addition to the logical dollars and cents argument for this bill there is one very real and compelling argument for the increase here enunciated: The committee wanted to present legislation which it felt would meet the approval of this House. It would have been an insult to your intelligence to have come to this body with an increase too extravagant or too small, for this House has the honor of representing not only the people of the United States for their best interest but also the Post Office Department and all of its employees. The facts are before you in the testimony before the committee and the report of the committee. They are the same facts which were available to the Post Office Department and to the Chief Executive and upon which they have based their opinions.

This body as a group of legislators will weigh the testimony and will enact legislation which will grant a pay raise and grant it now to these deserving employees. While we deliberate they lose a dollar a day. If the Members of this group feel within their hearts that the postal workers should have a greater increase let them not forget that their first duty is to obtain for them an increase which the facts show them clearly entitled to and to which we will all agree. This is not the last opportunity to enact postal-pay legislation; there will be other bills in other years. Let us give them the benefits they can surely get and get now.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address my remarks to an understanding that has been presented to the House with regard to Moss amendment No. 2 on the theory that the adoption of this amendment would bring an increase in pay to approximately 303,000 employees at the expense of, as I understood it, 47,000 other employees; and that would come about by the compression to $250 in the retention of that differential within grade step pay raises of the supervisory personnel at levels 14 to 20.

I respectfully submit that in the Post Office Department salary plan schedules and statistical comparisons of 1955 the estimate by the department of the total number of employees in Grades 14 through 20 is 412, and the number affected would be 397.

I further submit that in the matter submitted by the Post Office Department on January 31, 1955, showing the estimated number of employees in each salary level from 14 through 20, they estimate 960 employees would be affected by this uniform within grade step increase of $250 as provided under the Moss amendment. The people most affected are represented by the National Association of Postal Supervisors. According to a statement released by this association in April of this year 425 supervisors would be affected in levels 14 through 20 at an annual cost of approximately $68,000.

I submit that there is no rank discrimination in affording an increase to 256,000 employees as against the possible reduction to 425 or $47,000.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I was most interested in the remarks during the debate on the rule of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman

from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack]. If I interpreted his remarks correctly, the gentleman from Massachusetts made it quite clear that by recognizing the possibility of a Presidential veto we as legislators were not deserting our responsibility. I think he clearly pointed out that to do so was merely a realistic recognition of the political facts of life. The President has not threatened a veto. I do not think the word "threat" has been properly used here. The President has merely indicated that he will exercise his obligation under the Constitution, and I emphasize the word "obligation," to veto a bill that he does not approve. We are in no way restrained from voting a bill in excess of 7.6 percent; however, I do agree with the majority leader that to be practical we should consider what the President is likely to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that the top bill which will secure Presidential approval is the committee bill before you, providing for a raise of 7.6 percent, and I am equally certain that the necessary two-thirds vote to override a veto cannot be mustered. Where will this leave the postal workers? Right down the same old blind alley they have been down before with no pay raise at all. Oh, yes; another bill can be presented, and it can be passed, but in the meantime, what happens to 1,200,000 classified employees? If I were a civil-service worker, I would be getting pretty sick and tired of sitting back for some postal union leaders to play politics with postal-pay bills while I got nothing. If the 8.2 position prevails today, and if it is vetoed, if the veto is not overridden, I call upon everyone of you who support it to join with me and others in immediately demanding that a classified pay raise bill be passed at this time so that we can do away with this silly age-old principle, this unwritten law, that 1,200,000 classified workers must await the outcome of what happens to 500,000.

I will admit that there are undoubtedly some areas in the United States where a pay raise in excess of the amount provided in this bill is justified. I think probably our own State of California is such a place. But postal workers have long ago banded themselves together to seek united action through their representatives. I heartily approve of such action, and I commend them for having taken it. But this leadership has consistently opposed the principle of setting salaries in accordance with the cost of living in the various areas of the United States.

When you demand the same treatment for the country as a whole, you require the finding of an average need, and you reward those with a lesser need at the expense of those with greater need. Whenever you try to apply one rule to different problems, you invariably run into that sort of a situation. There are areas in the United States where postal salaries are very attractive, and they are very adequate. In other areas I admit they are not. But the President must view this as a national problem. He is not representing one congressional district, just as the postal union leaders are not representing one post office. They are representing the Nation as a whole, and they must solve the problem by finding an average.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the average which will be approved is 7.6 percent. I submit that if you pass a bill providing more, you will delay this much-needed pay raise. Furthermore, you will require 1,200,000 classified employees of the Government to await the raise which they also deserve, and which they are denied by the action of persons over whom they have no control.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss in the brief time that I have two points. First, it has been declared here this afternoon that we will be depriving the postal employees of any pay raise if we refuse to go along with the assertion that 7.6 is the maximum which the President will approve. I think it should be pointed out, and especially to the Democratic Members of the House, that it is perhaps time that we made very clear that if this veto is forthcoming, all of us will have to stand up and be counted as to whether or not we will deprive the postal employees by our votes of the 8.2 which is suggested by the Moss amendment. If the veto should be forthcoming, I for one would be very glad to see the issue clearly drawn for the few dollars that are involved. To say that the postal employees are not entitled to that raise is, I think, absolutely unrealistic, and I shall vote for the Moss amendment because 8.2 is the minimum, not the maximum, to which they are entitled.

I think, secondly, that we should pay very careful attention to the report of the committee, which on page 13 describes the administration features of this bill. It cannot be said, I think, that there is anything niggardly in the powers which have been given to the Postmaster General, and in view of the importance to all of the people of our country of the postal service, I for one would have liked to have seen an amendment here which would have required that any findings which he might make in regard to reclassification should be submitted to the Congress for approval prior to their going into effect. The Moss amendment says that a report will be required of the Postmaster General in order that the Congress can know and understand what he has already done. That is better than nothing. So I hope that as a result of the conference this Congress will adopt a bill that includes the increased pay scales provided by the Moss amendment, and the retroactive amendment, and especially a much more strict control of the Postmaster General's classification powers. If a Presidential veto should result we can then do our legislative duty and override it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat a figure I have given before, with clarification. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], the minority leader, mentioned that the increase in the cost of living has been 3.8 percent since the last pay increase. That figure might be correct or wrong, I do not know, but let us assume it is 3.8. The previous increase of roughly 10 percent should have been 21 percent, leaving a balance of 11 percent, and adding 3.8 and 11 percent is 14.8, or roughly 15 percent increase that the postal employees should be getting today. So, if the amendment of the gentleman from California prevails, the postal employees are only getting approximately one-half of what they should be receiving.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Robeson].

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with some interest to the discussion of what appears to be a very difficult problem, and there may be something lacking in my understanding, because it seems to me the problem is more simple than it has been represented. I serve on the committee and I heard the testimony and I heard the discussions. In addition to that, having for many years been in the field of job analysis, I was interested to inquire as to how these schedules and these rates were determined and as to what methods and criteria were used to arrive at the schedules that were before us. It seems to me that H. R. 4644 does very well, much better than I could do, even with the many years of experience I have had as an individual in determining a like finding on the same problem. It is primarily for the purpose of increasing the rates of basic salary which it does, and eliminating certain salary inequities, which it undoubtedly does. I assume there were inequities. There always will be inequities in wage scales and schedules. But as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] so eloquently said, this does not make a final determination. If inequities develop, there will be opportunity to change them. But certainly, if the competent people who spent months studying this matter, if the committee which gave over a period of weeks hours at a time to a study of this matter comes up with the bill that is before you, which is a complete wage schedule, there is no hope of improving it by arbitrarily making changes and adjustments, however well intended they may be, to give more money to certain people.

I do not think that my responsibility here is just to disburse money from the Federal Treasury. I think I am charged with a greater responsibility, as other Members are, to represent the employer, the Federal Government, to determine fair and adequate compensation for the service that employees perform. So I do not subscribe too much to the thought that the final determination should be made on what will furnish Federal employees or any employees money sufficient for the standard of living that they might desire or for the number of dependents they might acquire; but the basis for the compensation should be that it is adequate and fair for the service rendered, not alone for those presently employed, but for those who will continue to be added to the payroll and

who, we hope, will become more proficient and will be promoted.

What this amendment that is proposed will do is to tear apart a carefully prepared schedule and add, as I understand it, about $10 or $12 million to the proposed pay of certain employees, some 240,000 of them, and in making this adjustment arbitrarily to take away from others about $3,600,000, from people who probably are of more value to the Service than these people who are in the lesser responsible positions; give them less pay than the studies and analyses determine they should have.

In addition to that there are 21 classifications carefully drawn up from study and 138 rates and an arbitrary amendment is suggested—and this is with no disparagement of the competence and abilities of my colleagues, that would put in 59 rate changes in 138 rates of pay.

I call attention to the fact that it is a very serious thing when we represent the Government in determinations which the employer makes as to fair compensation for Government employees for the service they render, on the basis merely of argument and presentation and out of our generous attitude toward these people to destroy a wage scale. It was a hodgepodge to begin with. If anyone does not think so, let him study what you had. This bill certainly improves it. But then to come here today and change 59 of these 138 rates arbitrarily and add $12 million onto certain rates to certain people and take away from 48,000 others $3 million of pay and say that that is a better bill, does not make sense to me.

I think the amendment should be voted down. I will certainly vote against it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I am under no misapprehension in coming here to say a few words. I know anything I may have to say will probably not change a vote that is cast in this House today. However, there are a few things that I think might well be said in order that in casting your votes you may bear them in mind and know of the truth at the time you do cast your votes.

It is still my opinion that the decision to be made here today is whether we are going to vote a pay raise bill for the postal employees or vote a bill that will be vetoed. I think that is the question and the whole question here.

We have been told the President has promised to veto a bill that is greater than 7.6 percent. I did not consider what he said to be a threat. I actually think it was a promise, and there is a distinction between the two. I do not know why we should not be happy to have the knowledge of the President's position in this matter and to know that he had the courage to state his position.

The people from whom the complaints have come that the President stated his position are probably the same people who complained last year that the President did not advise us he was going to veto the pay raise bill that was passed last year. I think they are the same people. I wondered today as the vote was taken on the rule where all of those people went who on March 21 were screaming about a gag rule when this bill came up under suspension on that day.

After the House action on that day the chairman of our committee, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, together with the ranking minority member, appeared before the Committee on Rules and asked for an open rule so that the House could take whatever action it wanted to. If we are going to pass a bill that will be vetoed, let's pass a good one. You would be surprised to know the names of the people who did appear before the Committee on Rules and asked for this closed rule, the gag we have here, and insisted upon it.

To pass on from that, we know there have been lots of views on the kind of bill that ought to be passed. I have with me some communications that go from one extreme to the other on this matter, in order that you may know all the different ways people have in mind that this legislation ought to be passed. Most of them are cut off from having any chance of their position being presented here on the floor of the House.

There is one organization that represents probably 25 percent of the employees. They say they do not want this bill passed either with, or without the Moss amendments. They say, "We want you to vote against a closed rule." I am sure all of you got a similar telegram. I did vote against the closed rule. There is another one from another organization which says, "We do want you to vote for a closed rule because we think that we would like to have the Moss amendments." Yet others, want the bill as written.

Then here is a group of letters I received from Brooklyn, N. Y. I will read just part of one of them. It says:

I am a postal employee and I know that at present all postal employees are highly overpaid.

That is what he says—"overpaid."

The letter continues:

And I was disgusted when the Senate Post Office Committee passed out S. 1. The employees have had four raises already in the last 7 years.

There are several of those, and I will only read one of them. These next letters remind me of an immigrant farmer who had come to the United States and who had decided to become a citizen. He appeared before a magistrate for his naturalization papers. The offical asked him, "Do you like this country?" "Oh, sure," said the applicant. And then the question, "Does our government suit you in every way?" With some hesitation the immigrant said, "Well, pretty much, but I would like only to see it a little more rain."

Now we are getting in that position here. "Oh, yes, I want a pay raise, but, of course, I would like to see a little bit more."

Here is a letter I received from a Post Office employee down at Natalia, Tex., and that is not in my district. The letter says:

We have been hoping for more than a year that something would be done about a pay increase for the postal employees, but it looks like the matter is becoming more and more complicated. I personally would rather have a dollar in my pocket now—

And, of course, this means a dollar a day—

than the remote possibility of $1.15 some months later, and so I ask you and the other members of your committee to vote out this bill, H. R. 4644.

And then he goes on and states:

Personally, I would like to have more money, but I do not think more money would get by the White House so let us take the 7.6 percent increase and let it go at that. We have already lost more than enough to make up the difference. So it simply looks foolish to wrangle any longer.

And he quotes:

"A bird in the hand is worth more than two in the bush."

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. May I ask what State that letter came from? That has some good sense in it.

Mr. DOWDY. That is from the State of Texas, of course.

Here is one from my district:

I am writing you in regard to the postal pay bill. I would appreciate any consideration you would give this matter. We postal clerks would prefer even a 6-percent increase plus classification than to have a bill enacted which would not be signed by the President. Please consider H. R. 4644.

So you see there are all these different ideas of what should be done. They do not want the bill at all—they want more—they want a little bit more—and they want what is here.

Here is another one from Texas. I am reading you several from Texas. This letter is from all of the employees at a post office. It is right near my district. The fact of the matter is some of the rural carriers come into my district. It says:

We clerks and city and rural carriers at the Cleveland (Tex.) post office urge your support of H. R. 4644 which we feel is a compromise solution of the various bills now before the Congress. We feel that if certain legislation granting a larger increase in pay is enacted, it seems certain to die by Presidential veto leaving us without a pay raise for the remainder of this session of Congress. In view of this, we most respectfully urge you to exercise your important influence in support of the compromise solution which is possible by the passage of H. R. 4644.

Of course, as have other Members of the Congress, I have received a number of letters from various employees, some saying they did not want reclassification in any form and that they preferred no salary raise at all if it had any reclassification.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us just how much authority the Congress is surrendering to the Postmaster General in this reclassification section.

Mr. DOWDY. In this bill that has been presented here by the committee, it is my opinion that the Postmaster

General has less authority than he has under the present law.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like very much to vote for this bill, but I do not intend every year to continue to surrender all the authority that we have in the Congress to some Government department.

Mr. DOWDY. It is my opinion, he has less under this bill than he has under the present law.

With reference to this matter of limiting any possible amendments, I think, as I have stated, that if we were going to bring this bill before the House after the action taken on it before, it should have come in under an open rule. If I were permitted to write the bill myself, this 4644 would be different; since other people and circumstances had to be considered, I believe this to be the best bill we can expect to enact. Therefore, I have supported the committee action, even though acting alone, I would do otherwise. I feel the employees would prefer a pay raise over a vetoed bill. There are a great many amendments that could be offered. There are organizations representing 25 percent of the postal employees who say they do not want a raise if it has reclassification in it. It may be, if a bill is passed with reclassification, someone may wish to amend it so that no part of them would be affected by the bill; that none of its provisions would affect them unless in writing, the individuals gave notice that they wanted to come under the provisions of the bill. I think most of them would say in writing that they wanted to come under the provisions of the bill, but I think they should be given an opportunity to elect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. There is one thing to bear in mind—that this matter is going to a conference. Do you not think it best for us to pass a bill that we know will be signed, so that a pay raise can be enacted? For one dollar a week for just a part of the employees, should we take a chance on a veto? I am trying to be practical and sensible and realistic in what I am saying and in my action. The Senate passed a bill which amounts to a 12-percent increase. It cannot be approved. It will be vetoed. We will have a bill from the House that can be enacted; and if the conferees find improvements can be made and the bill still be enacted, they will certainly make the amendments.

There are some things that have been said about the proposed amendments, and that is that all of the reductions in salary would be in the higher levels. I do not think the truth has been made clear to you on that. They say they are increasing the pay rates about 8.3 percent. The significant part of that is that less than half of the employees are getting that raise. Over 50,000 employees are losing an aggregate of more than $3,600,000 per year, and over a period of 4 years that would be $16 million you are penalizing a part of the employees. And that is not in the higher brackets. Listen carefully. Forty-eight thousand of them were in level 5. The clerks, carriers, and motor-vehicle operators that are now in grade 3 will receive $80 a year less under the Moss amendment than under the present bill. Those in grade 4 will receive $75 a year less than under H. R. 4644. Those in grade 5 would receive $70 a year less. Why penalize those people in order to pay some others, in the same group, doing the same work, more money?

So let it not be said that the money they are cutting is coming from the top grades, because over $3,600,000 is coming from men in the lower steps in grade 5.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more that could be said on this bill. As I said in the beginning, these are just a few things that I wanted to call to the attention of the membership to be considered in passing upon the whole proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Kansas for his graciousness in yielding me this time to speak out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I have just introduced a bill of profound importance in connection with the American merchant marine and I should like to make a brief explanation of its purpose.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there are some 16 shipping companies operating in the foreign commerce of the United States whose expenses of operation are subsidized directly by the Federal Treasury. Generally speaking, the subsidy represents the difference between the cost of operating a ship under the American flag and the cost of operating under a competitive foreign flag. The great bulk of this difference, which now has risen to over $100 million annually, represents wage costs.

Back in 1936, when the act was passed, the wages of American seamen were substandard and the living conditions aboard ship were almost intolerable; so the Congress included in the act a provision directing the Maritime Commission to establish minimum wages, manning scales and working conditions for all vessels covered by operating subsidy contracts. Over the past 20 years, times have changed so that today there are indications on all sides that the high cost of operation under the American flag is driving the American merchant marine right off the seas. The coastal and intercoastal trades are gone; the few remaining nonsubsidized lines are on their last legs; the only segments of the industry that can survive are those whose operations are subsidized either by the Federal Treasury or by profits from other phases of the company's business, such as oil, lumber, fruit, or steel.

The bill which I have introduced would direct the Maritime Administrator to fix maximum as well as minimum wages, manning scales and working conditions for all subsidized vessels. These maximums would, of course, establish the limits beyond which obligations of the companies would not become obligations of the Government under the subsidy contracts. However, the parties would be left free to work out wage agreements under the collective bargaining process. Any increases in wages, manning scales or working conditions over and above established maximums would be absorbed in subsidy payments only if approved by the Maritime Administration after appropriate hearings.

I know there will be those who will point to this bill as antilabor. There will be those also who will condemn this bill as invading the parity concept of the 1936 act. To each of these groups I say, "If this bill is not the proper approach to the problem, come in and tell us why. But, do not come in unless you are prepared to offer some constructive alternative." I am sick and tired of those who are always ready to criticize but fail to see that unless something drastic is done—and done now—we will have no American merchant marine and all American seamen will be "on the beach" as they call it.

In conclusion, let me say that while I have indicated to the members of the Merchant Marine Committee that I might introduce this bill, I did not ask their approval of it. Hence, the proposal has been introduced by me as an individual Member of this body. And, my sole concern and purpose is to save our fourth arm of defense, the American merchant marine, from being completely amputated. I have the greatest hope and optimism, however, that carefully planned surgery can restore our patient to good health and enable him to keep pace with the advances in American business and commerce.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take any time this afternoon on the pending bill because I realize that the pros and cons have been discussed many, many times prior and I am not naive enough to believe that any remarks I may make will influence anybody one way or the other on this legislation. However, I do want to say that the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service on both sides of the aisle have studied this matter thoroughly and have gone into it conscientiously. All those who are concerned have had an opportunity to express themselves in every way.

The administration presented a 5-percent bill and many Members introduced 10-percent bills. I know of no better compromise between 5 percent and 10 percent than about 7.5 percent. I realize when we are discussing 7.5 percent or 7.6 percent, we are talking of an overall amount applied to the present salaries paid by the Post Office Department. I realize that some go somewhat higher and some go somewhat lower. But that is essential in a reclassification act.

When we are dealing with reclassification, we are dealing with something here that has been a realized necessity for many years and this has been brought out in the history of the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both the House and Senate. So we are just taking action on something that should have been done a long time ago.

Much study has been brought into this matter. We have had a great deal of pressure brought to bear on the Members of the House from the postal unions and from all angles. Let me say that as a Member of the House of Representatives, I fully realize the responsibility that the representatives of the postal unions have in trying to do the very best they can for the people that they represent. They would be derelict in their duty if they did not. They ought to be pushing for a 10-percent increase right down the line. But we have a responsibility, too, Mr. Chairman, a responsibility to see, first, that the employees of the Federal Government, whether they be postal, military, or civil-service employees, receive a fair and just wage and, secondly, we have a responsibility to the constituency which we serve, a responsibility to the people of my district, for instance, that I will not abdicate to anybody.

I want to say—and I do not lay this to any particular group—that some of the actions that have been brought to bear upon Members of Congress and some of the slanderous things, shall we say, that have been said, written to us and so forth, would have been better off if not done at all. I do not think I can lay those particular things that have happened to one individual or group. But let me give you an example. I certainly bear no malice to no one. I received a postcard today, postmarked Washington, D. C. So it does not concern me very much. It states:

> Labor eliminated Ferguson in Michigan. A Congressman should be no trouble. Special interests may have more money, but the people have the votes. If you can't recognize needs, replacement with one who will is in order. Re pay raise 10 percent.

The individual did not have the nerve to sign that card. I do not think that is a reasonable nor a good approach to the problem. It certainly does not impress me at all.

I think one of the things that this points up is simply this: There ought to be a more fair, a more equitable, an easier way for the employees and the Department to settle these wage disputes. A commission of some kind to handle this matter would do a far better job and it would relieve a lot of people, including the employees' representatives and the Members of Congress, from going into some of these problems and be subjected to all kinds of pressure from all sides.

Now, I just had to get that off my chest, because I believe it is important. You all know what I am talking about. You all have been subjected to it. I want to say this. I do not think these things have been inspired by the leadership of the postal workers. I believe it has been done by individuals themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this in the few minutes I have remaining, that I think this is a fair bill, and I will tell you why. If we compare the salaries that have been provided in this bill—and I do not know of anyone who would not like to pay a little greater salary; we all would; that is quite natural and quite human—but, if we compare them with the salaries being paid for like positions in industry in our given districts, taking into consideration fringe benefits, sick leave, vacation pay, holidays, and all of these other things, they will compare and compare favorably, and I think that is a responsibility that we have to be sure that they do compare favorably.

Now, there is one other matter that I think is going to come up, and it is important to every citizen of the United States. We have a matter, I believe, which is going to come before this body which is of equal importance to the operation to the Post Office Department—and that is the matter of postal rates. I wonder where everybody is going to be when they call the roll, whether they are going to raise the 3-cent stamp to 4 cents. I tell you I am for it, and I will tell you why. I am for it simply because I realize that with $160 million added to this bill on top of the post-office deficit, it is going to over half a billion dollars, and that is about $3 for every man, woman, and child living in the United States that they are subsidizing the users of the mail, and when 75 percent of the first-class mail is used by business other than individuals themselves, I think it is time we do something about rates to relieve the general taxpayers from this unrealistic postal deficit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I was extremely hopeful that the Rules Committee would report the postal pay increase bill to the floor of the House under an open rule. However, they have, in their wisdom, reported the bill to the floor permitting only 3 amendments and naming the amendments.

I certainly desire to vote for a substantial salary increase for the postal employees. However, I do not intend to surrender the few remaining powers left in the Congress of the United States to the Postmaster General or any other Government department. The Congress, during the past 15 years, has continuously surrendered its powers to the executive department to the extent that now it is impossible to even have a House committee take serious consideration of a bill without first securing the consent of one of the executive departments and, on numerous occasions, the consent of the Budget Bureau.

I certainly do not consider we have a representative form of government when Members of Congress, who are selected to represent the people of their respective districts in the Congress of the United States, cannot vote for the type of legislation they desire without first securing permission of the executive department.

I cannot understand why Congress could not vote the postal employees a salary increase without granting the Postmaster General additional authority which, if abused, could completely wreck the postal service.

I think if Congess wants the Post Office Department employees reclassified, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee should make recommendations and spell out the people whom they desire to secure promotions and the type of positions they desire to have created in the Post Office Department.

I regret very much that it is going to be extremely difficult for me to vote for the pending bill as long as it includes the section pertaining to reclassification which, in my opinion, gives the Postmaster General complete jurisdiction over the postal service without making it necessary to consult Congress on any proposal.

I hope that I am wrong in my interpretation of this section of the bill. However, from all the information I have been able to secure on this proposed legislation, we, Members of Congress, would, if this section were included in the bill, no longer be able to take care of the wishes of our constituents by calling on the Post Office Department to make certain transfers and appointments within the postal service in our respective districts. I would find it extremely difficult to explain to my constituents why we surrendered this jurisdiction to some other Government agency and must, if the present bill is enacted into law, go to the Post Office Department with our hats in our hands and on bended knees to plead for any little assistance for our constituents.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is no tremendous surprise to arrive in Washington as a freshman Congresswoman and find nearly every day's office mail containing from 1 to 100 letters from postal and other Federal workers earnestly written and conscientiously phrasing an appeal for an appropriate salary increase. This should surprise none of us, for it is evident, that for the most part, the history of Government wage legislation is one of shabby treatment of Federal employees. Too often Congress and the executive branch of our Government have considered Federal salaries as a largess—rather than a justifiably earned income.

In all cases, and especially so in the instance of the postal worker, whose devotion to duty, whose dependability and integrity have become a matter of superb record, the ratio between income deserved and income accorded has been and continues to be representative of a considerable sacrifice for themselves and their families. A further graceless financial condition in which the postal worker finds himself is seen in the ratio between his actual income and the cost of living.

During the greater part of the last two decades, postal employees and other Government workers have been denied the income which enables them to meet increased prices. They have been the stepchildren of our American economy. For example, in 1952, their income was a mere 4 percent above actual living costs.

In 1953, the difference decreased to 1 percent.

These facts and others equally important are well known to them and to us. And it is well known that the postal service is facing a situation which can lead only to extreme difficulty in procurement of high caliber personnel. In fact, such a situation is now in existence in many areas, resulting all too often in the necessity to secure personnel who are inadequate. This means added cost of operation, added burdens on efficiency.

It is obvious why we must act promptly to raise adequately the incomes of these workers—reasons which find their bases on both moral and economic grounds. Accordingly, I have consistently urged that a salary increase of at least 10 percent be provided by this Congress for the postal employees. It has been and continues to be my firm opinion that such an increase is entirely justifiable.

Nevertheless, such an increase, however justifiable, appears to be unsuited to the atmosphere created by this administration. The shadow of veto suggests the starkness of no increase at all. This then—all else having failed—is the time for compromise, to accept the amendments allowable, to recognize the great need for as substantial an increase as possible and to abide by that amount.

Therefore, I will vote in favor of the Moss amendments and an increase of 8.2 percent for our postal workers. It will be a reluctant vote, for it is suggestive of a continuing shabby treatment of our Federal employees. It will be reluctant because the half-a-loaf concept should have no place in an economy which is bound to expand as this great Nation seeks constantly to raise its standards of living.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I appeared before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the hearings on H. R. 4644 and testified that, in my opinion, a 10-percent increase for postal employees was the irreducible minimum that Congress should pass. However, the committee has seen fit to bring to the floor of the House, a bill providing approximately 7.6-average increase in the pay of postal employees. We have been assured by the Republican leadership that a 10-percent increase would receive a Presidential veto, and in view of the fact that the President vetoed a 5-percent increase last year, that warning is probably well founded.

The Senate has been more liberal and if this House passes the present measure, it will go to conference and something will be worked out, no doubt, on the order of a compromise.

I am going to vote for the three amendments that will be offered by the gentleman from California, and shall vote for the bill on final passage, because I believe that the postal employees would rather have an increse of 7.6 percent to 8.2 percent, rather than to run the chance of a Presidential veto that we might not be able to muster enough votes to override. I am supporting this bill, not because I am satisfied with it; not because I think it is sufficient, but because I believe, under the circumstances, as they exist today, it is all we can hope to accomplish.

Postal employees needed a pay raise last year, but even a paltry 5-percent increase met with a Presidential veto at that time. I do not know what has brought about the President's change of heart, but I am accepting the assurance of the Republican leadership, that the President will not veto this pay raise—if passed. I only hope our confidence is not being misplaced.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I take the balance of the time to discuss briefly amendment No. 2 which will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. When he presents the amendment, I want him to answer this question. Is it not true that there will be 47,926 employees who will lose under his amendment? In other words, are there not 17,399 clerks and carriers today in grade 3 who will lose $80 under your amendment as compared to H. R. 4644? Is it not true also that 13,524 in grade 4 will lose $75 as compared to H. R. 4644? Also, is it not correct that in grade 5, 16,503 will lose $70 as compared to H. R. 4644?

Yes. What you are doing by this amendment is taking away from these lower grade employees and giving to the employees in the higher grades. Yes, you give the top increase to those in grade 9. How many are in grade 9? 131,651. How much increase do you give them over H. R. 4644? $70. How much do you give those in grade 8? $65. Those clerks and carriers already receive the top in grade 9 and most of them already have the $300 representing 3 longevity grades.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California is approved, while I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet, I predict with all confidence that the President will veto this bill, and I for one am going to vote to sustain it. If this amendment is adopted, then I cannot in good conscience support H. R. 4644 with this unfair, unjust, discriminatory and inequitable amendment being made a part of the bill.

Do you want to follow the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and approve his amendment and wreck this bill, distort the entire salary structure, throw it out of balance and out of kilter, and then get a veto? If so, go ahead and do it. But if you want a good, sound bill, you will vote for H. R. 4644, without the Moss amendment that distorts these schedules. The Moss amendment to the salary schedule would transform my bill, which is a good bill, a fair and a just bill, into an unjust, unfair, discriminatory, inequitable bill. I, for one, appeal to you to stand by the majority of the committee and vote down the Moss amendment when it is offered.

I want to say this. This is no administration bill. This is no Democratic bill. This is no Republican bill. This is not a partisan bill. This bill represents the considered opinion and judgment of the great majority of our committee and I hope you will stay with the committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, today we have under consideration in the House H. R. 4644, the postal pay bill; and at this time I would like to make my position known on two vital points, which seem to be very controversial.

First, I was very disappointed to learn that my bill, H. R. 2094, granting a 10-percent pay increase to our postal employees was not favorably considered by the committee. When I introduced this bill in the House I was hopeful it would receive the proper consideration since our efforts last year to pass a suitable pay increase for these employees failed. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that this is little compensation in return for the loyalty and efficient service our postal organization has rendered the citizens of the country. Even when it was learned that the President would veto any measure granting a 10 percent increase, I had hopes that a compromise would be reached whereby a fair and just bill would be brought to the floor for amendment. However, under the gag rule, it appears those of us in favor of this increase will have no opportunity to make such recommendations to the Congress.

Secondly, I wish to state herewith that I am opposed to any type of reclassification, but again, because of the modified closed rule granted by the Rules Committee, we Members who take this stand find our hands tied and are unable to offer more liberalized amendments.

During all my years in Congress I have continuously worked to raise the living standards of our deserving postal employees. I am still in favor of a 10 percent across-the-board raise without reclassification and only wish I could be given the opportunity to offer the appropriate amendments.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said that it would be a good political vote to go for the amendment of 8.2 percent with the knowledge that the President would veto that amount. I am more interested in trying to see that these employees get a raise this session than to try to make any political vote.

I told the first committee that came to my office some weeks ago that, in my opinion, if they did not get the 7.6 percent raise at this time, the Congress would not override the President's veto and that there was a good chance that, as last year, they would get nothing. I have told the same thing to every postal worker who has talked to me since then.

I am going to vote against the amendment and therefore for a certain 7.6 percent increase at this session.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I voted against this rule because I believe that an open rule in this case would be of greater value to the average postal employee.

If the rule had been defeated we would then have been in a position to offer, as an amendment, S. 1, recently passed by the Senate. This provides for a 10-percent increase which, I believe, our postal employees warrant. It also would give us the opportunity to delete the reclassification feature of this bill, to which almost all of them object.

I am not too concerned with the threats here made that if that bill were enacted it would be vetoed by the President. I am not convinced, nor can anyone be, that this eventuality would take place; but even if it did, it is my firm and considered opinion that both this and the other body would override the veto.

At any rate, regardless of whatever action the Executive might take, it is our responsibility to pass legislation that we feel is fair and equitable and should become law.

I shall vote for the Moss amendments with the hope that when this bill goes to conference the Senate bill may be substituted for it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to indicate my support of the Moss amendments to the bill before this body.

I am not content with the basic proposal to provide a 7.6 percent increase or with the Moss amendment to provide an 8.2 percent increase. Neither percentage increase is adequate to provide our postal workers a fair and equitable standard of living. I will support the Moss amendment because it seems to be the maximum that can be voted out in this session.

The President is within his rights in announcing what kind of legislation he will veto—but, if he vetoes a bill which provides a .6 percent increase over his own recommendation, he must take full responsibility for his own arbitrary conduct in that respect.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, postal employees and other Government employees deserve a salary increase. The case does not rest on the answer to the question of whether or not their real wages today are as high as they were in the past; and does not rest on the answer to the question of whether or not their income is higher than that of some groups whose income was once below that of the postal worker, or nearly equal to the income of some groups whose income was formerly higher than that of postal workers.

The report which George Fry & Associate, Inc., prepared for the Post Office Department last year, shows generally that, with the exception of the wartime period, the average weekly earnings of clerks and letter carriers exceeded the income of production workers. The impression left by this comparison is that the salary of postal workers is therefore adequate. It should be noted, however, that in determining the weekly earnings of production workers, earnings of both full- and part-time, skilled and unskilled workers in manufacturing industries were included. Although the explanation of the chart does not contain the information, I assume that overtime pay of postal employees was also included in establishing the statistical basis for the charts. It should be noted, too, that the industrial workers, throughout the period covered in these charts up to 1941 or 1942 were working under the depressing influence of heavy unemployment. Their position has improved in terms of real wages very definitely in the period between 1939 and 1953. Using the 1947–1949 dollar as a base, the real weekly earnings of production workers show an increase of 55 percent. This was a 55 percent increase in purchasing power or in the standard of living of production workers. During the same period, the real weekly earnings of letter carriers and clerks increased only 1 percent. In other words, there has been virtually no improvement in the standard of living of postal clerks and letter carriers since 1939. The condition of nonsupervisory postal employees is about the same.

There has been no appreciable decline in the cost of living within the last few years. The fact that the increase which was voted by the Congress last year was denied by the President's veto makes all the more imperative early action by the Congress on an increase in salaries for Government employees.

There can be little satisfaction to the Government worker in the knowledge that his position in terms of real income is relatively better than that of others who have suffered a serious loss in real income in recent years. Nor can he take much satisfaction from the fact that other underpaid groups, such as the teachers, have not yet achieved equality. One cannot eliminate injustice by making it universal.

The Congress has the responsibility of protecting the integrity of Government service and of maintaining and improving the standards of Government employment. The Government employee has a right to just compensation for the services which he gives to the Government and to the country.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that three amendments will be offered to the pending bill providing for an increase of salary for postal workers. Two of the amendments are not too controversial. The third amendment, however, has become exceedingly controversial, and in my opinion unduly so. This latter amendment relates to the percentage of increase in the salary schedule.

The committee has reported a bill that provides an average increase of 7.6 percent. The so-called Moss amendment provides for an 8.2-percent increase. The latter would increase the cost of the bill by $12 to $14 million. The total cost of the bill with the amendment would be $170 million as against $158 million provided in the pending bill.

It seems inconceivable to me that so much fuss could be created over an expenditure of $12 million. When we consider the vast sums being appropriated by the Congress this small $12 million becomes so insignificant that it becomes unbelievable that so much controversy could be raised. For instance, today, the President presented to the Congress a message that calls for $3½ billion for economic assistance in foreign countries, mostly in the Far East, and yet when it comes to a mere $12 million for worthy postal workers to enable them to meet the high cost of living we are faced with an opposition based on the threat that the President would veto any bill that carried any such increase above the present bill. It is difficult for me to believe that the President would be so unreasonable. But, in any event I have a responsibility now, and after careful consideration I am convinced that the postal workers are entitled to this increase and I shall accordingly so vote. If the President should in the fulfillment of his responsibility veto the bill then I am willing to face that situation if and when it arises. I repeat that I will be surprised and certainly disappointed if the President should take such adverse action.

Furthermore, we must bear in mind that the Senate has already passed a bill that would increase the salaries of the postal workers by 10 percent. I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity to support such an increase in the House. I believe it was justifiable. We should not be cheap in dealing with our own Government workers. They work for us. They serve us well and faithfully. To those who are so fearful of increasing our expenditure in this matter by $12 million, I say that before this session of Congress is ended that amount and the entire $170 million, the overall cost of this increase can be saved from appropriations yet to be made for enterprises that have far less merit than this increase for postal workers. I shall support the amendment with my vote.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, over the years, I have consistently supported all legislation favorably affecting the hours, wages, and general welfare of the loyal employees in the field service, Post Office Department. From the very first day of the current congressional session I have made known my position regarding the dire need for an immediate upward wage adjustment for the more than one-half million postal workers nationwide.

On previous occasions I have stated my views concerning the need for passage of a pay increase measure which would provide a minimum of at least 10 percent for these faithful employees. That is still my position and I am greatly concerned over the action taken on Monday of this week by the Rules Committee, which provides a limited rule and prevents further amendments other than those stipulated in the House of Representatives.

I am ever mindful of the fact that the only possible way to secure this long-overdue, much-needed legislation is to pass H. R. 4644 with amendments and send it to a conference between the Senate and House of Representatives. I make that statement knowing that S. 1, the 10 percent measure which provides a minimum of $430 for each employee, passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority on March 25.

It now appears quite certain that the most expeditious approach for salary increase legislation for postal workers is to support amendments to H. R. 4644 in order that the legislation may be expe-

dited and that the postal workers receive this much-needed additional money without further delay. I am, therefore, in favor of these amendments to H. R. 4644 and passage of the bill. I do so with great reluctance because the monetary allocations for certain field service postal employees are inadequate in H. R. 4644.

Nevertheless, my action constitutes the only method by which an even greater amount than that provided in H. R. 4644 can be obtained, namely through a Senate-House conference. I hope that the conferees will authorize upward wage adjustments in keeping with present-day realities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to prolong the consideration of this measure by an extended expression of my support of the pay increase that has been proposed. I am for the increase proposed in the pending measure and feel that our postal workers have been most patient and that a cost-of-living pay increase for them is deserved and long overdue.

We have, to a large extent, taken care of the need for cost-of-living increases for other categories of Government personnel by previous legislation. We have passed legislation to make the armed service more attractive by means of increased compensation and pay—the incentive pay increase bill. It is now time that the rural carriers, postmasters, and other postal workers come in for their deserved and delayed pay increase.

The schedule worked out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is in the main—and here I wish to pay tribute to the hard work and detailed study and consideration which Chairman MURRAY and the members of the committee have given this legislation. We should be grateful to them. I am supporting the bill as fair and equitable and shall vote for the perfecting amendments to provide for some additional category increase and also to make the pay increases retroactive to March 1 just past.

I merely want to state my position of support of this measure and of the proposed increases. There are no more loyal, hard-working, faithful employees in our Federal Government than our postal workers and they are deserving of the consideration authorized in this measure and the amendments proposed. I urge the committee to take action to give them this deserved recognition for their service, efficiency and their need and pass this measure without further delay.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman CELLER, in expressing my unalterable opposition to the bill before us. It is highly prejudicial in favor of those in the upper as against those in the lower echelons in the postal service. Those who do the hard work in the postal service are discriminated against. Under the facade of reclassification, there are huge salary increases. In some instances, the increases range as high as 50 percent or more, especially to supervisors and postmasters. In contrast, the rank and file—to use the vernacular—are given a very raw deal. Their increases are meager. There are at least 15 positions or classifications in which immediate increases of 10 to 34 percent have been allotted. As was stated in the minority report:

> There are only 7 positions for which the increases average less than 7 percent. In these latter positions are the regular city carriers and clerks—the very warp and woof of the basic fabric of our postal service—motor vehicle operators, automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers. These carriers, clerks, and motor vehicle operators will average only a 6.9 percent increase, and many thousands of them will get barely over 6 percent. Automotive mechanics, janitors, and laborers will get well under the average for all employees. Thousands of rural carriers will receive only 6 percent. The remainder of the officers and employees will average 8.1 percent increases.

I cannot conscientiously vote for a bill of this type with such disproportionate, unfair, and inadequate increases. The Senate passed the bill for a 10 percent overall increase and with no provisions for reclassification. We here today, on the floor of the House, hear tell that if we pass such a bill, it would be vetoed by the President. Well, my answer to that threat is that we should be as independent in our legislative functions as the President is in his executive functions. If he vetoes the bill, that is his responsibility, not ours. We should not be cowed by a threatened veto. We are men and not mice and I think we should act like men and not crawl supinely before such a threat. Furthermore, I think our leadership is missing the boat. Here is an issue which we should seize and do all in our power to indicate by word and deed that we are for a decent living wage scale for postal employees. Let us make the issue clear cut. We are for the proper, the just, increases. Let the administration oppose. The opposition is full of political dynamite which should burst in Republican faces.

I am told I should vote for the rule because a half a loaf is better than no loaf at all. The bill does not even provide for one-tenth of a loaf. I would stultify myself if I voted for the rule making in order a bill which I violently oppose.

This obnoxious bill contains provisions for reclassification of postal field service positions. It gives the broadest grant of administrative authority to the Postmaster General—a politically minded Postmaster General. His freebooting methods will make mincemeat of civil-service rules and regulations and laws. He will ride roughshod over seniority rights in order to fill as many positions as possible with "deserving Republicans." It is true that mandatorily under a proposed amendment he shall report his activities vis-a-vis reclassification within 6 months to Congress. But what good will such a report be? The political dirty work will have been done. Congress will be confronted with a fait accompli. All we could do would be to protest in the event of injustices or impartialities, but our protests would be as effectual as trying to stem the tides with a groan. To my mind, one of the most inequitable provisions is just this reclassification provision, especially in the hands of an anti-labor bureaucrat like the present Postmaster General. The whole business is a travesty. Furthermore, this rule before us is a gag rule. This so-called deliberative body is supposed to dispose of 3 important amendments with only 10 minutes debate for each amendment, 5 minutes for each side. If one contemplates that the salaries of the postal employees depends upon such debate, then one realizes how inadequate is the time for deliberation. Just think of it, 10 minutes is to be given for debate on salary increases as provided for in the so-called Moss amendment which would increase the average rate from 6.8 percent to 8.275 percent.

Assuredly, the productivity of the employee should have some effect upon the salary, but no monetary recognition is given on this score to postal employees, for the greatly increased productivity that they have achieved in recent years. All the administration thinks of is the budget. Certainly workers' productivity should be just as much a factor in salary determination as budget goals. No real consideration is given to the increases and fluctuations in living costs. The cost of food, clothing, and shelter has mounted in geometrical progression—not so salary increases. The minority report states as follows:

> "From 1946 on, the workload per man-year, based on pounds of mail handled, moved irregularly upward. The workload per man-year, based on the number of pieces handled, which is probably a more accurate measure, moved consistently upward.
>
> "The overall picture, comparing 1938 to 1952, has been one of increased employment, increased volume, and increased productivity. From 1938 to 1952, employment increased 59 percent, while volume in pieces went up 92 percent. The great increase in volume handled over employment, meant that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938."
>
> The report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, showed a 6.04-percent increase in mail volume over 1951 and only a 1.3-percent increase in hours of employment. This report also showed that over the previous 5 years volume had increased by 33 percent and weight had increased by 29 percent, but that hours of employment had increased by only 9 percent.
>
> This increase of more than 20 percent in productivity was not created by machines, as often is the case in private industry, but, by reason of the extraordinary nature of personal services required to move the mails, is almost wholly attributable to greater efforts by the postal employees.

The salaries of the postal employees have not kept up with the salaries of private industry. For example, 15 years ago, the earnings of postal clerks and carriers were on a par with employees of General Motors Corp. In 1953, however, the General Motors Corp. employees averaged $92.27 a week, or an 8.4-percent increase over 1952. Postal employees got an average of $78.27 per week for 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Many comparisons could be made between salaries of postal employees and salaries of large corporate entities and the disparity between the wages paid would be clearly manifest.

It requires no recitation of authorities to show that the purchasing power of the dollar and the purchasing power of the postal worker's dollar has declined significantly during and after the World War II period, but the bill before us takes little heed of this consideration of

the declining purchasing power. The administration is worried about fiscal objectives. Making the salary of the postal employees sufficiently large so as to permit the worker to live in dignity and decency is, apparently, of little concern to the administration. Throughout the hearings, we could hear the thumping of only one theme—that was the need to balance the budget. We hear nothing of the vast costs involved in the granting of huge mailing privileges to the large publishing outfits like Life, Time, Fortune, Saturday Evening Post, Colliers, Look, Newsweek, and so forth. Maybe if these publishing houses would actually pay in dollars and cents what they should pay for the postal services rendered, then the Government might be in a position to balance the postal budget. But no—the Postmaster General in this administration would not dare ask these publishers for money. They contribute very handsomely to the Republican campaign chest. The administration says that the little fellow should sweat it out. Let the postal employee bear the burden.

My point of view is as follows:

First. I vote against the rule.

Second. If the rule passes, I vote for the Moss amendments.

Third. If the Moss amendments prevail, I shall vote for the bill although I would prefer to be given the privilege of offering an average 10-percent increase—something I cannot do under this semi-closed rule. One of the Moss amendments would provide for an average increase of 8.2 percent. I will take that as the best to be gained under the circumstances.

Fourth. If the Moss amendments do not prevail, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, it was my sincere hope that an opportunity would be given us today to vote for the passage of a 10-percent wage increase for our faithful post-office employees.

In my opinion the employees have made a strong economic case for at least a 10-percent increase and they are entitled to that minimum consideration.

The employees have demonstrated that a minimum of 10 percent is the only amount that would bring their purchasing power almost in line with present-day economic realities. It is most unfortunate that Members of the House who believe as I do that a 10-percent wage increase is both realistic and fair will be denied the opportunity of voting for that legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I support the bill before us today. I realize that a considerable number of hours have been spent by the committee handling this bill in bringing it before us, as I also appreciate the sincerity of the minority members of the committee who have suggested perfecting amendments to the bill. I had hoped they would be able to extend the benefits in the bill and regret that they have been obliged to stop short of what I believe would be a fair bill.

There are some features of this legislation, particularly those sections dealing with the reclassification of postal employees, that I think deserve considerably more study before we are asked to consider the legislation. If it were my prerogative, I would suggest that salary and reclassification be separated and considered as two distinct entities. Despite my own opinion in the matter, it appears as if this will be the only opportunity for the moment to adjust postal wages and while I had hoped that a higher increase would be voted upon today, nevertheless I am constrained to vote for the present bill in the hope that some measure of justice will be given postal employees before this session of Congress adjourns.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is with great reluctance and a heavy heart that I go along with this bill, knowing as I do that it does not contain enough money by way of an increase, and at the same time provides for reclassification proposals which I think should be given further study before being placed into law. I will support the bill simply because it appears this will be the only opportunity to act on this vitally important legislation. In so doing, I would urge my colleagues to go along with the bill with the hope that it can be improved in conference with the other body.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the rule on H. R. 4644, the postal pay raise bill, has been adopted, the House is now proceeding to consideration of this legislation.

Although I do not believe that the rule under which this bill has been brought to the floor is an entirely satisfactory one, it is evidently the best one we can get at this time. Rather than delay any longer this much-needed and well-deserved adjustment of salary for our postal employees, it is felt that action should be taken on the bill, and on the three amendments proposed by the gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

These amendments would, first, increase salaries by an average of 8.2 percent, rather than the 7.6 percent figure carried in the bill; second, make the retroactive date of all increases March 1, 1955, rather than the nearest pay period at the time of final enactment as now specified in the bill; and, third, call for the submission of a report to the Congress by January 15, 1956, from the Postmaster General on the operation of the reclassification program.

While these amendments are an improvement over the bill as it now stands, and although they will have my support on the floor, I firmly believe that the committee has sidestepped its responsibility in not reporting to the floor for consideration the bill which has passed the Senate—S. 1—and which provides for a 10-percent increase in postal workers' salaries. This 10-percent increase is little enough, and certainly will not go far in offsetting the increasing cost of living which has haunted the postal employees for years.

In the 83d Congress, because I believed that such an increase was absolutely justified, I had introduced legislation calling for an $800 per annum increase in the salaries of postal employees. No action was taken on that bill, and legislation providing for a much smaller increase was vetoed by the President.

This year, along with a number of other Members, I had introduced a bill which would provide for a 10-percent increase in the salaries of these employees, and had been hopeful that the committee would act favorably on this legislation. Unfortunately the majority of the committee has seen fit to report out a bill which does not provide the adequate increase in the compensation of our postal workers to which they are entitled.

In addition, the closed rule under which this bill is being considered limits the amendments to the three I have previously mentioned. This, in effect, prevents the Members of the House from enacting legislation similar to that already passed by the Senate.

Needless to say I am disappointed and regretful that we have not been given an opportunity to vote on S. 1 or similar legislation. However, I trust that this pending bill will in some small way compensate our postal workers for their long and devoted service to the public. Perhaps at a later date some further adjustment can be accomplished.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have long advocated, and as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have supported a pay increase for postal employees.

It is because I want postal workers to have a pay increase that I will vote today against amendments which will make the amount such that a Presidential veto will be visited upon this legislation.

President Eisenhower has long since warned that he will veto a pay increase bill above the schedules set forth in the committee bill. I can only assume that the President means what he says, and I am convinced that a veto will not be overridden.

I cannot, therefore, vote on final passage for a bill that provides for an increase of more than approximately 7.6 percent, for I want postal workers to have an increase and not merely promises of an increase.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a deep feeling of regret at the circumstances under which I am forced to take the floor today and address the House on H. R. 4644 and the rule under which it has been brought before us. I have this sense of regret because of the division which has arisen among postal employee organizations over the terms and conditions of their pay raise legislation. Here is another situation where a split in the ranks of labor could very well defeat their own best chances of getting a major part of what they set out to get originally and together. I know from experience that if labor groups do not hold their ranks solid and compromise their differences between themselves, they almost invariably achieve far less than they had hoped for or than they had a right to expect. That is the kind of a situation we have watched develop within the past few weeks, and with which we are confronted here today.

The division among the postal employee groups has been seized on by the administration and the Postmaster General, and has been worked on to the limit to the disadvantage of the post office workers and to the advantage of the administration point of view on the

question of how much of a raise shall be voted and what the terms of reclassification proposals shall be. The division has also placed the friends of the employees in an almost impossible position as far as working for their best interests is concerned. This split gives the administration and the President something to seize on to excuse a possible veto of whatever legislation now emerges by claiming that postal employees themselves oppose it—at least a part of them. The split also divides those Members of the House who have fought in the interests of the post office workers and endangers the chances of their working successfully together on the floor and in conference to obtain the most generous possible terms in the final bill.

In the face of the present situation, it has become parliamentarily impossible to get any direct action on the floor of the House on a 10-percent increase proposal. The chairman of the committee has stated that he would not bring such a proposal to the floor. Three separate polls taken among the Members of the House have indicated that even if a bill were brought to the floor under an open rule, an amendment calling for a 10-percent increase would lack a few votes of the necessary majority for its adoption. Any further delay at this point, such as would be occasioned by rejecting the present rule, would perhaps wind up with the one result the postal employees do not want—no pay raise at all for at least another year.

Under these circumstances each individual Member must assess the situation as he sees fit. As one of the leaders of the long fight for an increase of at least 10 percent and against the distateful reclassification proposals, unhappy as I am about it I have concluded that I must support the proposed rule. By passing this bill and with the addition of the amendments sponsored by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Moss] we can go to conference and still have some chance of bringing it more into line with the legislation already passed by the other body. That is, we can work for a greater percentage increase and a further cutting down of the harmful possibilities of the reclassification provisions. For my money, that is the best gamble available to support the interests of the majority of postal employees at this time and that is the one I am prepared to take.

I want to make it clear that I take this position with a great deal of reluctance. Unfortunately, we who have fought the hardest for a decent pay bill are now left with little choice. My support for this rule certainly does not mean that I no longer recognize the injustices which post office employees and their families have suffered over the years as a result of pay raises always coming too little and too late. However, I am convinced that any other action will result in this raise coming another year too late, with the probability that any raise voted at that time would still be too little.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my conviction of what is the just and proper thing to do in the matter of pay adjustments for the postal workers remains unchanged. There should be an increase of not less than 10 percent, and there should be no reclassification.

Letters that have poured into my office testify to a condition inexcusable and that is destroying both morale and efficiency. Something drastic and immediate must be done by this Congress or it is inevitable that we will lose the great and outstanding service that long has been a tradition of the post office.

I have been stunned by the reports that have reached me of the discharge of senior employees of the Post Office Department, on the flimsy pretext that they have slowed down. These employees who are being discharged or demoted to lesser services are the ones who, during many years of hard and faithful work, have built the fine reputation that the postal service has enjoyed.

If it is the thought of this administration that it can build a false reputation for efficiency and economy by sending in the wrecking crews to throw these experienced workers into the wastebasket, the price will be paid by the loss of the American people of the finest postal service that the people of any nation have ever enjoyed. I think there should be a congressional investigation.

I appreciate that in private business the so-called efficiency experts have set a formula that anyone past 35 years of age should not be hired on the theory that industry spends so very much money in educating an employee that it cannot get the money back if one starting in employment is past 35. It is a formula of destruction. If pursued another decade or two, then all the average American citizen can do is to buy a revolver when he is 35 in order to have it ready to end what has become an economically useless life when he is 40. I protest with all the indignation in me against the application of this formula to a department of the Government of the United States.

As I understand it, the purpose of advocating reclassification is to make it easier for the Postmaster General to put into immediate and drastic application this abominable formula.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time to call stops. For my part, I would stay here day and night in continuous session of this Congress to fight it out for an increase of at least 10-percent for every postal employee and for no reclassification. I am not intimidated by the threat of a Presidential veto. I think that I know pretty well the American people. The American people believe in doing the right and the just thing by everyone, and the American people have been served too faithfully and well by the postal workers to leave any doubt as to their reaction in the event of such a veto.

Unfortunately, we are not given the opportunity of voting for S. 1. We are offered our choice between a very inadequate bill and a bill which is much better, which provides a larger increase in pay, which calls for a report from the Postmaster General to the Congress and which has a retroactive provision putting the increased pay into effect as of March 1. Under the circumstances, I am supporting this bill as much the better of the two. I am supporting the Moss amendment No. 2, despite the fact that it has been intimated that even its compromise figure will result in a veto of the bill by the President. I anticipate that there will be no such veto. If, however, such a veto should be forthcoming, I predict with full confidence that the manhood and the independence and the sense of decency of the Congress will override the veto by a tremendous majority.

Mr. Chairman, while I am most unhappy that I have not been given the opportunity to vote for a 10-percent increase with no reclassification, I nevertheless compliment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and his loyal colleagues in the minority group of the committee on doing an outstanding job. But for their great service and the tireless efforts of the great leaders of the postal employees' organizations, a bill distasteful to most of us would have resulted. The adoption of the Moss amendments will mark a triumph of right over wrong. It will be a great victory in a long fight, marked by the ever-present threat of a Presidential veto, and in the 83d Congress stopped in its tracks by a veto, to get a better increase for the postal workers than the one that was sought to be forced upon us.

LONG OVERDUE PAY RAISE FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, this is so much like one of those old movies on television. You watch it, being pretty certain you have never seen it before, but nevertheless everything in it looks and sounds so familiar. So it is with this merry-go-round over postal pay raises.

Last year, after almost fantastic delays and maneuvers to block it, we passed a postal pay raise measure which was certainly not the best one in the world but which did, at least, have the merit of providing some increase to help meet the increased cost of living. It was the first such raise since 1951. As we all know, it was vetoed on what I think were very untenable grounds.

Now the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House has gone all through the issue all over again and finally we again have the opportunity to vote on pay increases for the postal workers of this country. The committee bill, however, is not nearly adequate.

I am deeply disappointed that the parliamentary situation on this bill is such that we cannot under the rules of the House vote for the 10-percent increase already passed by the Senate. The best we can do under the rule on this measure is to support the Moss amendments, and I, of course, will certainly support them. We can then hope that the conferees will compromise on a bill better than this one.

It is distressing, Mr. Chairman, to have to explain to our postal people—whose need for a pay raise is not disputed by anyone—that we were blocked here on the 10-percent proposal by the terms of the rule. This makes us sound rather ineffectual. I do not like to appear to be placed in that situation, and I know many Members share my feeling.

But I am not so reckless as to want to take responsibility for jeopardizing any

increase whatsoever for the postal employees. The combination of circumstances here—that is, the ultimatum from the White House to veto any 10-percent bill; the unity among the members of the President's party in the House in agreeing to stand by the committee figure and oppose even the 8.2-percent Moss amendment, let alone a 10-percent raise; and the definite and flat acknowledgement by our leaders in the House, who, we know, are equally anxious to see the 10-percent raise go through, that defeat of the rule would in all likelihood keep any postal pay legislation from becoming law in this session—this combination of circumstances, Mr. Chairman, leaves us little choice.

Thus it is not a case of ineffectualness but of practical reality in taking a step which will not do more harm than good. I know my constituents recognize that the important thing is to get through a bill which can in fact become law and which can thereby help our postal workers and their families meet the often-crushing burdens of today's living costs on their modest pay scales.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have an opportunity to vote on legislation which will increase the salaries of postal workers. I believe them to be one of the most loyal and devoted group of Government employees, and there is no doubt that they deserve an increase in compensation, particularly in these days of high living costs.

I know something of the difficulties which postal employees in my own congressional district have experienced and I know also of the excellent services which they have given over the years. I had hoped that an increase of 10 percent would be granted to them and I publicly indicated that I would favor such a raise. I am sorry that the legislation does not provide this degree of increase and that there was no opportunity of voting for it. I do, however, believe that the amendments as introduced by the gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, are the next best answer to the problem, and I am voting for them in the hope that the 8.2-percent increase they provide for will be adjusted in conference when the Senate bill is also considered.

I would like to add that I subscribe fully to the well-expressed remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, out of a sense of simple justice I am impelled to urge prompt passage of this bill, H. R. 4644, designed to extend a reasonable cost of living pay adjustment to our postal employees.

We all know that whenever the cost of living rises, as it has been doing for the past several years, persons with fixed incomes suffer the most. Some workers can obtain raises to offset at least a portion of the increased cost of living, but those whose incomes are stationary or whose salaries are set by law have serious trouble trying to keep up with rising prices and maintain their family on a decent living scale.

Such is the current predicament of our Federal employees. Their salaries are set by law, and it takes action by the Congress to raise their compensation. An important consideration in this connection is that while Federal employees may organize, they are not allowed to strike; and, to have the record present the truth on this subject, let us remind ourselves that they have never shown any disposition to strike. They have been content to rely upon a sense of fair play on the part of Congress and the general public.

May I also remind you that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend them adequate salary compensation.

It is only ordinary commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our Government employees are sufficiently compensated to enable them to reasonably meet their personal and family obligations with confidence and a high morale, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist ideas.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, during the 83d and the present Congress, I introduced legislation providing a substantial pay increase for postal employees. I have consistently supported a pay raise of at least 10 percent for all Federal employees.

I would therefore like to state my reasons for voting against the inadequate pay raise and reclassification bill reported out by the Murray committee and against the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

I believe that the amount provided in this bill as amended, is insufficient, inadequate, and unfair to postal workers. I feel that these faithful public servants are entitled to an increase of at least 10 percent and I regret very much that the Members of the House have not been permitted to vote for that increase as provided in S. 1 when that bill passed the Senate.

Because of my strong feelings in this matter, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the small increase provided by the House version of this legislation as presented to us today. Further, it is my conviction that post office employees should not be forced to accept a reclassification plan they do not want.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak today in behalf of the postal workers of the United States for the benefit of whom the legislation we are considering has been introduced.

It is my firm conviction that a postal pay increase is long overdue. As the cost of living has gone up, salaries of postal workers have remained comparatively static. The net effect has been that as the standard of living of other work groups has been raised, that of the employees of the Post Office Department has dropped to a level not in keeping with the American way of life. Indeed, many families of postal workers in my district would find it impossible to subsist were it not for the fact that the wives in the households are working, too. In many cases postal employees hold outside jobs, in addition to their regular full-time postal duties, in order to maintain a living family wage. Such conditions are a breeding ground for disharmony in the home as well as for juvenile delinquency. Surely, we have a duty to do our utmost to alleviate this situation, and it lies within our power to do it.

I am sorry that the bill reported out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not contain provisions for a 10-percent salary increase. However, I feel that an equitable and satisfactory adjustment between the Senate bill and this bill will come out of committee. Having waited so many years for a pay raise, the postal workers must not be disappointed again.

Let me call to mind here and now that the postal employees serve us, one and all. We help ourselves when we help them. We are assuring ourselves of more efficient mail service by making every effort to see that this legislation becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments are in order to the bill except those printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1955, by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. These amendments are not subject to amendment.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] desire at this time to offer any of the amendments that were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as indicated?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 1, as printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: Page 81, after line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 205 (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1956, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

"(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are asigned, and the reasons for such actions;

"(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

"(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

"(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.).

"(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day,

and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. This report shall be printed as a House document after appropriate consideration by the two committees."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment and accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a technical amendment to the amendment be approved. It has been suggested by the legislative counsel. It merely strikes the last seven words in the last line of the last paragraph of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to modify the amendment as indicated in the gentleman's statement?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: Page 82, strike out the entire postal field service schedule occurring after line 2, and before line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which has provoked the most controversy. Before proceeding with a detailed explanation of it, I should like to deal with some rather amazing charges which have been made in the first instance by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and by the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

It has been charged that under these amendments 47,000 persons would receive a lesser amount than they would under the committee bill. Temporarily that is partly true, but every one of those 47,000 persons except 425 supervisory employees will ultimately under my amendments receive more money than under the committee bill and, in addition, 253,000 employees will receive an immediate amount in excess of that which is set forth in the committee bill.

What are we proposing here?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. What does the gentleman mean, that they will temporarily take a loss?

Mr. MOSS. Because their ultimate increase under my amendment is more under every single step of every single level from 1 to and including 13.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman know it will take 4, 5, or 6 years for all of them to receive that increase?

Mr. MOSS. I believe it will take approximately 3 years at a maximum. Most of them would overcome the difficulty after the first year, but 253,000 people will receive an immediate amount in excess of the amount provided in the bill itself.

We are proposing here at an increased cost of $12 millions to bring approximately 60 percent of the total working force of the postal field service up to the average of the bill which was originally reported by the committee, to correct a gross inequity, to accord fair treatment to people, and it will not result in any distortion of the schedule, as was intimated by the chairman. There is more distortion in the relationship between salary levels 4, 5, and 6 as contained in the bill reported by the committee than there is in the amendment I am offering you at this time.

It restores a proper relationship between the various levels proposed in the legislation.

We have heard about the amount of increases these people have received, and I think we should give some thought to them. If we take the average increase since 1926 for the postal workers, it is approximately 97 percent. The increase in the cost of living is approximately 98 percent. The increase in the incomes of people employed in industry for the same period is over 275 percent. We are not proposing anything here which is at all a shocking amount. It is the bare minimum necessary to deal decently with these people. It gives no consideration to the increased productivity of every person employed in the postal-field establishment. Those of you who have noticed the recent full page advertisements by the General Motors Corp., with reference to their employee relations, know that within the period from 1950 to the present time just for the factor of increased productivity, they have given their employees an increase averaging 22 cents per hour. I think it is time we stopped being kidded or being threatened. You are not going to get a veto necessarily. I know of no one here on this floor on either side of the aisle who can, in all sincerity, arise at this moment and say that the President of the United States has assured him that if the Moss amendments are adopted, he will definitely veto the bill. There has been no such assurance given. Certainly, there is an intimation that a veto might be expected. However, a veto might be expected regardless of what you do, because the other body has adopted a bill far different from this bill. Then there remains the conference procedure which must be gone through before this legislation can become law. I would like to see the House of Representatives send to that conference, a bill which is at least fair to every person employed in the field service of the Post Office Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is most obnoxious. It absolutely destroys the proper balance and relationship of the salary schedules. The gentleman from California does not seem to think I know what I am talking about when I talk about the distortion of the salary schedules by his proposed amendment. Well, the present salary classification law—Public Law 134—was written by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the late chairman of the committee, Mr. Burch, and myself. I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] if that is not true. I have studied the postal service system and its operations much longer than the gentleman from California. I have been on the committee over 12 years. He has been on it a little over 2 years. I was with the Post Office Department for 9 years, and I think I know a little about postal salaries and postal job reclassification. I am willing to predict without reservation that if this unfair, discriminatory, inequitable Moss amendment is adopted, unquestionably, the President is going to veto this bill. It is up to you whether or not you want to take this chance and have the bill vetoed by the adoption of this amendment. My opinion is that this Congress will not override the veto of the President. It is up to you whether or not you are going to follow your committee. This bill was approved by your committee by a vote of 17 to 6. The committee gave long and careful attention to the bill. We worked out a good bill. We spent 3 years on this salary schedule and reclassification and yet the gentleman from California comes here and offers 59 specific changes in this reclassification schedule. I tell you that this amendment offered by the gentleman from California will absolutely throw out of balance and out of kilter the salary reclassification schedules. Not only that but the cost of the amendment is around $12 million. The principle involved is that the schedules proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] will absolutely throw the schedules out of balance and you will be doing an injustice to 47,629 employees when you reduce by $70 and $80 the amounts they will receive under the Moss amendment, as compared to what they will receive under the committee bill.

As I said before, the Moss amendment is in the interest of the long-time clerks and city carriers who are today in grades 7 and 8 and 9. These carriers and clerks in these grades get much more pay today than the carriers in grades 3, 4, and 5, yet under the Moss amendment you penalize the city carriers and clerks in grades 3, 4, and 5 by reducing their salaries and give to the carriers and clerks in grades 7, 8, and 9 from $60 to

$70 increase. In addition, most of these carriers and clerks in grade 9 are getting longevity pay of $300. It is a question whether or not you want a bill sent to the White House that will be approved by the President or whether you want to adopt the Moss amendment and then have the bill vetoed, and then have the veto sustained. Then the postal employees will have no salary legislation at all. You may want to take that gamble, but as for me, I am going to stand by this bill without amendment, and I hope the Members in their clear judgment will support the great majority of our committee and vote down this amendment. If you approve the amendment, then it makes my own bill so bad that I cannot conscientiously vote for it upon final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment to provide an 8.3 percent average salary increase to postal employees, in my opinion, is a very reasonable compromise.

In my opinion, a good case was made before our committee for a 10 percent increase, using statistics relating to the increased productivity of postal workers in recent years, the cost of living increases since the last postal pay increase, and comparable pay raises which have gone to workers employed by private industry. And certainly postal and Federal pay has not kept pace with the Nation's ability to produce. I am quite certain that this administration would have a great many less headaches over surpluses if they would take a more liberal attitude toward placing more purchasing power in the hands of the people, particularly where the need is most urgent.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. I would like to point out to the committee that nine members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service signed the minority report on this bill, in which this amendment is included, and that with this amendment this bill is acceptable as a compromise to a vast majority of the postal workers of this country. Without this amendment it is acceptable to hardly any or very few of the postal workers of America. I urge you to pass this important amendment.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to say in reply to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], that I do not think it matters much how long you may happen to be a member of any committee. That does not change your basic thinking and philosophy. I see a basic difference here on which there can be an honest difference of opinion. I say that with all due respect to our chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee. But we all realize that the legislative process is complicated, and we have to give and take. The administration's position has been an unyielding and stubborn refusal to commit itself to more than a 7.6 percent pay raise. The threat or promise, or whatever you call it, of another veto has always hung over our deliberations. This, I believe, is an unfortunate and unwarranted pressure by the executive branch. However, we in the Congress must not surrender our prerogatives and our duty to legislate in what we are convinced is the best interests of our postal employees and of the Nation as a whole. We should not be intimidated or swayed by guaranties of approval of certain legislation if specific provisions are written into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was with great reluctance that I made the decision to compromise on this issue by agreeing to support the 8.3 percent increase, and particularly because of the questionable reclassification provision. If any of these amendments are voted down, I intend, if I have the opportunity, to offer a motion to recommit the bill.

This amendment does much to eliminate the unfair discriminations in pay which were contained in the administration bill. It is a fair compromise openly arrived at after due study and consideration of the factors involved, and I therefore urge all Members on both sides of the aisle to support it without reservation, because I am convinced it is the best possible raise which can be enacted at this time; and I think it can be enacted despite what has been said about the threat or promise of a Presidential veto.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. MOSS], who distinguished me as the "gentleman from New York." I hope I will always conduct myself as one.

I rise in opposition to this amendment because, as I have said before and as I am prepared to repeat, I think it completely distorts the classification features of this bill over which this committee had labored for a very long time.

Secondly, I think if any amendment were to be offered it would have been far better, if I may use the vernacular and perhaps speak as a gentleman, to have gone the whole hog and gone after 10 percent. I have no recollection that the gentleman from California or any other member of the committee ever offered such an amendment.

The present amendment, first of all, distorts the carefully prepared salary schedule established by a 17 to 6 vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee by giving additional increases to certain groups of employees and taking away part of the proposed increases from others.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California would increase the raise for the highest-paid clerks and letter carriers by about $70 a year and reduce the raise provided by H. R. 4644 for approximately 40,000 clerks and letter carriers by $70 to $80.

The amendment would arbitrarily reduce the raises proposed for assistant postmasters and superintendents of mails in many large offices, and would result in some postmaster positions being paid a lesser salary than provided by the present law.

This amendment would add another $11 million to the annual cost of H. R. 4644, and would give this money to the same group of employees who already have received through amendments in committee to the original bill an additional $20 million over and above the amount originally proposed.

The Moss amendment would destroy the traditional relationship as continued by H. R. 4644 of the salaries of city letter carriers with the salaries of rural letter carriers, thus seriously discriminating against the rural carriers.

The Moss amendment would increase the pay of post office janitors far above the salaries for janitors in other Federal buildings as provided by bills under consideration by the Congress to raise the salaries of these employees.

In other words, this amendment, though undoubtedly well meant and though undoubtedly trying to give the employees what they desire and what we all want them to have, is not well conceived, is not well prepared, and does not show sufficient experience in the matter. The chairman of the committee did well to bring out his many years of service, not only on this committee, but also as a member of the Post Office Department. Certainly he had the experience and the knowledge; certainly he must be, from personal knowledge, sympathetic to the problems of the postal people. There are many other members on this committee who have also been here a long time, who have worked year in and year out on this problem.

For these reasons I urge this committee to give careful consideration to the bill as it was written in committee, to realize that this amendment was not submitted to the committee, also to realize that the one question that seems to have come up at that time was whether we should have a 10 percent pay raise or the pay raise as written in this bill. After careful consideration, after going over all of these figures, it became abundantly clear, after 3 months of hearings, this this bill was the best we could get.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, some 13 years ago I was assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. I have served on various committees of the House during the past 13 years. Recently, the great Committee on Ways and Means asked me to go back on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. So I am here in the capacity of a member of the committee, although the junior member of that committee.

As I listened to the debate today I found it quite confusing in the attempt to explain the number of grades, levels of pay and so forth that have been announced and I have tried to clear my own thoughts down to what this actually means. I think this is important.

If we compare the wages of the post office employees today, their purchasing power, not the number of dollars but the purchasing power, with 1939, we find that a salary of $2,026.50 purchasing power in 1939 that that same man is working for $1,863 today under the terms of the committee bill. In other words, he is receiving $163 less in purchasing power after 26 years in a career job in the United States Government.

What does the committee amendment of 7.6 percent increase mean in a week to the average employee in increased wages dollarwise? It means an increase of $5.60. What does the Moss amendment mean? It means 80 cents to $1.20 more a week. It means 16 cents to 20 cents a day more than the committee bill. We are now getting down to the point where the wife of a post-office employee goes to the grocery store to buy a quart of skimmed milk and she will get under the Moss amendment from 16 to 24 cents a day more. She can buy 1 quart of milk for her children with the increase under the Moss amendment.

Does anyone in this House want to tell me that the President of the United States will veto this bill because the Moss amendment will give to the wife of that postal employee the right to buy one quart of milk a day more than under the committee bill?

If the President should veto this bill because of the Moss amendment, I state that his veto would be known as the quart-of-milk-a-day veto. I do not think the President will veto it.

Now, let me bring another point to your attention. In 1945 a Congressman's pay was $10,000 a year. We recently had a pay raise which brings out total pay raise since 1945 up to an additional sum of $12,500. That is 125-percent increase since 1945 up until the present time. What have we done in the same period of time for the post office employees? Beginning in 1945, and passing six bills increasing their wages, we have increased their wages 92 percent. You have advanced your own salary 125 percent. You are advancing the post office employees 7.6 percent, which would bring the total up to 100-percent increase over the past 9 years for the postal employees. In other words, even with the Moss amendment, which gives six-tenths of 1 percent pay increase in rates, you still only give to the post office employees 100.06-percent increase in the last 9 years, but you have given yourself 125-percent increase. I voted for the increase, because I thought the job was worth it, and I still do not think it brought up the purchasing power of a Congressman to what it was 25 years ago under a $10,000 salary. It is still less than it was then according to the purchasing power of the dollar and what we have left after taxes. I ask the Members of this body to be just as fair and considerate to the post office employees as they were in considering their own salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that notwithstanding the President's position in respect to this legislation, the bill is a good, well-balanced piece of legislation. The original bill should be supported on its merits. It is the result of careful consideration of a committee which has gone into this matter thoroughly. It is the best judgment of that committee. These proposals you are considering at the present time, let me repeat, were not considered by the committee but just brought to our attention only yesterday. Considerable has been said on the floor of the House about 10 percent and things of that kind. I ask you, where were those Members when we held our executive sessions? Not one member of our committee, not one member on either side, got up there and said, "We want you to consider a 10-percent across-the-board increase." None of them; none at all. Then those same members go before the committee day before yesterday. Did they ask for an open rule? No, they asked for what they call a restricted rule. Just amendments they wanted to offer. No chance to examine them. Not even submitted to our committee. Did the gentleman from Louisiana ask for an open rule? Not that I have heard about.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. These were my exact words before the Committee on Rules yesterday. I said:

> I will follow my distinguished chairman of the committee and distinguished ranking member and ask for an open rule, but——

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, but.

Mr. MORRISON—

> but if the committee in its wisdom brings in or decides to bring in a closed rule, I suggest that these three amendments be allowed.

I asked for an open rule just like the gentleman did.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman told the committee he was representing his colleague, which he had a right to do. I am just saying he did not get up and insist on an open rule. In any event only a few minutes ago he voted for the rule just adopted.

I say the 10-percent proposal was not even considered.

Now, this bill as written is right. But look at the changes you propose to make in legislation that you have been talking about all day. Yes, we expect to be back next year considering this problem, but nevertheless here are 48,922 people who work for our Government who are not going to feel too good about what you are doing if you approve this amendment. There are 59 different places where you are changing schedules in this bill.

Letters have been referred to. We all received letters. Rightly so. I, as you do, encourage people to write me. People should express their views even more than they do. Because someone mentioned letters he received I am going to read a part of a letter I received from the president of the National Rural Carriers Organization. He says his organization joins with the National Association of Postmasters, League of Postmasters, National Association of Supervisors, Association of Special Delivery Messengers, and others, in support of the bill as reported to you by our committee.

Mr. Chairman, as I suggested heretofore, the bill as now written represents about 3 years of work and study by our committee, together with the Postmaster General, postal employee organizations, engineering firms, and others who testified before our committee.

A complicated salary schedule such as is contained in this bill and governing the pay of over a half million employees cannot be tampered with or it will no longer preserve a proper relationship between positions.

Let me give you one example of what happens when you alter a part of a salary structure in order to provide a pay raise for a select group of employees. This, I am sure, is the principle behind the Moss amendments. Under the bill all employees will receive a minimum of a 6-percent increase on top of their present salaries, and they will then be fitted into the within-step rate of their level that is next highest to that figure—that is, to their present salary plus 6 percent. Let me give you one example to illustrate what will happen under the Moss proposals compared to the present bill. Let us take a clerk or carrier who is presently in automatic grade 4 of Public Law 134. His present salary is $3,570 a year. Adding 6 percent, it would be $3,874.

Under the provisions of the bill as it presently stands, he would be placed in step 3 of level 5 at a salary of $3,880. Under the proposal of Mr. Moss he would be placed in step 2 of level 5 at a salary of $3,805, or his immediate increase is $75 less under the Moss proposal than he would receive under the present bill.

The cost of this amendment is approximately $11 million. What we have not been told is that a group of employees will receive more than the additional $11 million because 48,000 employees will get less money than they receive under this bill. In fact they will be in effect contributing about $3½ million to others already being paid more than they get. It should be observed this amendment will change the schedule by placing revisions in levels 1, 2, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. Mr. Moss has made 59 specific rate changes. All of them could have the same disastrous effect of the one I have pointed out. And I might add the illustration I have just given is not the worst of these examples.

Let us see now what is happening. One of the reasons for reclassification is to provide equal pay for equal work. What we are doing under Mr. Moss' proposals is that we are taking money away from employees who are lower down in the present pay scale and giving it to the top-grade employees because that is where the biggest increase occurs under Mr. Moss' proposals. These top-grade employees are already drawing up to $1,100 more than some other employees doing exactly the same type of job. In the example I have given you, we are taking $75 from the man who is making $700 less than the top-grade clerk doing the same job in order to give the higher paid man a $70 raise.

As I have said, this is the product of 3 years' study and more by our committee. Really, it was the study which began in the 80th Congress nearly 8 years ago. I believe that this illustration I have given you effectively demonstrates that no one individual can just pick up and completely revamp a complicated schedule like this without throwing it completely out of kilter.

I would like to make one additional point. If we are going to have a reclassification of postal employees' salaries, and I think most of the membership of this body believe it necessary, we cannot give everybody the same dollar increase. We do, however, guarantee a minimum increase of 6 percent on their present basic salary for every postal employee.

Some groups of employees naturally will receive a lower salary increase than others under the job classification features of the bill. Those employees who will receive the smallest increase are, in general, the employees who are now receiving a higher rate of pay than any other employees doing a similar type of work in the Government or in private industry. Conversely, those who will receive the higher increase are the employees who, through the years, have been grossly underpaid for the duties they performed and the responsibilities they held.

One of the groups receiving a little better break under this bill is the supervisers. The provision of the bill which gives them an apparent advantage is one which puts them for the first time in a pay pattern giving within-grade step promotions. This is the same thing which clerks and carriers have had since 1945. In fact, in 1945, clerks and carriers were given 11 automatic promotion steps. They were subsequently reduced to 9. Under this bill, there will be 7 automatic step increases for all clerks, carriers, postmasters and supervisors.

In addition to the flat across-the-board pay increases with minimums and ceilings which have been granted to postal employees since 1945, and which everyone recognizes has distorted the pay schedule, the fact that letter carriers and clerks had automatic step increases while supervisors had only a single grade permitted clerks to catch up to their supervisors' salary and in some cases surpass them.

I was impressed during the hearings with the many compliments given the chairman of our committee, along with the late Senator Burch and our colleague, Congressman NOAH MASON, by representatives of the postal employee groups. These three gentlemen, in 1945, developed the present pay and classification plan which was an admittedly long step in the improvement of postal employees' salary and classification. I am told that at the time that law was passed there was also a great deal of criticism on the part of employee groups feeling that they did not get as much as their members expected to get out of the bill.

I would like to predict that this bill if enacted into law will be as highly thought of and considered as great a step forward as was Public Law 134 after the employees have had time to experience the benefits it will provide in the way of better opportunities for promotion and the satisfaction of being well paid for a job well done rather than on the length of time on the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

To close the debate, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, addressing myself to the necessity for the Moss amendment No. 2, which is presently under consideration, I should like to say that, with all respect, I do not have much sympathy for the crocodile tears of the speaker who preceded me concerning the rule under which we are operating. Because I remember, not too long ago, he wanted one that was worse than this one. So let us address ourselves to a consideration of the merits of the amendment and decide whether or not we want to vote for it as it stands.

H. R. 4644, in level 5, which represents the big group of employees with whom we are mainly concerned, starts at $3,640 and winds up at $4,360. There are in that group approximately 303,000 employees. The Moss amendment would add to that salary raise, at the beginning step $40, and in the final step $70.

Why is that? When you take the total increase and boil it down to how much more a man is going to get per hour, it amounts to 2 cents per hour, 15 cents per day, or 77 cents per week. Why does that become important? Please allow me to show you why it does.

On page 82 of the bill you will find this tremendous distortion which exists in the bill, on which the committee worked very carefully. But unfortunately, in an effort to reach a compromise in the last days of the committee hearings, the present schedule was put into the bill as a compromise, and after it was adopted it was determined that the following very obvious distortions took place, which were highly detrimental and injurious.

The whole theory of reclassification is based on getting more money for more work and putting people in the proper levels as compared with each other, in respect to the duties which they perform. That makes good sense, does it not? It does until we examine carefully the pay schedule that is in the bill. Then what do we find? We find in level 5—and, mind you, under the original bill all of these employees were put in level 4. Then the committee decided and determined that that was an improper level, that they were out of the proper classification and that they should be at a higher level. They put them in level 5. What did that do with their pay? Here is what it did. If you went from level 4 to level 5, as an employee, you would get only $50 more, but if you went from level 5 to level 6, you would get $240 more. If that is consistent with the purposes of reclassification, I will eat the bill page by page.

Look at the difference between salary level No. 1 and salary level No. 2: $210. You are creating an incentive for the employee between level No. 2 and level No. 3 of $250; and between 3 and 4 of $260. Everything is fine and rosy for the employee. He is going to become a supervisor or a postmaster—until he gets to level 5. The next jump is $50. Between 5 and 6 it is $240, and between 6 and 7 it is $310. If that is not distortion in the present pay schedule I have never seen it in my entire life.

Let us take this next one, which is a distortion in the present pay schedule, and look at it from another angle, and here the Moss amendment should be adopted regardless of politics, partisan or otherwise. Look at this chart. This is the present bill. This is the way it stacks up right now. You find supervisory employees receiving a minimum salary increase of 12.3 percent, a maximum of 27.7 percent. You will find clerks and carriers, 303,000 of them under the present bill, receiving 6.91 percent. That is regulars only. You find all other employees receiving a 8.25 percent increase.

The Moss amendment does one single thing. It gives all nonsupervisory employees in the same average percent salary increase. It does not discriminate. It is not costly. Everybody admits that point. It is a question of principle. We respectfully submit that the principle in favor of the Moss amendment is more sound; there is less distortion, there is more equality; there is more fairness under the adoption of the Moss amendment than there is in retaining the present pay schedule under H. R. 4644, and I say this with due apology to all of the Members who worked so hard and to the chairman of the committee, who certainly was fair in every respect, in trying to present a proper bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognize the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to close debate in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Before the chart was carried out, I noticed on it that the regular clerks and carriers were credited with a 6.9 percent raise. I think it has been conveniently forgotten that 20 percent of the postal field service, 120,000 substitutes and temporaries, were not included on that chart. If they were, the average raise would have been 7.2 percent.

Mr. HALLECK. At that point, and with particular reference to that chart, I think this point should be made, and everybody ought to be fair enough to understand it. In recent years we have had what we call across-the-board raises of $400 and $450. Obviously everyone recognized that this profits in greater proportion the men in the lower grades as against the higher grades. That is what is meant by the reclassification, to bring some sort of equalization in pay to the more responsible positions. So, certainly, this proposal of the committee should not be attacked on that ground.

I am for this bill and against this amendment for two reasons: First, because the committee has brought in a good bill, that is fair and equitable; and second, there is no question about it in

my mind that it is the only bill that can become law.

Reference was made to the fact that even if we go this far, the 8.2 is risky. It is more than risky, because if you stop to consider, this is the fact: Already this bill recognizes a tremendous amount of compromise from the original administration proposal. I know something about it because I worked very diligently trying to bring about an arrangement by which we could get fair treatment for the postal employees and have a bill which would be passed. So the original 5 percent was raised to 6 percent. Other adjustments also were made. A total of $30 million has been added to the cost of the bill by the action of the committee as against the original administration proposal. Now let us take another look at it. I realize it is always easy to want to be openhanded. I have had people working for me and I would like to pay them more, but the question is how much can I afford. That is one of the things involved here. The total cost of the committee bill was $160 million a year. You may say, "Well, to add $12 million more—how does that make it bad?" I just want to say to you the committee bill has gone about as far as we can go. It has gone as far as we can go. Not only will we add on more expense every year, but in addition it will wreck the whole reclassification proposal, which is most important.

Bear in mind another thing. We ought to be responsible in respect to affairs of government. The Post Office Department is operating at a deficit right now of $400 million a year. You are going to add another $160 million a year in expenditures. How many of you who want to raise that amount are ready to stand up here and vote for a rate increase to balance it out? What you are doing is saddling the taxpayers of the country with additional burdens.

I say this bill is fair. Since 1945, the increases for the postal employees have totaled 96 percent and in that time the cost of living has increased only 48 percent. The gentleman from California referred to the increases in our own salaries. I have received some rather critical letters and communications. They said, "Well, you voted yourself 50 percent and now you will not give us 10 percent." But they overlook the fact that since our salary was set at $15,000 a year, we increased it 50 percent while in that time the postal employees have received a 60-percent increase in their pay and here is an additional 7.6 percent. This bill is fair treatment for them. If the average pay for the postal employee is $2 an hour, and that is about what it is, then this 7.6-percent rate is equivalent to 15 cents an hour increase in their pay. Is that not comparable to what you have heard has been done generally in industry in that time? If you go back to 1951, when the last pay adjustment was had for the postal employees, the cost of living has increased 3.8 percent and here is proposed a 7.6-percent increase in their pay.

Finally, as I say, we have a responsibility and I think we ought to meet it. I do not think we ought to touch off another inflationary wage spiral and price inflation. Reference has been made to the increased cost of living. We all know how that has affected us. Fortunately, in recent years the cost of living has balanced out. I do not want to be responsible for starting that inflationary action all over again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. Moss and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 178, noes 174.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moss: Page 89, strike out lines 4 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which will make the salary increase proposed in this legislation retroactive to March 1 of this year. This is a proposal which essentially boils down to a matter of personal opinion and your own feeling as to whether or not we deal more fairly with these people by making the effective increase retroactive or whether they should continue to wait for the salary increase proposed in the legislation until it becomes effective.

I would like to point out it is not the fault of the people who work in the Post Office Department that it has taken so long to finally get this bill to the floor where the Members of the House could work their will. The bill could have come to the floor a long time ago, I think it should have, but there has been delay and unless this amendment is adopted we are going to unnecessarily and unjustly penalize the people who have a full entitlement to every dime we propose to vote under this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. It boils down to just this: Simple justice for the workers in the post office.

Mr. MOSS. I think that is very well put. It certainly is simple justice.

Mr. DINGELL. If they are entitled to an increase they are entitled to this retroactive provision.

Mr. MOSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman. We have already granted increases to two large groups of Federal personnel and their increases are now effective. I urge that you give this most careful consideration and grant it in justice to these people who are entitled to this measure of relief from the Congress.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I agree to the amendment. It will be carried forward in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, there are some very minor technical changes for the purpose of clarification that have been suggested by the Post Office Department and the General Accounting Office. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moss asks unanimous consent that in the first paragraph of the language of this amendment now adopted by the House the phrase "or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended," be stricken out, and that on page 110, line 6, of H. R. 4644, after the phrase "as amended,", the following matter be inserted: "or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we have not had a chance even to consider these proposed amendments, I will have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, 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. 4644) to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 211, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, known as the Moss amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 82, strike out the entire postal field-service schedule occurring after line 2 and before line 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment, on which a separate vote was demanded.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 189, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—224

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bailey
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Celler
Chelf
Christopher
Chudoff
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Doyle
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Hardy
Harris
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knutson
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riley
Rivers
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Sieminski
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Vinson
Watts
Whitten
Wickersham
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Winstead
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—189

Abbitt
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andresen, August H.
Arends
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barden
Bass, N. H.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Carrigg
Cederberg
Chase
Chatham
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Dowdy
Durham
Ellsworth
Fenton
Fino
Fjare
Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Henderson
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
James
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knox
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McConnell
McGregor
McIntire
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Minshall
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
O'Hara, Minn.
Osmers
Ostertag
Phillips
Pillion
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Robeson, Va.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scrivner
Scudder
Short
Shuford
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Withrow
Wolcott
Young
Younger

NOT VOTING—21

Allen, Calif.
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolton, Oliver P.
Canfield
Carlyle
Cooley
Dollinger
Eberharter
Herlong
Holt
Kearney
Kilday
McCulloch
Powell
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Roberts
Scott
Thompson, La.
Walter

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mrs. Blitch for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. Holt against.

Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Allen of California against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 125, nays 287, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—125

Alger
Allen, Ill.
Andresen, August H.
Arends
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Bates
Becker
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bosch
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chase
Chenoweth
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Coudert
Cramer
Crumpacker
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Derounian
Devereux
Dixon
Dolliver
Dondero
Fino

Fjare
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
George
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hosmer
Hyde
Jackson
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Kean
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Krueger
Laird
Latham
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Lovre
McDowell
McGregor
McIntire
McMillan
Mack, Wash.
Martin
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Murray, Tenn.
Phillips
Poff
Prouty
Radwan
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scrivner
Scudder
Siler
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.
Thomson, Wyo.
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Weaver
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Calif.
Wolcott
Young
Younger

NAYS—287

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andersen, H. Carl
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett
Cretella
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Heselton
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Lesinski
Long
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Mumma
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neil
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—22

Allen, Calif.
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolton, Oliver P.
Canfield
Carlyle
Cooley
Davis, Ga.
Dollinger
Eberharter
Herlong
Holt
Kearney
Kilday
McCulloch
Powell
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Roberts
Scott
Thompson, La.
Walter

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Holt for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mr. Allen of California.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana, with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 324, nays 85, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—324

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baldwin
Barden
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Baumhart
Beamer
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Buchanan
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carnahan
Carrigg
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Colmer
Cooper
Corbett
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dodd
Dolliver
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Doyle
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gregory
Griffiths
Hagen
Haley
Hand
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holtzman
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Knutson
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Quigley
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
Schenck
Schwengel
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—85

Alger
Allen, Ill.
Arends
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Bates
Becker
Bentley
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Chase
Clevenger
Cole
Coon
Coudert
Cramer
Crumpacker
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, Wis.
Derounian
Devereux
Dondero
Fino
Fjare
Ford
Gamble
George
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hale
Halleck
Harden
Harrison, Nebr.
Harvey
Heselton
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hyde
Jackson
Johansen
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Krueger
Laird
McGregor
Mack, Wash.
Martin
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mumma
Murray, Tenn.
Phillips
Poff
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
St. George
Saylor
Scherer
Scrivner
Siler
Simpson, Pa.

Smith, Kans.	Utt	Wigglesworth
Taber	Van Pelt	Williams, N. Y.
Teague, Calif.	Vorys	Wilson, Calif.
Thompson, Mich.	Vursell	Wolcott
Thomson, Wyo.	Wainwright	Younger
	Weaver	

NOT VOTING—25

Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Powell
Blatnik	Eberharter	Reed, Ill.
Blitch	Herlong	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holt	Roberts
Canfield	Johnson, Calif.	Scott
Carlyle	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Cederberg	Kilday	Walter
Cooley	McCulloch	Wier
	Mason	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Mason.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 4644 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 4644 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. R. 4644.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. COON asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made with reference to Dr. Jonas E. Salk during the consideration of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill may appear in the RECORD following the conclusion of the legislative business today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a news item appearing in the press on Monday, of a meeting that President Eisenhower is going to have with Dr. Jonas Salk on Friday, and the statement in the news item that Mr. Hagerty said the President was hopeful that the new award would be the first by the Congress, and in time for the Friday appointment in Washington for the developer of polio vaccine, Speaker RAYBURN and I conferred and we decided that if President Eisenhower desired legislative action to be taken between now and Friday, we would cooperate in every way possible. We decided that a resolution would be introduced today in the House, to be taken up by unanimous consent.

On conferring with administrative assistants in the White House with a view to getting something official from the President, or the White House, to the effect that such an emergency bill for Dr. Salk was desired, I was informed that there was an unintentional misconstruction placed by the press on what Mr. Hagerty said; that President Eisenhower did not expect legislative authority for the issuance of a special medal would be passed between now and Friday; that a bill was being drafted in the executive branch to carry out the President's recommendation, and that a bill following his recommendation in his message on the state of the Union in this respect will be transmitted to the Congress in the very near future so that appropriate consideration and action by the proper committees might be taken.

The intention was to convey the distinct impression that when such legislation was passed that Dr. Salk would be the first who would be given consideration for recognition for this honor.

The Democratic leadership in the House, and I know the Democratic leadership in the Senate, as well as the Republican leadership in both branches would gladly cooperate with the President to have legislation passed which would enable the conferring of the medal on Dr. Salk next Friday, if desired and requested by the President.

However, as a result of my talk with the administrative assistants in the White House, this is not expected, and it is desired that when the bill is received in the Congress it will take the regular legislative course.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] may extend his 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. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 5687, an identical bill to S. 1697 which was introduced in the Senate by my Michigan colleague, Senator PAT MCNAMARA. The title reads:

To express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life.

The keyword in this title is the word "appreciation"; appreciation for patience and tireless efforts put forth by this man as he ventured upon an uncharted path of human suffering. His road was not at all times an untrammeled vista which promised riches for a successful journey. The motivating impulse was that of the true scientist who has burned the Hippocratic oath indelibly upon his being; for nothing less than unselfish dedication could have brought forth this gift to all humanity.

In reading the newspaper accounts that accompanied the momentous announcement on April 13 one small caption arrested my attention among the massive scientific accounts of Dr. Salk's discovery. I should like to read it. The caption said: "Dr. Salk's only reward is his accomplishment." It further read:

Dr. Jonas E. Salk got a standing ovation by 400 scientists and reporters today when he reported on his successful polio vaccine.

Dr. Salk developed the vaccine under a grant from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis to the University of Pittsburgh, where he is on the faculty.

The vaccine is an unpatened product, so Dr. Salk's only reward is the satisfaction of his accomplishment.

Undoubtedly Dr. Salk will be the worthy recipient of many laudatory awards that will memoralize his Gargantuan efforts in arresting this scourge of humanity; no one could appraise the value that Dr. Salk will attach to these nonmaterial manifestations of his colleagues and fellow men. His place among the great men of his chosen profession is well established for all time. But I, along with my colleague, feel that our appreciation should be carried one step further as expressed in our companion bill.

Therefore, I recommend to the Members of this House favorable consideration of this token of national esteem to a most worthy member of our country's medical profession.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yesterday introduced a bill providing for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement to be awarded to Dr. Jonas Salk for his outstanding work in developing a vaccine against the dread

disease of polio. It is entirely appropriate that Dr. Salk should be the first recipient of such a medal. His contribution to society is tremendous and one which will affect millions of people who otherwise might have suffered the terror of an attack of infantile paralysis. This is undoubtedly the greatest step forward in medical research that has taken place in recent years, and ranks in importance with the discoveries of a vaccination against smallpox and the antibiotics.

It is significant to note that the announcement of the effectiveness of Dr. Salk's vaccine against infantile paralysis came on the 10th anniversary of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who himself had been a victim of this disease and who was the first to mobilize the battle against it. This is a fitting tribute to a man who worked so courageously to prevent others from being afflicted in such a terrible way.

We of Pittsburgh are particularly proud that the University of Pittsburgh was the scene at which the tests were conducted by Dr. Salk and his colleagues. During recent years Pittsburgh has become one of the great medical centers of the country, and I am gratified that this outstanding discovery should have taken place there, adding to the prominence of the work in medical research being done in that city.

I hope that the Congress will see fit to provide for this medal for Dr. Salk, whose sacrifice and work will mean so much to humanity.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any and all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks during the next 5 legislative days on the postal pay increase bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I hope President Eisenhower will not attempt to thwart the overwhelming will of Congress by vetoing a fair pay increase for postal employees.

The 8.2-percent increase voted by the House is less than adequate, but under the circumstances, was the best could be had. I have favored and still favor a 10-percent raise and am hopeful that the final conference agreement will be closer to 10 percent as voted by the Senate, than the 8.2 percent voted by the House. Either figure is small enough when measured by increased costs of living which have sharply reduced the purchasing power of postal workers.

We would be inconsistent, indeed, if we did not insist on making the increase retroactive to March 1. After all, the 50-percent salary boost Congress has voted for itself was made effective as of March 1. An additional safeguard provided in the House bill will prevent abuse of the reclassification program by requiring the Postmaster General to report his actions to Congress. If these reports indicate that the reclassification procedure is being abused, or being used for partisan political purposes, Congress will have an opportunity to change the program.

THE STATE AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION COMMITTEE OF MISSOURI

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the dictatorial abuse of power and authority of the State Agricultural Stabilization Committee of Missouri is well known by the farmers of Missouri. This condition has become so deplorable that the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri passed the following resolution to investigate the State ASC committee:

House Memorial 1

Whereas it has been stated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture that it is the policy of the present administration to administer our agricultural stabilization and conservation programs with the farmers themselves being given a voice in the supervision and control of such programs; and

Whereas the State agricultural stabilization committee, presided over by Murray C. Colbert as chairman, has discharged 3 elected committeemen, suspended 4 elected committeemen, and forced 1 elected committeeman to resign in Texas County, Mo., with just the broad charge of certain irregularities without any specification of what particular irregularities; and

Whereas at a hearing held by the State committee in February of 1954 on the proposed discharge of certain elected committeemen in Texas County, Mo., one William Young McCaskill, a qualified dealer under the emergency drought feed program and also a special correspondent for a metropolitan newspaper of this State, was denied access as a member of the press to such hearing by Murray C. Colbert after the said Murray C. Colbert was requested by the committeemen of the local ASC committee to hold a public hearing; and

Whereas William Young McCaskill was suspended on February 3, 1955, for alleged irregularities in drought feed certificates and on April 6, 1955, was reinstated after an investigation of the alleged irregularities by the Commodity and Investigation Division of the Commodity Stabilization Service and on April 7, 1955, the said Murray C. Colbert again suspended William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. alleging that William Young McCaskill and the Smith Feed Co. had made an agreement to circumvent the first suspension; and

Whereas it has been charged that the State ASC committee presided over by Murray C. Colbert is not operating the ASC committee on an impartial basis free from personalities and pressures; and

Whereas numerous counties in the State of Missouri have experienced similar wholesale dismissals and suspensions since Mr. Colbert assumed the office of State ASC chairman; and

Whereas the farmers of Texas County and the State of Missouri are greatly disturbed by the aforementioned actions of the State ASC committee which is definitely hindering the successful operations of such ASC program; and

Whereas a suspension of a dealer under the emergency drought feed program practically destroys the business of such suspended dealer and does great damage to the reputation of such dealer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of Missouri, That the Secretary of Agriculture be memorialized to investigate the activities of the State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen throughout the State of Missouri and the suspension of the said William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers for the purpose of bringing the true state of facts to light and of ascertaining whether the declared policy of the present administration of giving the farmers themselves a voice in the administration of the ASC program is being carried out in Missouri; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House Committee on Agriculture of this Congress will also investigate the partisan and dictatorial methods being practiced by the ASC against and contrary to law and the interests of the farmers.

PATRIOTS' DAY IN MASSACHUSETTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 19th of April, was Patriots' Day in Massachusetts. This is the day when the people of Massachusetts, particularly the townspeople of Lexington, Concord, Acton, Bedford, and surrounding communities give thanks to God and our forefathers for the first stand made for liberty and freedom.

On this day, the 19th of April, 180 years ago, Paul Revere made his historic ride shouting his notice the British were coming, to every Middlesex village and farm. "To arms!" was the cry on that day so long ago and the village patriots assembled in Lexington and Concord to make their stand for freedom. When they returned the British fire their shots were heard around the world and the beautiful peaceful towns of Lexington and Concord and their courageous patriots carved into the history of mankind one of its finest pages. Here liberty was born. Here freedom was born. Here our great American Nation was born. It can be said this was our finest hour and it can be truthfully said, "Never have so many owed so much to so few," for this was the beginning of freedom, freedom that is as certain as the light of sun, to reach all peoples everywhere in the world.

These hallowed communities, these historic towns, are in my Fifth Massachusetts Congressional District. It is for me such a deep and great honor to represent them in the Congress. Every time I pass the statue of the Minute Man and every time I pass Concord Bridge and the Lexington Green, my heartbeat quickens and my blood rushes with pride, my soul is thrilled and my thoughts are humble in being so close to the great deed that was accomplished here. Every American should visit Concord and Lexington and feel the thrill of the incidents that brought about our liberty and freedom.

Yesterday at the celebration of the 180th anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord, the Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, made a great and ringing address. I wish every American could read it and give it thought. In my remarks here I include his exceptionally fine address. General White is a very superior officer with a great war record and worthy of standing on Lexington Green, 180 years after Captain Parker fired the first shot for freedom. General White's address follows:

It is a moving experience to participate in your celebration of Patriot's Day. I believe that every American—at least once in his life—should come to Lexington on the 19th of April. Here he could be reassured that the spirit which has made America great is still unwavering.

One hundred and eighty years ago this morning, your beautiful town was a small community of peaceful and peace-loving people. All at once this quiet village moved into history's spotlight. Men like Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and Captain Parker spontaneously made it clear that however much the New Englander loved peace, he loved liberty more.

You have a proud heritage, well described by Daniel Webster when he said:

"I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts; she needs none. There she is. Behold her and judge for yourself. There is her history; the world knows it by heart. The past, at least, is secure. There is Boston and Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill, and there they will remain forever."

In the 125 years since Daniel Webster said this, events have proved that he was right. Time has a way of changing many things, but you and your forbears have preserved much of your historic past, both in landmarks and in spirit.

Within our view, for instance, still stands the house of Jonathan Harrington, bridegroom of only a few months, who gave his life one memorable morning, for an ideal. This ideal has since become the balance wheel of our civilization.

Evidence of your unchanging spirit is this thrilling ceremony that we join in today.

Although time has not succeeded in dampening your spirit of independence, it has wrought a world of other changes.

Although we are here to honor the men of 1775, the occasional sound of a plane overhead serves to remind us that this year of 1955 is a year in the air age. Althought we call it the air age, it is but a part of a great period of technological progress. During the lifetimes of many of us here today there has been more scientific achievement than was made during hundreds of preceding years.

Scientific progress has given us many advantages, but it has also served to enlarge and complicate the same old problems that have always beset mankind.

Our main problem today is similar to the one our ancestors faced in 1775. We love our freedom, and we want to keep it. However, it is being menaced by forces which would make us slaves.

In that respect it is the same old problem. However, the threat to our freedom is more frightening now. The forces which menace our freedom are that of a strong and terrible aggressor. They are the forces of communism, the forces of the Soviet Union and her Communist satellites.

In the Revolutionary days, aggressor forces on a distant continent would not have been cause for great alarm. In fact, Thomas Paine said:

"Not a place on earth might be so happy as America. Her situation is so remote from all the wrangling world, and she has nothing to do but trade with them."

In 1776 this was a reasonable idea, but the progress of which I spoke has erased that concept forever. In this air age, Russia is closer to the United States than New York was to Boston during the Revolutionary days.

Other comparisons between today and yesterday are interesting. On the morning of April 19, 1775, it took the British soldiers about 4 hours to march from Boston out to Lexington.

Just a little over 1 month ago, a number of United States Air Force jet planes traveled from California to New York in considerably less than 4 hours.

Even more meaningful to us here today, if a Communist bomber took off from northern Russia about the time we got out of bed this morning, it could be over this Boston area just about now.

Thus we are no longer remote from all the wrangling world. In this air age we find ourselves right in the middle of this wrangling world. An aggressor can threaten us with the greatest danger we have ever faced.

Again, compare our present situation with the one this area faced 180 years ago.

In 1775, the British left Lexington after the initial encounter and went on to Concord to destroy the patriot arsenal there. They took some 5 hours to do so. Consider that several hundred men needed so much time to destroy one relatively small arsenal. Admittedly, it is unfair for me to use this as an example of their inefficiency. It is well known that the good New England rum was responsible for slowing the British down.

Let us subtract the rum factor and give them credit for having been able to do this job in 1 hour on a drier day. Even so—compare that capability with today's.

Today one man could drop a bomb in the Boston area which could spread destruction out as far as Lexington. The destruction would take seconds, not hours.

This is an awesome thought, but it is one that cannot be ignored at this gathering of patriots. It is your duty, as it was the duty of your courageous ancestors, to clearly understand the nature of the threat to American freedom. Unless we understand the danger, we cannot counter it. Unless we counter the danger, our freedom is lost. Ceremonies like this would become meaningless.

Today, the problem of defending our liberty is as serious to us as it was to the Minutemen in 1775. However, we can no longer depend upon an untrained militia gathered together in a few hours.

Today's Minutemen must be able to react in minutes and with today's weapons. If enemy bombers were to head this way, our warning systems would allow our air defenders only minutes to take off, climb high in the sky, and destroy the intruder.

At the same time, from here and overseas, our long-range bombers must be able to be off the ground and on their way before the enemy could even complete his attack. Likewise, our Army and Navy must be able to instantly move against any attacker.

Besides these full-time defenders, we need many others standing by, ready to serve their country when needed. These are the Reserves of our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

I know personally how highly specialized and exacting are the requirements that our Air Force Reserves must meet. Flying our modern airplanes requires a high degree of skill and continual training to keep proficient.

Flying and maintaining airplanes is not like riding a bicycle. They say that once a man learns to ride a bicycle he never forgets. If the same were true of flying, we could teach many to fly and then call upon them only in emergencies.

However, if a man is going to fly in combat he must fly all the time. Every pilot knows how dangerous it would be to let his flying get rusty—dangerous not only to him, but to those with him and below him. For this reason our Air National Guard and our Air Force Reserve men must train constantly.

Perhaps these men are the greatest patriots of our time. They are on their civilian jobs a regular 5- or 6-day workweek. To keep their skills high, they must sacrifice their weekends to training. They, like you and I, would prefer to spend their weekends with their families, in their gardens, at picnics, and in church.

They realize, however, that our need for air age minutemen is great, and so they continue to prepare themselves for a conflict which we hope will never come. They know that our preparedness is the best guaranty that this conflict will not come.

Near here, at the Bedford Hanscom Air Force Base, some of the activities I have mentioned are being carried out. In a few months our interceptors of the Air Defense Command will be constantly poised on the end of the runway there. They will be doing part of the job that other Air Defense pilots are now doing at Stewart, Otis, and Westover Air Force Bases. At all these bases pilots of fast jet planes are ready—24 hours a day—for any emergency.

At other locations are the lonely radar sites. At these sites, our men maintain constant and watchful vigil. They are the ones upon whom we depend for the vital warning and control of our air defense.

Believe me, this system is not untested. Word from the radar sites is often flashed to the pilots. They jump into their fighters and are in the air in 2 or 3 minutes. Right after they take off, they do not know where the target is, or what it is. It may be the real thing. While they are climbing, the ground controller will tell them what direction to go and how high to fly. Soon the pilot's own radar in his plane will spot the target and he will move in close to it.

In each case, up until now, the target has turned out to be one of our airplanes or a commercial airliner which has been lost or blown off course. The interceptor pilot radios this information back to the ground controller, and then, guided by the ground controller, the pilot returns to his base and lands.

Thus our air defense is actually functioning night and day, good weather and bad. When a pilot returns he is tired, but he always is happy that he was able to intercept the unkown airplane before it got to a critical target area.

The requirements of air defense mean that our pilots work at odd and inconvenient hours. The alert shack in which they wait for that important call is usually crude and

uncomfortable. Many of them are married, but it is impossible for them to lead a normal family life.

I think that all patriotic Americans are deeply indebted to these men. In all the history of man, the knowledge that someone was looking out for him and his family has been a great source of comfort. Back in 1775, the people of Boston were comforted by the call of the town crier. When they heard him, they knew that all was well.

Today, people near air defense bases get similar reassurance from the sound of your Air Force jets as they climb into the sky to make sure that all is still well above us.

Also at Bedford Hascom Air Force Base the Air Force Reserve is training. The Bedford wing is making grand progress. In case of any national emergency our Reserves will be a skilled, trained backup to our regular forces.

The laboratories at Bedford, as you well know, are some of the finest in America. The work being done there will eventually result in better defense for us all.

All over America, our air bases are parts of the community in which they are located and which they protect. The air base at Bedford is certainly a part of this community. Like the patriots of Lexington in 1775, you play a valuable part in the modern day defense of our liberty. One of the ways you do this is in support of the defense we are required to have today.

Your celebration here today is visible and heartwarming evidence that our love of freedom here in America is as strong as ever. As liberty was menaced in the days of the men we honor, it is menaced in our own time but now the menace is on a global scale.

We recognize that if we wait until the evil that menaces our liberty is at our doorstep, it would be too late. In this air age, we must stop the march of communism far from our shores. The farther from our shores we stop it, the better chances are that we can do it without a war.

In these days, courage backed up by firmness and great strength give us our best chance for a lasting peace.

Daniel Webster recognized this in 1830. He said:

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard it and defend it."

We must remember those words as we honor the gallant few who first sounded the trumpets of liberty at Lexington. They passed on the torch of freedom to us and it is the duty of the patriots of today to keep that flame bright.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for 10 days, on account of official business—having been appointed as a member of the Committee To Investigate the Immigration and Refugee Program.

Mr. REED of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), until May 10, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. CHATHAM regarding Pan-American Day.

Mr. DEMPSEY and include an article dealing with postal matters.

Mr. LESINSKI in two separate instances.

Mr. ALGER in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. GRANT.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 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:

711. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

712. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide for special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

713. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

714. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

715. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

716. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service Hospital, Carville, La."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

717. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to the request of the corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

718. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

719. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 427. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 428. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. 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. MASON:

H. R. 5694. A bill to provide revenue from an excise tax uniformly applied to end products of manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5695. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5696. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, in order to provide authority to allocate and establish priorities for Salk vaccine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 5697. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5698. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5699. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5700. A bill to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 5701. A bill to repeal subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, which authorizes the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide for exemptions in the case of certain classes of securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5702. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit certain employed persons to be paid annuities under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 5703. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quit-claim 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. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 5704. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 5705. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5706. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5707. A bill to amend chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in regard to certain investments by dealers in real estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 5708. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1.25; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5709. A bill providing for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, and authorizing its award initially to Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5710. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5711. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1934 (Public Law 435, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5712. A bill to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5713. A bill relating to the status of certain organizations as tax-exempt organizations under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 5714. A bill to amend section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deduction of trade or business expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5715. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5716. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5717. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 5718. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 63 Stat. 917) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 5719. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide that arthritis, psychoses, or multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5720. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 5721. A bill to provide for aid to the States in the fields of practical nursing and auxiliary hospital personnel services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5722. A bill to provide for payment of pension to the widow of any recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 5723. A bill providing for the designation of United States Highway No. 101 as a part of the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5724. A bill to establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, to establish a Federal Advisory Commission to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation, to provide awards of merit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5725. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of women officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve on the same basis as male officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 5726. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 5727. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5728. A bill to provide that certain retired members of the uniformed services shall be paid certain travel and transportation expenses incurred in establishing a home within 1 year after their retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5729. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to authorize loans to be made by the Small Business Administration to development credit corporations or industrial foundations located in areas having a substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5730. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5731. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and their dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5732. A bill to repeal section 412 (e) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5733. A bill to add section 246 (f) and amend section 412 (b) of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5734. A bill to amend section 301 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5735. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5736. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1950, relating to the extension of the terms of patents of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 5737. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5738. A bill to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers Training Corps programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5739. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5740. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 5741. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to provide for regulation of the amount of radio and television program time which may be devoted to advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5742. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 5743. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5744. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5745. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5746. A bill to amend section 304 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the disposition of certain imported articles which have been seized and condemned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 5747. A bill to amend section 812 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to allow a deduction under Federal estate tax laws for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests for public, charitable, or religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize a deduction under Federal estate tax laws for certain death taxes imposed by a State upon bequests or devises for public, charitable, or religious uses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5749. A bill to provide for the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5750. A bill to provide special acreage allotments in areas of general crop failure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 5751. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5752. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to 90 cents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5753. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the refund of manufacturers' excise taxes paid on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5755. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 5756. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5757. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5758. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5759. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to authorize more effective use of the special fund provided for in section 44; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 212. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study supplies of petroleum on the west coast of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. Res. 213. Resolution to provide a residence for pages; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a study and investigation into the feasibility of establishing additional manufacturing enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations in this State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of house memorial No. 7 of the Alaska Legislature, pertaining to title XII of the Social Security Act, as amended, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 5760. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Lines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5761. A bill for the relief of Annemarie Moeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgina Calvano (nee Bootz); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 5763. A bill for the relief of Toyoji (Suzuki) Whipple; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 5764. A bill for the relief of Joseph Beidel (also known as Joseph Beidel Wiedmayer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5765. A bill for the relief of Basilio Rus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5766. A bill for the relief of George K. Toskos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5767. A bill for the relief of Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 5768. A bill for the relief of Lum Shee Seid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5769. A bill for the relief of Gregory Andrew Bohosiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5770. A bill for the relief of Italo Liccari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5771. A bill for the relief of Elpidio Dosado, Aurelia Dosado, Deanna Dosado, Elpidio Dosado, Jr., and Ambrosio Dosado; to to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5772. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Mininni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 5773. A bill for the relief of Jacques Marius Poletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 5774. A bill for the relief of Charles Grant John Giles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5775. A bill for the relief of Hesna Hun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 5776. A bill for the relief of Winston W. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 5777. A bill for the relief of Nickolas Bodner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 5778. A bill for the relief of June Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 5779. A bill for the relief of Miguel Saenz-Gallegos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 5780. A bill for the relief of Peter Wei Ting Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 5781. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Boffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 5782. A bill for the relief of Father Evencio Moreno Villar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5783. A bill for the relief of Father Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5784. A bill for the relief of Copalkrishna (Gopalkrishna) U. Bhat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by the Chief Justice of the United States at the Marshall-Wythe-Blackstone Commemoration Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, September of this year has been designated as John Marshall Bicentennial Month by the action of the 82d Congress, and extensive ceremonies will commemorate the 200th anniversary of the birth of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall.

Chief Justice Marshall firmly implanted the precepts of judicial review in our constitutional system. History records this commentary of 1833 which has become a lasting tribute and memorial to his great wisdom and genius:

> Your expositions of constitutional law enjoy a rare and extraordinary authority. They constitute a monument of fame far beyond the ordinary memorials of political and military glory. They are destined to enlighten, instruct, and convince future generations and can scarcely perish but with the memory of the Constitution itself.

In this setting, and as a member of the John Marshall Bicentennial Commission, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, delivered at the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, Va., on September 25, 1954.

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

ADDRESS BY EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, AT MARSHALL-WYTHE-BLACKSTONE COMMEMORATION CEREMONIES, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., SEPTEMBER 25, 1954

It is our pleasure today to honor great men of another day, men who have contributed much to our national life and to the civilization of which it is a part. We speak of them, of course, in gratitude, but we have another reason, even more personal to present-day Americans and in keeping with the necessities of our time. We meet here to strengthen our own convictions concerning government and law; to fortify our belief in a government of laws and not of men. We seek rededication to the cause of justice, between individuals, between citizens and their sovereign, and between the nations of the world. We reach for perfect justice, but we do not expect to grasp it, because history, both profane and divine, teaches us that as long as time and human nature exist there will be issues to decide, causes to adjust. We learn from Holy Writ that even the angels quarreled and that Satan and his angels were banished to darkness for their wrongs. We know that the path of justice in every time and place has been rough, tortuous, and uphill. No nation has yet reached the summit. Exact justice has not been achieved. No mortal has embodied all its principles. We recognize, however, that civilizations of the past have advanced it; nations in all ages have made contributions to it, and individuals have either evolved or formulated or synthesized principles of justice in a way that has challenged the admiration and emulation of people in many lands—people who are interested in that kind of government which is premised upon freedom and the dignity of the individual. We honor those nations for their accomplishments and revere the memories of such individuals for their contributions.

As Americans, we are proud of our system of government and our standards of justice, although we claim neither originality nor perfection for them. We, too, have had our great men who have made contributions to the sum total of human knowledge in the field of justice. We do not deify them. Like the sages of other countries, they were people, subject to all the limitations of human beings. As a nation, we make no pretense except to a passion for justice based upon the dignity and rights of the individual. We stake everything we have on our belief that only through this kind of justice can there be order and contentment within nations and peace between countries of the world. We believe this kind of justice is the rightful heritage of every human being and that it is his right and duty to achieve it.

For three and a half centuries Americans, using the experience and wisdom of older countries from which we or our forebears came, have endeavored to develop in this section of the world a system of government and a body of law that will accord justice to everyone. We have made mistakes—many of them. People have at times succeeded in using our system for selfish and even oppressive ends. We have often been required to wipe some things from the slate and start again. At times we have been close to failure but we have never failed in our climb toward the pinnacle of true justice. And we are climbing today to meet the test of Thomas Jefferson that "The most sacred of the duties of a government is to do equal and impartial justice to all its citizens."

We do not assume that justice is indigenous only to our soil or in our own people. Waves of passion, prejudice and even hatreds have on occasions swept over us and almost engulfed us, as they have the people of other lands. In our efforts to guard against these things, we have called upon the wisdom of the ages. We have accepted unblushingly the contribution of those intellects of other nations and ages who, in accordance with the circumstances under which they lived, have placed foundation stones in the temple of justice.

Our own symbol of justice, the home of the Supreme Court of the United States, honors great nations of lawgivers. It is of Grecian architecture of the Corinthian order so loved by the Romans and used by them in a countless number of their public buildings. In the courtroom itself, we give public recognition to the lawgivers of all ages. On the frieze of one wall are the figures of ancients who made their contribution before the birth of Christ: Menes, Hammurabi, Moses, Solomon, Lycurgus, Solon, Draco, Confucius, and Octavian; and on the opposite wall the figures of those who came after Him: Justinian, Mohammed, Charlemagne, King John, St. Louis, Grotius, Blackstone, Marshall, and Napoleon. The most significant to us, of course, are the figures of those who expounded the two systems that are the most alike of any because premised on the affinity of lineage, language, concept, and emulation, the British and American. They stand side by side, William Blackstone and John Marshall. These men were contemporaries although not known personally to each other. The one had not been out of England; the other lived almost his entire life within a few miles of his beloved Virginia.

While Blackstone was writing his commentaries on the law of England, Marshall was studying the great events of history upon which the rights of Englishmen were predicated in order to establish here a comparable system of justice. At that time, he and his compatriots were concerned not so much with a better system of justice than the English system as they were with having the same rights as Englishmen. A few years later he fought with Washington at Monmouth, Brandywine, and Valley Forge to establish here a Nation for that purpose. Blackstone expounded the law of England as it had developed by tradition, charter, statutes, and judicial interpretation for a thousand years. Marshall expounded our Constitution, a document of 5,000 words, only a dozen years old, but which had been designed to establish for all times a more perfect Union of States that had but recently achieved their independence. That Constitution was an experiment in the science of government. Many people believed it to be a dangerous experiment. Many feared it and believed it would become another instrument of oppression. It was approved by the States only by the narrowest of margins. No one was certain if or how it would stand the test of time. One of the signers of the Constitution said, "Constitutions are not the same on paper as in real life." It fell to the lot of John Marshall to translate our Constitution from paper into real life, to enable it to meet the problems of a new, poor, war-tired, and divided country. To say that it took wisdom, foresight, patience, and courage to do this task is trite. But it is nonetheless true, and he did it for 34 years during the most formative and politically turbulent period of our national history, leaving at his death a greater imprint on our legal institutions than any American to this day has ever made. We honor him today at the beginning of the 200th year since his birth in testimony of the lasting and universal veneration in which his work is held.

It is appropriate that this recognition should be given him in his beloved Virginia where he lived all his life and in whose service he offered his life for the new Nation he envisioned, in whose legislature he labored for the Constitutional Convention, where he worked for ratification of the Constitution, and which State he represented in the Congress. It is also fitting that this ceremony should be held at beautiful and historic College of William and Mary where he received his only formal education under the benign tutelage of George Wythe, then occupying the first chair of law in this country. John Marshall was not an orthodox student. Born in the wilderness, he learned from his parents and from an occasional tutor, but largely from the life of his time and from the great men of Virginia in the causes for which men struggled in those days. What men he encountered in his native State—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Patrick Henry, Mason, Monroe, and a host of others immortal in United States history. Whether these men agreed in politics or not, they all had great minds, were passionately devoted to their own political philosophy and each sharpened the minds of the others either through friendly intercourse or political contention. Marshall was the beneficiary of these associations as much as any American of those days, whether it stemmed from the adoration he had for his beloved chief, George Washington, or from his almost lifelong political strife with his kinsman, Thomas Jefferson.

We are most fortunate that we can have with us on this occasion Dr. Goodhart, master of University College, Oxford, where English law was first taught and where Sir William Blackstone taught and wrote his commentaries. And how greatly we are honored by having with us on this occasion the Lord Chief Justice of England whose historic position makes him the guardian of the rights of all Englishmen as those rights have come down to them from Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the Acts of Parliament. It gives us a sense of comradeship in a very troubled world.

John Marshall has rightly been called the "expounder of the Constitution." It was new to the point of being without precedent when he became Chief Justice January 6, 1801. The Nation was poor as a result of years of warfare. Means of communication between the States were sadly lacking; there was no national economy; our standing among the nations of the world was deplorable; the States were divided in interests and politics; men held passionate views concerning the relationships between the three branches of Government and between the Federal and State governments. The leaders were men of powerful intellect and passionate convictions. There were those who would center most power in the Federal Government. There were those who would leave practically all power in the States. It was Marshall's mission in life to pursue a course somewhere between those two extreme positions through the construction of the new Constitution in a myriad of cases that arose during his 34 years as Chief Justice. He had spent a horrible winter at Valley Forge with Washington, and the weakness of the Government under the Articles of Confederation had seared his soul. He believed in a strong, central government—Federal supremacy in all matters within the domain of the Federal Government. He believed the Constitution should be construed liberally to accomplish that end, and he confirmed the power of Congress to do so in these historic words:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

He believed that if we were to remain a nation we must have a national economy, and that any strong economy must be based upon the scrupulous performance of contracts, and the orderly regulation by the central government of commerce among the States and with other nations. He realized that if we were to command the respect of the world, we must meticulously fulfill our international obligations and honor the treaties we make. All of these desired results he achieved through decision after decision until they became embedded in our law.

But perhaps the greatest contribution he made to our system of jurisprudence was the establishment of an independent judiciary through the principle of judicial review. In a case instituted the first year of his incumbency, he rooted this fundamental principle in American constitutional law as our original contribution to the science of law.

This and many other of his decisions aroused a storm of protest as being beyond the words and intent of the Constitution, but for 34 years in accordance with his belief, stone by stone, he built the foundation of our constitutional structure, and he constructed it sufficiently strong to support everything we have since built upon it. In those 34 years of his incumbency, he wrote 519 of the 1,106 opinions handed down by his Court.

He did not go with the tide of public opinion or the course of politics. Often his opinions were contrary to both, but he continued to build, patiently, logically, courageously. His sense of duty is epitomized at the time of the trial of Aaron Burr, which he conducted fearlessly in spite of the intense feeling of the public and the national administration against the defendant. In the conduct of that case, as a circuit justice, he said:

"That this court dares not usurp power is most true. That this court dares not shrink from its duty is not less true. No man is desirous of becoming the peculiar subject of calumny. No man, might he let the bitter cup pass from him without self-reproach, would drain it to the bottom."

And he did his duty in that case, unpopular though it was.

He lived with this conviction, throughout his long career. When his work was done and he passed away in Philadelphia on July 6, 1835, in the 80th year of his life and the 35th of his Chief Justiceship, he was acclaimed by friend and foe alike as a man of virtue and great accomplishment.

His long-time friend and illustrious associate, Joseph Story, said of him:

"Chief Justice Marshall was the growth of a century. Providence grants such men to the human family only on great occasions to accomplish its own great end. Such men are found only when our need is the greatest. His proudest epitaph may be written in a line—'Here lies the expounder of the Constitution.'"

The people of Philadelphia accorded him a hero's farewell, and as his body was borne along the streets to the dock for transmittal to his beloved Virginia, the Liberty Bell tolled from the belfry of Independence Hall. Then a strange thing happened. A great cleft appeared in the side of the bell, and like Marshall's voice, it too became still forever. It was taken down and placed in the Hall. It remains there today for all to see—the symbol of our liberty—while the memory of John Marshall abides with all of us as that of "the great Chief Justice," and "the expounder of our Constitution."

Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening last I was privileged to deliver a talk to the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, at the Carnegie Endowment Hall, New York City. The talk was entitled "Tribute to the Exiles of Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

TRIBUTE TO THE EXILES OF FREEDOM

(Remarks of Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, before the Second International Congress of the Christian Democratic Union of Central Europe, at the Carnegie Endowment Building for International Peace, New York City, April 17, 1955)

Scarcely 2 weeks ago announcement was made by a Lithuanian newspaper in Chicago of the death of Canon Antanas Petraitis, a Christian martyr to the communistic terror. It was 14 years ago, serving as pastor in the Lithuanian community of Erzvilkas, that he was arrested by the robot agents of the dictator at the Kremlin and subjected to unspeakable tortures designed to crush his will and destroy his soul. He was one of the few survivors of the death march to the Cherven Forest, where thousands were shot down because they were deemed dangerous to the plans of the dictatorship because they preferred death to the loss of liberty.

I pay my tribute tonight to this noble priest, and to all others of the Baltic peoples who were the first victims of the vast plan of Soviet Russia to conquer the world. These men and women, who had the spiritual capacity to resist inhuman torture rather than surrender the freedom with which they were endowed by their Creator, have given us and all the people of the world the example that must be followed before liberty can triumph over force. They are not forgotten by the exiles who have escaped from Central Europe and who have gathered here to keep alive the basic concept of individual freedom which all Christendom has cherished for 20 centuries.

With humility and a deep sense of my own inability to pronounce a fitting epitaph for those who have already made or are still to make the sacrifice of their lives in this struggle, I have accepted the invitation to speak here tonight and shall try to outline some of the facts which it seems to me we must never forget if civilization is to survive this, its most terrible crisis. Note I do not say if religion is to survive, because of that I have no doubt. The soul of man cannot be liquidated by the tortures of the tyrant because it is the breath of God. Men were made free by their Creator. This knowledge has sustained the people of Europe and the people of all countries to which the message of Christendom has gone. It will sustain them now but we must all know that the triumph of the spiritual over the evils of materialism can be permanently won only by those who are willing to sacrifice the temporary material values of life in order to preserve the eternal values bestowed by God Himself upon every human soul.

The struggle in which we are involved is the conflict between the spiritual and the materialistic. The human race, through all written history, has made frequent compromise with the evil of materialism, and has endured wars in the hope that they would speedily pass away, that peace would be restored, and that mankind would once again return to the pursuit of spiritual and cultural objectives. But compromise has failed. The Napoleonic Wars ended at Waterloo in 1815. Not until 55 years later did the Franco-Prussian War begin. Only 44 years of peace intervened before World War I broke out and, after 4 years of the most terrible military slaughter in all the previous history of mankind, all the peoples of the world cherished the hope that with the foundation of the League of Nations peace among men had at last been attained, but only 21 years elapsed before the Second World War was launched in 1939. With vastly improved engines of destruction, with mounting casualties, with war raging on land, on sea, in the air above, and in the deep oceans underneath, the capacity of man to destroy himself reached its zenith. When the shooting stopped, once again men cried peace, but there is no peace. The few treaties which have been written and the termination of the shooting have not yet revealed how war may be abolished and justice among men and nations attained. In the 140 years which have elapsed since the capture of Napoleon, the intervals of peace between wars have been growing steadily shorter, and no answer has yet appeared to the question every man asks in his heart: How can permanent peace be attained?

There was a time when wars were fought by only a portion of the population and under rules that save the open city from

destruction, when women and children were spared. These were days when poets would have us believe that knighthood was in flower. There was chivalry, there was tolerance during the small wars fought during the Christian era, but we live in a time when such rules of warfare have utterly disappeared. This century has seen the development of planned total war in which not only the men in uniform are involved in conflict but when the unarmed civilian population has no protection from ruthless attack. In the war against Japan, this Nation dropped the atom bomb at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was the ultimate in force. It stopped the fighting but it did not bring peace.

It should be plain to us, therefore, why even the greatest of military leaders tell us that war is outmoded. It was Napoleon, when his days of battle and conquest were over, who confessed as he looked back upon his life that he was amazed at "the impotence of force to organize anything." Even the most successful of modern military leaders see the futility of force as Napoleon did. "There are only two powers in the world," he said, "the spirit and the sword. In the long run the sword will always be conquered by the spirit." Napoleon died, an impersonation of the failure of force, but wars continued.

In our generation another great military leader who in World War II led the forces of the Allies in Asia, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, came to the same conclusion. I was in the House of Representatives on the 19th of April 1951, when he spoke to the Congress of the United States about war. He was the commander of all the forces of the Allies in Asia when, on September 2, 1945, on the battleship *Missouri* he accepted the surrender of Japan. All the memories of his experience in two World Wars were fresh in his mind when he spoke to the Congress. I give you his testimony:

"I know war as few other men now living know it," he told us, "and nothing today is more revolting. I have long advocated its complete abolition as its very destructiveness on both friend and foe has rendered it useless as a means of settling international disputes."

"Useless," he said it was, having in mind the capture of the Philippines by Japan while he was the commander, having in mind his return and his recapture of the Philippines, having in mind the dropping of the bombs and the surrender of Japan. He then quoted from his utterance made on the deck of the battleship *Missouri* when Japan surrendered.

"Military alliances," he said, "balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war." He was explaining why World War I had failed to bring peace to the world and why, when the Second World War occurred, we felt compelled to enter it and use all the inventions and weapons that science had achieved. He had seen at first hand what total war means and so he quoted from that speech on the battleship *Missouri*, giving us a message which we can forget only at the peril of losing the great western civilization which is the world's heritage from Christianity.

"The utter destructiveness of war now blots out this alternative," he said, meaning, of course, the use of the most destructive weapons the human mind can conceive. Some other alternative than force, he was telling the world, has to be found, saying:

"We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door."

It is not necessary to depend solely upon the opinions of the great generals of the world. I could recite here how Alexander of Greece, when he had no more worlds to conquer, tried to turn to thoughts of peace. I could tell the story of the Christian concepts of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant and Gen. Robert E. Lee when the great trial of the Civil War came to an end in this country. But I shall be content to give you the facts which show that force defeats itself.

Even the dictators eventually kill one another off. Of Lenin's inner circle, only he and Stalin survived to die natural deaths. The others were liquidated. A dozen ministers were purged. High officials in the Communist Party central organization, more than half of the Communists who wrote the Soviet Constitution, military leader after military leader, all of them experts in torture, ruthless and faithless, were themselves the victims of the dictatorial system they were trying to enforce upon the world. It is a system which cannot last because it is a system without faith. It believes in neither God nor man, and because of this lack of spiritual faith it consumes its own adherents.

What then is the alternative to which MacArthur said man must turn? What is the method by which in this century the spirit will conquer the sword, as Napoleon predicted? Perhaps it is too simple to be understood. Surely no one knows better than the descendants of the people of Western Europe the great spiritual triumphs which marked the civilization of Christendom. All the terror and slavery of paganism were unable to crush the spirit and the will of the people who had the faith to believe in and the courage to live by the principle of the Christian religion that God lives and calls to those who will to be free.

Society, any society, is an organism which reflects the spirit of the individuals who constitute it. The relationship between God and man is the relationship between God and every man. When into any society there enters the materialism of paganism, that society inevitably falls to lower standards of character and morality. We have lived in a time in which too many individuals have set aside the concepts of religious faith and have worshiped before the image of the Golden Calf. That is the symbol of materialism. But it is not the symbol of the millions of the people who have received and accepted the heritage of Christendom.

The men and women who founded this country, the United States of America, were men and women of deep religious faith. That was why they wrote into the Declaration of Independence the plain and specific recognition of the fact that man has certain unalienable rights which were given to him by the Creator.

The men and women of the Baltic States and of Europe also have cherished the same faith. It was this deep conviction that enabled them to stand unyielding before the faithless and cowardly minions of the Communist dictators and endure the most inhuman torture rather than sacrifice that share of divinity which they had received from the Creator.

The conflict between the spiritual ideology and the ideology of materialism which now threatens the world with a third global conflict is essentially a moral struggle for the independence of the souls of men. It is not at all a struggle for wealth and power. It is a struggle to preserve the basic concepts of tolerance among men, mutual recognition of the dignity of the human individual faith, hope, and charity, the virtues recognized by all Christians and the Fatherhood of God.

This, if I understand the motives and purposes of the exiles of freedom, is the faith you hold. It is the faith for which you have sacrificed and your relatives and friends have suffered and died. It is the faith which binds you together in this organization, an organization which makes a link between the people of America and the people who live behind the Iron Curtain and along its fringes as well. It provides a means by which as individuals we can all carry the message of Christendom to all other individuals with whom we come in contact. No people want war, but wars come. Perhaps it is because leadership has been inadequate to the task of creating the organization that is capable of preserving peace, or individuals, faltering in their faith, have been willing for selfish and temporary gain to make a little genuflection to the Golden Calf.

You and your associates possess the moral fiber which every individual of every nation desiring to be free should possess. Moral fiber can be disseminated throughout the world by the example every believer in the spiritual motivation of mankind can give to those with whom he comes in contact.

The individual who, in this crisis of civilization, falls below the standards of faith in the spiritual concepts of Christendom weakens by that failure the moral fiber of every nation which really loves and wants freedom. Every such individual impairs the capacity of his nation to participate in the struggle of the free world against the evil forces of totalitarian dictatorship that have been released against it, but he who adheres to the spiritual concept of Christian civilization adds to the strength of freemen everywhere.

The character and morality which are cherished in our daily lives, in home life, in business and professional life, the faith we cherish in the bond between man and God, these and these only are the means by which the spirit shall eventually triumph over force.

Organized as you have organized them, men and women living by the faith that is in them can build a barrier of spirit that Communist force can never overcome.

Remarks of Senator Goldwater at Commissioning of U. S. S. "Hassayampa"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] honored the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by his presence at the commissioning of the U. S. S. *Hassayampa*, which is named for a river in the State of Arizona. He delivered a very interesting and able address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER AT THE COMMISSIONING OF THE U. S. S. "HASSAYAMPA," PHILADELPHIA, PA., APRIL 19, 1955

As we gather here this afternoon in sight of one of the landmarks of American history to commission this new ship, you might well wonder about the name that has been chosen. Surely to most of you here as to most people east of the Rockies the name Hassayampa brings nothing quickly to mind except that it is unusual and somewhat hard to spell. There is even serious question in my mind if many of you have ever heard it used before in conversation or have seen it printed in a story or on a map. Consequently, I approach my pleasant assignment this afternoon with mixed feelings—one, that my remarks might be educational to most of you, but, even more dominant, the feeling of humility, in that this name, Hassayampa, is one that every Arizonian knows and of whose history is deeply and rightfully proud.

Hassayampa is the name carried by one of Arizona's few but famous rivers. We are a dry State when measured by the standards of rainfall and moisture; ours is not a State of vast water resources, ours is primarily a desert area. Even our forests, and they are vast and among the largest in the world, are classed as desert forests because there are not many bubbling streams marking their soft carpets nor does one find moss and fern, usually associated with such growths of trees. Natural lakes are few but those we have sparkle with the exuberance of diamonds among the dark green of the pines. It is easy, then, for one to imagine the enthusiasm we Arizonians have for our lakes and for our rivers and, recognizing that, you can imagine how proud we out there were made when it was announced that this fine new ship was to carry the name of *Hassayampa.*

I said that this was a river. Yes, but not just another river. It is a special one, for within its banks flows the water that we need so greatly for our lands, and along its banks has occurred much of the history of this great State.

It is a lonesone river. Its birthplace is in a small canyon high up on the northern slopes of Mount Union, a peak rising over 7,000 feet into Arizona's glorious blue sky. It is fed by springs and by the melting snows of winter and by the sometimes gentle and sometimes violent rains of the summer months. Up high in those mountains, as it flows over rocks and soft sands, it tells a murmuring tale that has lulled me to sleep many a night as I have camped by its side. It tells of the men who first came to its headwaters to mine gold. It tells of the now ghost town of Senator where men gathered as they sought the yellow richness which the Hassayampa carried from ancient rocks. It breathes the wonderful story of nearby Prescott which was the first capital of our State, where our laws were written, where our early government was hewn out of argument and debate by solid American men who saw in this new country a place where their families could be reared in the American tradition. It whispers the stories of men made rich and men made poor and men who were strong and ruthless and men who were strong and peaceful. It is a wonderful story to hear and many and many a time my memory carries me back to the days of youth and to the upper Hassayampa and its bed lined with the pines whose tips touch the sky and go into the heavens to seek God.

But this is not all of this river; it is a lonesome river I have said, but it is also an ambitious one, for it would not die in those peaks, but sought the arid lands below where its waters could do more for men than just provide the carrier for gold. So it left those peaks for the greenness of the lower mountain valleys where the cattle would come to drink of its waters, down past the settlement of Waggoner it went, and then, leaving the cool and vast valleys it ventured out onto the desert floor of southern Arizona where it soon wore its own roadway of sand and rock. Here developed a battle with the sun as to whether or not this stream would carry its load above the earth or whether it would have to go to the coolness and the sureness of traveling beneath its sandy bed. The sun often wins out and for many miles of its travels across the desert one cannot see water but one knows, as generations of desert dwellers have known, that a scooping out of the sand will bring into that bowl cool and abundant water for drinking. In fact, one of the meanings of this famed word has been ascribed to the Indian meaning "water that is hidden." As one crosses this stream at Wickenburg on Highway 60, if one is a stranger, one might wonder why a bridge here at all for here the water is hidden. It is hiding from the ever-present suction of the sun who seeks its cool waters for its own empty daylight skies, but this stream, which is empty, can fill quickly. As the great thunderheads of summer fill their black bellies with the moisture stolen from a thousand lakes and vast oceans and meager streams, and finally disgorge themselves over the homeland of the Hassayampa and its smaller tributaries, this usually docile stream fills to the banks with raging and often damaging water, roaring and tearing its way down its mountainous course, carrying tree and rock before it, out onto the vast desert and past Wickenburg to lose itself finally in the dryness of its lower bed as the sky gives no more.

Wickenburg. This is the one settlement of any size on the banks of this lonely stream, but it is one of the West's most fabulous places. Its history goes back to the beginning of the West and to the swaddling days of our Territory. Just a few months after Arizona became a Territory of the United States, Henry Wickenburg, in 1863, discovered a vast cache of gold that the earth was tenaciously holding in her grasp. The resulting mine became known as the Vulture, and from it man took millions of dollars worth of gold. The mine needed a mill, and the waters of the Hassayampa provided the water to run it. It also furnished the growing town of Wickenburg, named after the obscure miner, with water for its population. The town grew fast, and by 1866 was large enough to have been considered as a site for the Territorial capital. Nearby, other mines were established, the Congress, the Constellation, and the Mack Morris, and all of them added to the new stature of the town of Wickenburg. It was a robust town, peopled by men and women of the hearty nature of our early pioneers. They were happy in this new town, and as the gold started to be exhausted, they did not wish to leave the banks of their friendly river, but sought, instead, new ways to perpetuate their community's prosperity and growth. The railroad came, and with it Wickenburg became a cattle-shipping point. The ranches grew, and so did the town, but then came modern man and his way of life, and the oldness of our western towns began to disappear before the chrome and gilt of newness, but not this place where the West had so long been a part of the daily lives of its people. Here the West stayed, and today it is the guest-ranch capital of the world, a city seen daily by thousands, a city where one finds all the newness of this age, but sees and senses always the true and real spirit of the West. Here, the high-heeled boot is not just part of a uniform, but it joins the large hat and the open shirt in their adornment of people whose "hello" is meaningful and whose "good day" comes from the heart long before it gets out of the mouth. Here it is warm in the winter and warm in the summer, but over all this warmth of nature is felt the warmth of people who, above all else, want to remain just people. Theirs is no desire for tall smokestacks, or the rat-tat-tat of the rivet gun, or the hustle that goes with the change they would rather not have. They know that as long as man lives he will have a desire for peace and quiet and the calm reassurance of real friends. They know that this place on the banks of the river whose name this ship proudly carries can be that Shangri-la, can be a port where men can always come who come in the spirit of the West, seeking happy relations with neighbors who want the same. Wickenburg is the old with just enough of the new thrown in to make life comfortable according to our modern standards. It is the new, with an abundance of the old thrown in so that we can remember the faith and the hope and the spirit which made our West great. And the lonesome Hassayampa flows past it, sometimes under the sand and sometimes over the sand, as it goes on to its eventual union with the Gila River many miles below where the desert has given way to man's conquering march of reclamation.

That is the river whose name you will carry, but the tale cannot end there for the name itself has special significance in the minds of Arizonians. Many tales have come down through the years about the potent characteristics of the waters of the Hassayampa. We aren't quite agreed as to which fable is correct and history has not given us much help, either, in her constant tests. One version of it has it that he who drinks above the trail is ever truthful, while he who drinks below is lost to truth. In fact, some of my fellow Arizonians say that to call a man a Hassayamp is to call him a liar, but as I said, history has not been faithful to that and I have seen many truthful men whose life's liquid came from that stream and I have seen many of the other category who never quaffed its waters. Then there is the little poem of Orick Jackson's that denies a man the right to drink downstream or upstream as his choice for future veracity.

"You've heard about the wondrous stream
they call the Hassayamp.
They say it turns a truthful guy into a
lying scamp.

"And if you quaff its waters once, it's sure
to prove your bane,
You'll never forsake the blasted stream, or
tell the truth again."

This afternoon, as we face this most pleasant task, I have related to you a bit of the history and charm of this river, Hassayampa. I told you that the Indians called it hidden water, but they also construe its ageless name to mean beautiful water and that is the name I want to recall as we dedicate this ship to the useful purposes it will pursue. This bottle of water has been sent here by the people of Wickenburg. I hope it retains a prominent and perpetual spot in the wardroom so that those who sail this ship might be ever mindful of the pride we Arizonians have in that name, and be mindful too of the new pride which we will carry in our hearts as this ship cleaves the oceans of the world. Thus, the waters of the Hassayampa will go around the globe, seeking everywhere an answer to the question that has always been asked about the veracity of those who partook, for you see that answer has never come forth, since only honest men and women, dedicated to the perpetuation of our American way of life have lived along its course. What happened to those who partook and wandered on we do not know, but we do know that through truthfulness, honesty, and devotion to our fine cause our State has grown to great stature and her people to great respect. It is my wish, and I but reflect the wishes of the people of Arizona, that the course of this ship be ever honest, ever true, and that the close association with this great name will bring true at least a line of that poem I read. "You'll never forsake the blasted stream," and I assure you that neither it, nor the State I represent, will ever forsake you.

Proposed Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week former President Harry S. Truman made a statement before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations studying possible

revision of the United Nations Charter. It was a clear, forceful, and very thought-provoking statement. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Truman on the U. N."

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

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

Senator GEORGE, members of the committee, Senators, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to testify before you today. I am grateful to Senator GEORGE for his invitation.

I understand that the subject you have under consideration is the amending of the Charter of the United Nations.

The United Nations is now almost 10 years old. This has been a rough and stormy decade for an organization dedicated to the cause of world peace. Since the Charter was signed in San Francisco, an international situation has developed which in many ways is far more serious, far more dangerous, than the international rivalries which produced World War I and World War II. The present international situation is worse than the one which wrecked the League of Nations and rendered it ineffective. Nevertheless, one of the most significant things about the world situation today is that the United Nations still exists. It is still a functioning body with a powerful influence. In spite of dissatisfactions and dissensions, none of the great powers has withdrawn. Whatever its weakness and difficulties, the United Nations is a power to be reckoned with, and no aggressor can afford to ignore it.

This, in and of itself, is a great achievement. The mere existence of the United Nations after a period of such terrible international tension, is an important and hopeful fact. It demonstrates the tremendous underlying desire of all peoples for international peace.

I will go even further than this. I believe that if we had not had the United Nations, the events of these last 10 years would again have plunged the world into unlimited international warfare. The fact that we have not had such a war is attributable in considerable measure to the existence of the United Nations.

In my judgment, the United Nations is an indispensable force for peace in the world today.

It is true, of course, that the present status of the United Nations does not correspond to the high hopes which were held for it when it was first created. Nevertheless, those of us who helped to set up the United Nations knew that it would have a long and difficult task. We did not go overboard on the assumption that once the charter was signed, world peace was assured forever.

I remember very well the circumstances under which the United Nations was created. The first question that was asked me after I took the oath of office as President at 7:09 p. m. on April 12, 1945, was whether I wanted the San Francisco Conference to open as planned on April 25. I answered at once that nothing should interfere with that conference. It was my firm conviction on that night just 10 years ago that the establishment of the United Nations was absolutely essential to the maintenance of world peace, and I knew that the great majority of the American people felt the same way. I recall my surprise that there should be doubt in anyone's mind about holding the San Francisco meeting to draft the United Nations Charter on schedule.

I soon found out that the eagerness we felt in the United States for the success of the San Francisco Conference was not felt universally. Representatives of the Soviet Union had participated in the preliminary meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, and Stalin had pledged the support of his country to the United Nations at Yalta.

But the victory in Europe now seemed certain, and the Soviet leaders seemed to feel that they could turn their backs on their promises. They implied that the United Nations was not so important after all, and that Foreign Minister Molotov would not attend the San Francisco meeting. This looked to me like a double-barreled challenge: First, would we accept without protest the breaking of an understanding that the Foreign Ministers of the principal powers would attend, and more important, could we permit the Soviets to torpedo the Conference by openly showing a lack of interest?

Just because the end of the war in Europe was in sight I had no intention of ignoring agreements that had been made during the heat of combat. The United Nations idea was too important for the future of mankind to be treated in an on-and-off fashion. I informed Premier Stalin that it was imperative for Foreign Minister Molotov to attend. The Soviet leaders reconsidered, and a few days later I had a rather frank meeting with Mr. Molotov in my office on his way to join the San Francisco Conference.

I explained to him at that time the unshakeable desire of our people for an organization that could effectively solve political problems before they broke into conflict, and that could assist governments to improve the well-being of peoples throughout the world. I expressed these same thoughts in equally vigorous terms to Premier Stalin at Potsdam a few weeks later. Stalin was, I believe, extremely impressed with the overwhelming vote of 89 to 2 by which the United States Senate approved the charter on July 28. He, and many others, apparently had felt that the United States would lose interest in the rest of the world as soon as the fighting was over and would repeat the mistakes made after the First World War.

Speaking as a private citizen, I am very proud that the support for the United Nations, declared so vigorously by the Senate that day in 1945, has been stanchly maintained by both Houses of the Congress ever since then.

We knew at the time the United Nations was created that we were having difficulties with the Soviet leaders and that our difficulties might increase. We were determined, nevertheless, to go ahead with the creation of the United Nations and to get the Soviet Union into it, committed to the principles of international peace which are expressed in the charter. Without such a commitment on their part we believed that the United Nations would not be successful. Looking back now, I think this was the correct course. We were striving to prevent the East-West split which has now become known as the "cold war." We were striving to set up an organization which would bridge the split. Of course, no charter, no constitution can wipe out a power conflict. We must not blame the United Nations for all the bad things that have happened outside the United Nations and in violation of its principles. Soviet membership in the United Nations has been an advantage to the cause of peace, because the peoples of the world have been able to compare the Soviet's conduct to the standards of international peace laid down in the charter and to see that the Soviets have violated the basic ideals of mankind.

When the charter was created at San Francisco, we did not believe that it was perfect. We were surprised that a charter could be agreed upon at all by so many different nations and peoples. In my address to the closing session of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco I said:

"That we now have this charter at all is a great wonder."

I also said:

"This charter, like our own Constitution, will be expanded and improved as time goes on. No one claims that it is now a final or a perfect instrument. It has not been poured into any fixed mold. Changing world conditions will require readjustments, but they will be the readjustments of peace and not of war."

And at that time we clearly left the door open for improvement.

I am sure the charter is susceptible of improvement. That is true of all documents written by human hands. But we ought not to underestimate the difficulties and dangers involved in trying to get improvements at this time. And we ought to be extremely careful not to lose what we already have in the United Nations, because what we have now is very essential to world peace.

We should consider that the circumstances were more favorable to getting agreement out of 50 different nations in 1945 than they are now. Difficult as it was then, and imperfect as the result may have been, it was far easier to set up the United Nations in 1945 than it would be to set it up today.

This was the world situation in June 1945: We were still fighting a world war. We had finished the war in Europe, but a long, bloody struggle appeared to be ahead in the Pacific and in Asia. We did not know how long it would take or how many casualties it would cost. We were just finishing the battle for Okinawa. The great army which the Japanese had on the Continent of Asia was still untouched. The Japanese Air Force, Navy, and land forces were being concentrated for the defense of the Japanese islands. Weakened though they were by our successes in the Pacific, they were still capable of a fanatical defense of their homeland. Secretary Stimson informed me that it could cost 1 million American casualties to take Japan.

All around the world nations were prostrate and exhausted from 4 years of conflict. In this atmosphere of suffering, uncertainty, and continued fighting, the people yearned for peace. Statesmen were under pressure from their peoples to make concessions that would bring peace to the world. Peace and an end to suffering were the universal cry, even on the part of the Russians, whose losses had been among the worst suffered by any nation.

These were the circumstances in which the charter was drawn up and signed. I do not have to point out that it would be much harder to get similar agreements from national leaders in 1955 than it was in 1945. And I respectfully suggest that this is something you should always have in mind when you consider amending the charter today.

We signed the charter at San Francisco with a clear realization that the charter itself was not enough to guarantee world peace. As I said in addressing the closing session of the United Nations Conference, we had created a great instrument for peace and security, but we must now use it.

During the intervening years, we have used the charter, and we have found in it not only defects and inadequacies, but unsuspected resources. We have discovered some virtues which we did not know it possessed.

In spite of the obstruction of the Soviet Union and its satellites, we have had the united will and the firm determination of a great number of nations to make the charter work. And their will for peace has been so strong that they have used the charter in ways not foreseen at San Francisco. For example, let us take the history of the Security Council. On this organ of the United Na-

tions most of the job of keeping the peace was intended to rest. However, the frequent use of the Soviet veto rendered the Security Council virtually powerless to meet any serious international difficulty. Consequently, in 1950, a good deal of the burden of keeping the peace was shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly. This was done without an amendment of the charter but by the so-called "Uniting for Peace" resolution. Under that resolution, the General Assembly undertook to make recommendations for maintaining the peace where the Security Council was paralyzed by the veto.

This was an important change.

The fact that the General Assembly under the charter cannot require action by the member states but can only recommend action, is not so important as it seems. In any critical situation where a nation may be called on to use its armed forces or to apply sanctions, there must be assent. Few nations are going to go into that sort of a situation unless they feel they ought to do it. And a recommendation of the 60 nations, constituting the General Assembly, may be more effective as an expression of world conscience than the command of 11 nations on the Security Council.

I am not saying that the charter would not work better if it were possible for the Security Council to perform the functions that were envisioned for it, but I am saying that the veto power has not made the United Nations powerless to keep the peace.

I do not wish, at this time, to get into the technical problems of amending the charter. I believe that we should think about them. I believe that we should study them. If the majority of the nations desire a review conference, I do not think we should oppose it. I only believe that we should approach it with caution and with full realization that it may be impossible to get any worthwhile changes under present circumstances. If we go into such a conference with inflexible demands for particular changes, we can be sure that we will encounter strong Communist opposition, and there may be strong differences of opinion among the free nations, and the net result of such a clash may be concentration by the peoples of the world on the defects rather than on the virtues of the charter and a weakening of the United Nations just when strength is most needed. This could do very great damage so far as the effectiveness of the United Nations is concerned.

I do, however, think we should practice vigorously the idea expressed at the signing of the charter in 1945—the idea that we must use the United Nations to make it work. Wherever we can, we should use it. And we should use it now by bringing before the General Assembly the current threats to world peace.

Aside from questions of aggression and armed conflict, there is another wide area in which we should use the United Nations to the utmost—that is the area of social and economic betterment and progress.

An outstanding feature of the charter is the emphasis it puts upon international cooperation to promote higher living standards, full employment, and economic and social progress. One of the most important parts of the United Nations is the Economic and Social Council. This council has the responsibility for promoting international cooperation in the economic and social field, and for coordinating the work of the other international agencies specializing in particular fields of work, such as health, agriculture, and communications.

One of the reasons for the world crisis we are living through is the tremendous upheaval—in social and economic terms—among the peoples of the poorer or less developed parts of the world. Most of these peoples have lived for centuries very close to the margin of existence, with little hope for progress or improvement this side of the grave. In the last hundred years two tremendous things have happened to them. Contact with the highly developed nations has shown them that other peoples can overcome poverty and misery—that progress and improvement are human possibilities. The growth of population, however, has tended to make them even worse off than they have been. Added to these factors, the spread of Western political ideas has given them an irresistible desire to be free and self-governing. The upheaval resulting from these changes has remade the face of Asia in our lifetime, and it is now changing the face of Africa.

We want to see these peoples advance and prosper. For many decades now, through our humanitarian institutions, we have extended a helping hand to the peoples of the less developed countries.

Today, we should realize that no force on earth can restore the old pattern in Asia and Africa. We cannot put the rising flood of human aspirations back into the ancient channels.

We can, however, help it to achieve its goals. And that will be to the advantage of the United States as well as to mankind as a whole.

This was what I had in mind when I proposed a program of assisting underdeveloped areas as the fourth point in my inaugural address in 1949. And this same concept of assistance on the path of progress underlies the economic and social activities of the United Nations.

In the years since 1945, nothing has happened to make economic development and technical assistance less important. Indeed, I think they are more important to world peace now than they were then. We should be doing more in the economic and social area than we are doing. We should stand, in the minds of other peoples, for the concept of orderly and rapid social and economic progress.

In this field, we have the answer to communism. In know-how, in the raising of living standards, in economic development, we can beat the Communists from the start. There is no atomic stalemate, no military standoff in this part of the struggle against communism. We ought to sustain a really significant program of aid in the economic development of Asia and Africa and Latin America. While we must, of course, continue our military programs for our defense and the defense of the free world, a vigorous program of economic development may, in the long run, prove to be more decisive.

In this effort the United Nations, with its economic and social organs and the specialized agencies, can be a great help. Providing technical and economic aid through international agencies offers difficulties in administration and often presents irritating problems. But an international agency sometimes can do things that direct United States aid cannot. The Soviets, in their propaganda, are trying to discredit our aid programs as an imperialist plot. But that kind of propaganda cannot be raised against the United Nations. Very often the governments of the underdeveloped areas are highly sensitive, and will accept U. N. help when they would reject United States aid. The question of who gets the credit is much less important than the need of the underdeveloped nations to get ahead, and to relieve the terrible social pressures that are pushing them toward revolution or communism.

We should, therefore, encourage the United Nations and the specialized agencies, in their economic and social activities, and support them fully. Wherever they can reach the poor and the suffering better than the United States Government can, we should encourage them to do so. I hope we will not cut the United Nations technical assistance program this year.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I urge you to continue to give your strong support to the United Nations. It is helping to build up international understanding and friendship among people by the nations working together on economic and social problems. It serves as a conscience for mankind. More than once it has kept the peace where a serious outbreak threatened—as it did in Iran and in Indonesia. And in the fateful summer of 1950, when the aggressor broke the peace of the world in Korea, the United Nations met the challenge. For the first time in history, an international organization organized effective collective resistance to armed aggression. This is the great lesson of Korea.

I'm sure the United Nations can be improved upon. If we continue to give it our firm support, I'm sure it will be improved upon. But let us be everlastingly careful not to throw away the good and great instrument we already have in a search for something better.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

TRUMAN ON THE U. N.

Former President Truman talked with restraint and good sense about the role of the United Nations in the present world situation and about the problem of revising the U. N. Charter. He took note of the many weaknesses and imperfections in the charter and expressed the wish that the United Nations could be a much stronger instrument than it is for putting down aggression and maintaining peace. But this did not blur his appreciation of what the U. N., with its limited powers, has been able to accomplish.

The complaint most often heard against the United Nations is that it has been rendered powerless by the Soviet veto in the Security Council. Consequently, there is much demand for abolition of the big-power veto. Mr. Truman was realistic in saying that the U. N. would never have come into being without the veto. Neither Russia nor the United States would have accepted a charter without the reserve power the veto provision gives. It follows that talk of abolishing the veto is so much wasted breath. Mr. Truman pointed out that it would be more difficult to secure agreement on the charter today than it was in 1945. We do not think there is a chance that the Senate would agree to an amendment that would permit the Security Council to order military action against an aggressor without specific acquiescence of this Government.

However, the veto ought to be eliminated in regard to the admission of new members, and that should not be impossible of attainment. Also, numerous improvements in the U. N. can be made by strengthening the capacity of the General Assembly to act against threats of aggression when the Security Council is moribund, as at present. The fact that the Assembly has to act through recommendations and consent of a majority of its members is not an insurmountable handicap, as the experience in Korea proved. If there is a will among the law-abiding nations to act against aggression, they can do so through the Assembly under the uniting for peace resolution. This line of development within the U. N. ought to have every encouragement.

While moving toward improvements of this sort, Mr. Truman cautions us "not to throw away the good and great instrument we have in search for something better." This is sound advice. And the best means of upholding and strengthening the United Nations is to make it a positive force for peace and to invoke its powers as effectively as possible whenever there is a threat of coercion by armed force.

The Postmaster General's Disregard for the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, because the Members of this honorable body are today considering H. R. 4644, a measure which gives the Postmaster General unusually broad authority to reclassify Post Office Department employees, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring to the attention of the House certain circumstances that cause me a considerable amount of misgiving in supporting such legislation. Despite the recent vehement protests by the Postmaster General before congressional committees that political considerations do not enter into his administration of personnel matters and his assertion that there is less politics in the postal service today than at any other time in history, I find it most difficult to reconcile his statements with the facts I am presenting to you. They convince me the Postmaster General has utterly disregarded the law.

If ever political consideration and connivance have entered into the appointment of a postmaster—or rather the failure to appoint one—the record with regard to Portales, N. Mex., stands out as a shameful example.

The postmaster at Portales retired on April 30, 1953. An acting postmaster was named and an open competitive examination was called, with the closing date set for August 11. On December 18, 1953, a register of three eligibles, all with 10 percent disabled veterans' preference, was sent by the Civil Service Commission to the Post Office Department. After a delay of 6 months, during which the Postmaster General made no appointment, the examination was reopened on June 16, 1954, at the request, according to civil-service records, of six applicants who claimed to be disabled veterans. Three cf them took the reopened test. Three others failed to prove eligibility as disabled veterans. Two of the three who took the test were held ineligible for lack of required experience. The other, who had not taken the first examination, flunked the reopened test.

On October 5, 1954, the identical register of eligibles that had been sent to the Post Office Department on December 18, 1953, was sent again by the Civil Service Commission. Again no appointment was made by the Postmaster General, although all of the eligibles were disabled veterans, with passing marks of 87.5 up to 97.25 percent, and, further, notwithstanding the requirement of law that there be no delay in postmaster appointment.

On January 24, 1955, nearly 4 months after the second register was in the Postmaster General's hands and more than 13 months after he had received the identical first register, no appointive action had been taken by him. Strangely enough, neither the officials in the Post Office Department nor in Civil Service would tell why the second long delay, although frequent reguests were made by my office for an explanation. The answer came, however, in the form of a telegram from the man who had flunked the first reopened test, requesting a second reopening, so the register of eligibles was sent back to Civil Service on January 26, 1955.

The man who flunked the first reopened test again failed to make the required grade in the second reopened examination with the result that the original list of eligibles, carrying the names of the same three disabled veterans, has been returned again to the Post Office Department by the Civil Service Commission. Yet no action has been taken because, as was explained to me by the Post Office officials, "we are waiting for recommendation from the Republican National Committeeman in New Mexico." They have been waiting for 1½ years. The Portales post office has had no duly appointed postmaster for 2 years. The people of Portales have been denied the service that can be rendered only by an administrative authority which has permanency of tenure. Officials of veterans' organizations in New Mexico have protested strongly about this discrimination against three disabled veterans who are entitled to preference under our law.

Not only has the Postmaster General given his sanction to this gross violation of the Veterans' Preference Act but he has ignored the mandate of Congress as contained in the law concerning appointment of postmasters, which states that they shall be appointed without undue delay.

The Postmaster General cannot plead ignorance of this willful disregard for the law and the rights of these disabled veterans because I discussed the Portales situation with him 3 months ago. At that time he said he would conduct an inquiry into the matter and advise me. To date I have not heard further from him. I can only assume that by his silence he is seeking to cover up his willful maladministration. If it is to be his continued policy to play politics at the expense of disabled veterans and of proper administration of post offices under his direction why does he not come out openly and say so?

Not only should we safeguard the provisions of H. R. 4644 with regard to classification of employees by a proper amendment to require the Postmaster General to give the Congress detailed reports of the actions he takes, but I believe we should go further and authorize a thorough investigation by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of such apparent law violations as are indicated in the situation at Portales.

It is evident that the Postmaster General feels that he is above the law, that he has dictatorial authority over his Department. He has indicated that by his take it or leave it attitude in appearing before congressional committees with regard to this legislation, particularly in respect to the pay increase of postal employees. Therefore I feel that it behooves us to see to it that the Congress retains sufficient control over the administration of the Post Office Department to prevent further disregard for its mandate as expressed in the law. The rights which we have provided for veterans, particularly the disabled, should be fully safeguarded. It is manifestly our duty to see that they are.

Prof. Norman Neal: Fighting Badger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call attention to a situation that existed in our Foreign Operations Administration and its predecessor for some time, which resulted in a waste of American taxpayers' money and unfair dealing with some of our friends abroad. At the same time, I would like to pay public tribute to an intrepid professor of agronomy at the University of Wisconsin who battled bureaucracy, refused to be strangled by Government redtape, and almost single-handedly brought about a correction of the unsatisfactory situation previously existing.

That man is Prof. Norman P. Neal, of Madison, Wis. It has been my pleasure to work with him and help him in a small way in this task. Others who have assisted have included Dean Rudolph K. Froker, of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture, as a member of the Commodity Credit Corporation advisory committee, and Raymond H. Lang, head of the nationally known seed company in Madison, Wis. But the rest of us have sort of run interference for Professor Neal; he carried the ball over the goal line.

For some years Wisconsin has pioneered in the development of hybrid seed corn and its varieties have won international recognition. Wisconsin experiment stations have cooperated with a number of our friendly European nations since 1947 in efforts to help them establish satisfactory corn stocks.

In the past few years, the University of Wisconsin exported to Italy parental foundation inbred and single cross seed valued in excess of $25,000 to facilitate production of hybrid seed of Wisconsin varieties in that country. Notable progress has been registered.

In addition to Italy, Wisconsin has furnished a very substantial volume of both breeding stocks and parental foundation seed stocks to The Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal and Greece.

In 1954, I received complaints that through American funds supplied by FOA, another European country was importing Wisconsin hybrid seed corn under very questionable circumstances. The corn was not raised in Wisconsin, was not certified as being Wisconsin hybird seed corn, and was being purchased for a little over $2 a bushel, whereas true Wisconsin hybrid seed corn was selling for $9 to $12 per bushel.

Agriculture officials in our State notified me that in their opinion there was not sufficient true Wisconsin hybrid seed corn raised outside Wisconsin to supply a 64,000 bushel order. They pointed out that one bidder offered to supply 600 bushels of a certain Wisconsin variety whereas only 26 acres of that variety had been raised in all of Wisconsin.

"It was reported that one of the suppliers from outside Wisconsin who furnished seed for export actually sold a mixture of all of his reject seed from all varieties," Professor Neal wrote me. "I am firm in the conviction that if the United States Government is financing the purchase of hybrid seed corn for export, it should do so only on the basis for seed that complies in respect to varietal purity. If such seed is not worth planting in this country, it is not worth planting elsewhere. It not only is an injustice to the farmers of the importing country, but also is a shameful squandering of American taxpayers' money, as well as a travesty of the American sense of fair play and America's equity in world affairs."

From my investigations in Washington, I learned that seed corn FOA was sending to Europe in 1953 and 1954 was inspected only to determine if it would germinate, if it had been treated for disease, and was free of weeds. The only assurance FOA had that the European country was receiving its requested Wisconsin hybrid seed corn was the supplier's statement that it corresponded to Wisconsin types.

The amazing thing about all this to me was the attitude generally expressed by FOA officials: "What is the difference, as long as no one is kicking about it?" One Washington official sought to dismiss the matter with the statement that "the supplier is happy, the buyer is not complaining, and the only people making any complaint are you folks in Wisconsin."

Eventually, however, complaints began to be heard, reports from FOA inspections in Europe were not so favorable, and the European buyers began to demand that they get what they requested, even though the money was coming from Uncle Sam.

"Because of the significant role that Wisconsin hybrids have played in the past, and now play in European corn culture, we feel keenly the existence of practices that, in our judgment, prejudice not only the reputation of Wisconsin corn hybrids, but even more importantly, the prime objectives that are basic to the very existence and purposes of the Foreign Operations Administration," Professor Neal wrote me last year.

This year, there is a different story to tell. European nations in their specifications have been requiring official certification, tagging and sealing of the seeds. In consequence, a substantial portion of the seed order has been filled in Wisconsin, and the buyers may be certain that they are getting Wisconsin hybrid seed, and not feed corn corresponding to Wisconsin types. Wisconsin growers assure me they are sending only first class seeds to their farmer friends in Europe. There seems no question that better crops will follow, and our friends abroad will have a better opinion of Uncle Sam's agriculture as a result, thanks to Professor Norman Neal of the University of Wisconsin.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours of February 17, 1955, this Nation lost a distinguished and intrepid soldier, statesman, and diplomat. I lost a dear and valued friend with whom I had the honor of serving in Congress from 1938 to 1949.

Pete Jarman left behind a record of accomplishment which time and age shall never dull, which shall always remain prominently in the memory of those who knew and loved him.

Pete served as a lieutenant in the First World War in France with distinction and honor. He fought courageously for the honor and ideals of his country, and until his death he sustained a deep and active interest in military affairs, ever mindful of the continuing need of a strong United States in the face of alien threats to its security. From 1924 to 1940, he served as division inspector of the 31st Infantry Division, and in 1927 was elected commander of the Alabama Department of the American Legion.

This great American came to Washington in 1937 as a Member of the 75th Congress. Immediately he distinguished himself as a statesman of peerless courage and sagacious foresight, as a faithful representative of the interests of his people in the Sixth Alabama Congressional District. As his colleague I had the privilege on numerous occasions of observing and admiring his tireless and conscientious endeavor in the interests of his district, State, and country.

In 1949 Pete was named United States Ambassador to Australia. As a friend and former colleague who was personally acquainted with his ability and convictions, I regarded this appointment as one of significant wisdom and foresight. And most assuredly my confidence and expectations were never blunted. I doubt that the United States has ever before enjoyed the position and prestige in Australia as that manifested during Pete's ambassadorship.

From various and sundry sources, the appraisal of Peter's attainments as Ambassador to Australia was the same—outstanding. In this connection, I was told by Dr. Bob Jones, founder of the Bob Jones University in Greenville, S. C., that on one of his evangelistic trips to Australia he was profoundly impressed everywhere he went in that country by the reception of Government officials and people in all walks of life to Pete's representation of the United States. Dr. Jones was very high in his praise of Pete's achievements in this foreign land.

Yet Pete left behind more than the memory of his warm friendship and dedicated service to his country. Pete left behind a person who was always at his side in spirit and faith and inspiration. The union of Pete and Miss Beryl Bricken, lovely daughter of the late Honorable Charles Bricken, presiding judge of the Alabama Court of Appeals, was as formidable as their equally shared ideals and aspirations. Pete and Beryl constituted a partnership that never deviated from their individually elected roles as public servants and ministers of the American way of life.

Soldier, statesman, and diplomat, Pete Jarman was laid to rest in the Arlington National Cemetery with military honors. As the last reverberations of the volleys fired at his graveside spent themselves in the far-reaches of that hallowed ground, I am sure that those in attendance felt that Pete had come to rest among friends. He is now with the other soldiers and great Americans who have given their very best for their country.

Japanese Rice Negotiations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend our Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, for standing firm against the dictates of our State Department in the matter of the Japanese rice negotiations. I am informed that at a meeting of the Council on Foreign and Economic Policy yesterday the views of Mr. Benson prevailed and under these negotiations some 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice will be released to the Government of Japan under the provisions of Public Law 480.

These objections in the past on the part of the Department of State have created grave apprehension in the ranks of agriculture. There have been rumors that the Department of State has concluded agreements with certain Asian nations pledging that we would not seek markets in southeast Asia and that we will subvert the intent of the Congress of the United States when we enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, known as Public Law 480.

The specific action of the State Department in opposing sales of rice under Public Law 480 in the southeast Asia markets gives credence to these rumors. The views of the Department of State in this instance would deprive our American rice industry of a market that contains one-half of the world's population and constitutes the greatest rice market of all time.

If the State Department can make such agreements and the Congress does not protest and take action to curb the Department's power, we may see other agreements made depriving us of the

opportunities and privileges of selling our goods in world markets.

Mr. Speaker, even with the release to the Japanese Government of this 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice, there will still be a total supply of 15 million hundredweight available for export. We cannot deny this rice to world markets—especially the great southeastern Asian market, where rice has been the staple for centuries. We cannot limit our trading activities at the will and demand of the Secretary of State. For such an action would destroy our American rice industry.

Such an action in one commodity can lead only to similar actions on other commodities—and we would soon see the destruction of our agricultural economy—and with it, the collapse of our Nation's strength.

If the Department of State succeeds in keeping our rice out of far-eastern markets, it may just as well put on a campaign against export of cotton, tobacco, and wheat in various parts of the globe.

A few days ago a great outcry was raised because the Secretary of State fired one man. This action on the part of the State Department has the effect of depriving untold thousands of families in the United States of their jobs—because just as surely as this policy of the State Department is permitted to prevail then we will see the end of the American rice industry as we see it today. We have already suffered drastic cutbacks in rice acreage across the Nation—and this action on the part of Mr. Dulles and his nonagricultural experts in the Department of State would make it necessary to further reduce rice acreages by a large percentage in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed appeasement throughout the time that I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. I do not believe in appeasement. Nor do I favor this policy of the Department of State, which is, in my humble opinion, nothing more than economic appeasement.

Reciprocal trade, a bulwark of our American foreign policy, cannot be a fact if our Department of State, in the secrecy of negotiations, gives away our export markets and exerts veto powers over actions of other branches of our Federal Government seeking to implement Public Law 480.

Back in September the President issued an Executive order stating it to be the policy of the United States to dispose of our surplus agricultural commodities on a competitive world market. Yet, for some reason, the Department of State, while recognizing this order, seeks to restrain agreements under Public Law 480 and speaks belittingly of "subsidized sales."

Mr. Speaker, there has been introduced in the House H. R. 5568 which would pin down the intent of the Congress in reference to Public Law 480 and would prevent the Secretary of State from exerting such veto powers. I favor this bill and I urge the Congress to take speedy action in adopting this bill to protect our agricultural families and to keep open the channels of world trade.

I wish to commend again the firmness of our Secretary of Agriculture. He has done a valiant work to save markets for our agricultural commodities. I trust that he will continue to stand firm, and I do hope that next week when the Dodge committee meets again that they will heed the intent of the Congress and refuse to permit the Secretary of State to give away our export markets and disrupt our domestic agriculture.

H. R. 5115

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] recently introduced H. R. 5115, to prohibit the disposal by contract or Executive order of work traditionally performed by civilian components of the Department of Defense unless it can be proven that the disposal is economically sound and that it will not endanger our national security.

This measure interested me, Mr. Speaker, because I have received protests in connection with the curtailment of certain types of activities performed by the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in the legislative district I have the privilege of representing. I am sure other Members of Congress have had similar protests.

On receiving these protests I made appropriate inquiries and was advised it was the policy of the Department of Defense to foster free competitive enterprise and to avoid the use of Government-owned and operated commercial and industrial type facilities. I was further advised that pursuant to this policy, the Navy had issued directives providing for study of such activities in our naval shipyards.

The criteria to be used in eliminating any Government operation I was informed would be on the following basis:

The necessity for meeting the military demand at all times without delay, particularly where abnormal or fluctuating military demand makes private sources or operation impractical to the extent that the current or mobilization need cannot be met.

The absence of private facilities of sufficient capacity located within a reasonable distance from the point of demand.

The need for maintaining facilities for the training of personnel (for operation in a zone of action or advance base or overseas operations where commercial facilities will not be available) where an organized training program for the type of skills involved, specifically requires the use of the facility in question.

The danger of compromising information which would aid potential or known enemies, or which would otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States, where adequate provision can be made only through Government operation.

Any other criterion demonstrating a particular Government operation to be in the public interest.

In compliance with these directives, and based upon the criteria set forth therein, the laundry services at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard have been discontinued, box and crate manufacture has been curtailed, and the office machine repair shop will be closed, effective June 15, 1955. In addition, studies are presently being undertaken to determine the desirability of continuing the acetylene, oxygen and nitrogen plants, the automotive repair shop, the tree and garden nurseries, and the photographic equipment and chronometer repair facilities.

The Navy assured me that implementation of the above-mentioned policy is being carried out with due regard to the importance of maintaining our naval shipyards in a condition of readiness to accomplish their appointed tasks both now and in the event of a future national emergency.

The Navy further assured me that when services or the manufacturing of items required at Puget Sound are curtailed in the shipyard, these items and services will be contracted for with local private firms when practicable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out one glaring omission in the criteria which I just recited as having been given me by the Navy, which is covered by H. R. 5115; namely, the transfer of work to a private contractor would have to be economically sound. Efficiency and economy require the integration of many operations. Some of these may be such that individually they could be performed by private contractors outside of Government property, but it seems to me, if you are going to follow the Navy's criteria, the net result could greatly increase cost and reduce efficiency. Take automobile repair as a case in point. In a Government garage work can be performed when cars are not in use. This cuts down on the total number of automobiles required; also, by upkeep and preventive attention, the overall repair cost is greatly reduced.

I do not want to appear in the position of opposing competitive free enterprise. After all, I have supported elimination of costly barge lines and other Government operations directly competitive with private enterprise and costing the taxpayers vast sums of money. But I think Congress should watch our purse strings and be sure the Department of Defense is not going off on an ideological spree. I hope the Armed Services Committee will take a careful look at this whole matter.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMOND CHATHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of another Pan-American Day I again want to assure our friends south of us in this hemisphere that we are

bound by ties more solid, more sincere, and more understanding than ever before. We form a great bloc of free nations under God, and with God's help we will go forward together for better lives and all those things that mean peace and prosperity under a Christian system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my personal tribute to Rev. Joseph F. Thorning for his unceasing work to further cement our relations with our southern neighbors. He is always in the forefront of every movement that tends toward closer cooperation, and how fortunate we are to have such a man giving of his time and talents to this most worthy cause.

The Anniversary of Bataan Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year in 1942 a battle was raging in the Philippines. In both American and Philippine history the defense of Bataan will long be remembered, not only as a chapter in the story of man's struggle against tyranny but as a crowning testimonial to the historic friendship between Americans and Filipinos. Today the government and citizens of the Philippines are meeting the challenges which confront their independent republic with that same courage demonstrated on the battlefield at Bataan.

We in the United States are prone to look upon the Philippines somewhat as a father looks upon a son who has grown into manhood. While recognizing the maturity and independence of the Philippines, we retain those bonds of amity which have their foundation in a tradition of close association of our peoples. We take pride in the fearless energy with which President Ramon Magsaysay and his government act in the welfare of the new republic.

In our relations since Philippine independence was proclaimed in 1946 there has been evident a spirit of cooperation both in achieving the domestic aims of the Philippine Government and in jointly supporting the aims of the free world in Asia.

In the forefront of the problems with which the new Republic has been confronted have been those relating to the Philippine economy. There has been the need for rehabilitation and reconstruction in the wake of the damage inflicted by the war. There have been a myriad of economic and financial problems which are closely related to independence itself and to the withdrawal of the United States. There have been problems related to the general economic development of the Philippines including the expansion of light industry. Perhaps at the very heart of these complexities has been the haunting question of the ultimate effect of independence upon Philippine trade, a trade based upon the export of Philippine sugar, hemp, hardwood, and other products to the United States on a preferential tariff basis.

The United States did not leave the Philippines to cope alone with these economic problems. Since independence it has offered its economic assistance. Among other measures taken, it has been considered in the best interest of the two countries that a tariff not be imposed on imports from the Philippines. We have recognized that both countries benefit directly from this trade and, in the larger view, that the building of a strong Philippines is in the interest of the United States and the free world.

In addition to its economic development, the Philippine Republic since independence has made great gains in the development of its political institutions and in further enhancing the public welfare. A Communist-inspired rebellion has been dissipated by the combined use of force and such constructive measures as homestead grants and land reforms. The firm alinement of the Philippines with the countries of the free world is reflected in the initiative taken in the development of the Manila Pact for the collective defense of Southeast Asia and in the Pacific Charter.

The people of the Philippine Islands are building a democracy in the Pacific. They are facing their present difficulties with vigor and courage—the same qualities they manifested in such a conspicuous manner 13 years ago in the defense of Bataan.

Price Support and the Wisconsin Dairyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each week there arrives in my office, as in the offices of other legislators, a great variety of daily and weekly newspapers from my State.

One such newspaper is the Sharon Reporter, published weekly in Walworth County, Wis.

On the front page of its most recent issue, it carried the grim story of an aroused meeting of grassroots dairy farmers who had, in my judgment, very rightly assembled to protest the inadequate return which our farmers are getting for milk. Some 400 to 500 farmers crowded the local grange hall to talk over their problems and to try to get some action upon them.

The farmers pointed out that in the last 3 years their milk returns have dropped $1.50 per hundredweight, and that right now Wisconsin dairymen are receiving only approximately $3.25 per hundredweight, which is less than 7 cents a quart. That is certainly a meager return for the farmer's labor—7 days a week, 52 weeks a year—and for his heavy investment in cattle, machinery, and buildings.

These facts point up problems which I, for one, have raised on the Senate floor time and time again, and which I have reviewed in detail with the Department of Agriculture and other Federal authorities.

I congratulate the farmers of the Sharon area for taking steps to secure justice for the great dairy segment of our economy, and I pledge my own continued efforts toward that objective.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial which was carried in the April 14 issue of the Sharon Reporter which described this grassroots meeting. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE FARMER IS UNHAPPY ABOUT HIS PRICE FOR MILK

The price being paid the farmer in the Chicago milkshed for his milk is the most important matter in his mind at this time. One must admit as much, after witnessing the assembly at Grange Hall last Tuesday night.

To bring 420 farmers out to an 8 p. m. meeting, after they had worked in the fields all the day, is a Herculean feat. But the "protesting farmers" announcement of a meeting to discuss the matter on a real grassroots level did just that.

It took county sheriff's deputies to handle the traffic; there were cars parked almost a mile on either side of the hall. One farmer told us, "I parked my car a mile away, walked to the hall, then couldn't get in." The writer had trouble edging his way through the packed hall to a position where he could get within camera range.

"Keep farm organizations out of this," Mike Dorocke, who did much of the speaking said. "We aren't here for the purpose of battling them. We want, instead, to do what we can as producers to get a more equitable share of what the consumer pays for fresh milk in the Chicago market area."

There was ample opportunity for all to be heard. At times it was hard to hear, and a tap of the gavel from the chairman was necessary to maintain order. But this was the real "grassroots"—these were not polished organizers who had called this meeting to order.

W. T. Carlson of Walworth presented a letter from Colorado's Department of Agriculture to prove that dairymen in the Loveland-Greeley-Longmont area get only $1.42 for grade-A milk—and their farms are worth $200 to $400 per acre. "Things could even get that bad," he said.

There was a definite majority of those present who believe the lawmakers in Washington can help to improve the local milk price situation. Of course some spoke openly in opposition of "going to Washington for help," but the assembly returned to the majority desire to do just that.

So they distributed mimeographed letters. These are to be signed by producers and members of their family and mailed to their Senators and Congressmen. "We want no handouts, but demand a decent livelihood," they say in part. "We will fight through the ballot box for our rights and justice."

If nothing more were to come of the meeting, the very fact that 420 turned out should stir all those concerned with dairying to the point of doing whatever is humanly possible to get the milk producer his fair share of the retail price.

But more may come soon from this meeting. There was a committee of producers formed—farmers from Sharon, Elkhorn, Clinton, Delavan, Harvard, Capron, and Alden. This committee will determine to keep the ball rolling—to carry the fight for a fairer share of the consumer's milk dollar along, until they feel the results of their fight in the milk checks.

Pan-American Day and Hemispheric Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1890, was a historic day, for it marks the inauguration of what we know today as the Pan American Union. On Pan-American Day, as indeed on every other day in the year, the American Republics can be proud of the conception of pan-Americanism. Under it we demonstrate to the world that different cultural traditions can join in common cooperation, that 21 sovereign nations can respect each other's rights.

If pan-Americanism has been a success, this has been due in no small measure to the work over the years of the Pan American Union.

The pan-American idea derived its inspiration from the vision of Simon Bolivar, the Liberator, and from our own statesman, Henry Clay. Active American participation dates from 1890, when the first International Conference of American States was held here at Washington, under the able leadership of Secretary of State Blaine. As a result of that conference an International Union of American Republics was created, represented by a Commercial Bureau located in Washington. The name, Commercial Bureau, reflects the purposes of this early organization. It was not a political union; rather its purpose was the promotion of friendship and good relations among the republics of the American Continent, through the fostering of trade. In 1902 the Commercial Bureau was renamed the International Bureau of American Republics, and the scope of its activities was broadened. Finally, in 1910 the name of the Bureau was changed to the Pan American Union, which came in time to be the popular name for the broader Union of American Republics, of which the Pan American Union was but the agent.

As the popular embodiment of pan-Americanism, the Pan American Union was a most useful center of information on all topics of concern to the nations and peoples of this hemisphere. It provided import and export data, and general commercial information. It stimulated the exchange of students and professors, and promoted closer cultural relations among the member republics. While perhaps undramatic, these activities have contributed materially to the growth of hemispheric solidarity.

In 1948, the Union of American Republics was reorganized at the Bogotá Conference into the Organization of American States. The Pan American Union was designated as the central, permanent organ of the new organization. In this capacity it serves as the general secretariat for the Organization, and is thus of crucial significance to the efficient functioning of the Organization as a whole. Inasmuch as the United States bases its policy in this hemisphere on cooperation through the Organization of American States, the Pan American Union is of great significance for our policy as well. The mutual interests of all American states are bound up in its program and its operations.

Today the Pan American Union still serves as a center for the exchange of information and as the means by which individuals and private groups can become most directly apprised of the activities of the Organization of American States. It carries on the work assigned to it by the decisions of the various conferences and conventions of American Republics. Finally, and perhaps, of greatest importance today, is its work, together with other organs of the Organization of American States, in sponsoring programs of technical cooperation.

It is in such basic and vital activities as these that the Pan American Union is continuing today, as in the past, to serve the highest interests of world peace and progress.

A Bill To Amend Section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to deduction of trade or business expenses.

This bill is a companion measure to a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM PURTELL, of Connecticut.

The purpose of this bill is to permit nonprofit economic development corporations in depressed areas to charge stepped-up rent for a period of the first 5 years adequate to pay off borrowed money and interest, and permit the renting corporation to deduct such stepped-up rent in the determination of taxable income during those 5 years.

This measure will be of great assistance to depressed areas in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England. It will bring new industry into our community and will ultimately provide employment and generally stimulate our economy.

The bill which I have introduced reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 162 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of trade or business expenses) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For purposes of paragraph (3), in the case of a lease of property (A) which is owned by an organization described in section 501 (c) (4) (relating to civic leagues or organizations for promotion of social welfare) which is exempt from taxation under section 501 (a), and (B) which is subject to a mortgage or other lien securing indebtedness incurred in the acquisition or improvement of such property, such rentals or other payments may, during the term of such mortgage or other similar lien (if such term is not less than 5 years and ends on or prior to the date of termination of the lease as fixed therein), be in annual amounts sufficient to discharge such indebtedness at the end of such term, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective wtih respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954.

Mental Hospital Facilities in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska to treat the mentally ill in the Territory is imperative. The population of Alaska has boomed, with nearly 180,000 people reported in our northern Territory.

At the present time Alaska mental patients are transported thousands of miles from their homes to a privately operated hospital in Portland, Oreg. At the same time mental patients are forced to undergo confinement, frequently in outmoded territorial jails, while awaiting transportation to Portland. Commitment procedures are archaic and outmoded.

To meet the important need for mental facilities in Alaska, I have introduced Senate bills 1027 and 1028. Congresswoman EDITH S. GREEN has introduced identical bills in the House of Representatives.

I am very pleased to learn of the reported general support Secretary of the Interior McKay has given these bills, and I am especially pleased by the support afforded my bills in the city of Portland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the columns of the Oregon Journal for April 12, 1955, which supports the immediate need for mental hospital facilities in Alaska and for urgent overhauling of outmoded commitment procedures.

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

ALASKA NEEDS OWN MENTAL HOSPITAL

In general, we support Senator NEUBERGER'S two bills (S. 1027 and S. 1028) to provide mental hospital facilities for Alaska in Alaska and for modernizing Alaska's obsolete commitment and treatment laws. And so does his stanch political foe, Secretary of the Interior McKay.

Since 1904 mentally ill patients from Alaska have been sent to Morningside Hospital in Portland, a privately owned and operated facility, for care and treatment. And while this hospital has an excellent reputation, it is generally conceded that Alaska has long since reached the point where it is entitled to its own mental hospital facilities.

It also is conceded by health authorities in the Territory and in the States, including the director of Morningside, that Alaska's commitment procedures are "archaic and extremely inhumane."

Thus these bills, sponsored in the House by Representative GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, attack both these problems simultaneously.

One of the problems, naturally, is that of cost, for both the construction of mental hospital facilities for outpatient and inpatient treatment, and for modernizing Alaskan commitment procedures.

But Secretary McKay suggests an answer: Annual Federal grants on a declining scale for the interim period; expenditure of $6,500,000 over a 10-year period for construction of facilities, and transfer to the Territory of 500,000 acres of public lands, including mineral rights, from which Territorial mental hospital costs could be paid. Senator NEUBERGER's hospital-construction bill merely provides for the appropriation of "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." S. 1028 also suggests that Alaska eventually should assume responsibility for its own mental hospital program.

Based on our own observation of the handling and care of Alaska's mentally ill patients, some such program is imperative. The ordeal disturbed patients have been forced to go through while awaiting transfer to Portland—including incarceration in cramped and obsolete Territorial jails like ordinary criminals—is harrowing indeed.

That is one procedure S. 1028 would prohibit. Section 14 provides that persons ordered hospitalized in Alaska may be held in a local hospital or foster home or other suitable facility pending commitment, "but he shall not, except because of and during an extreme emergency, be detained in a nonmedical facility used for the detention of persons charged with or convicted of penal offenses."

In his speech before the Portland City Club the other day, Senator NEUBERGER predicted that if Secretary McKay would support his bills they would pass. Now that McKay appears to have done so, the chances of approval are at least good.

It's about time.

A Tribute to the Late William S. Jacobsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the late William S. Jacobsen, of Clinton, Iowa, former Congressman from Iowa's Second District. As a constituent of his for 6 years, I came to know and respect the fine example of leadership my Congressman upheld in the Halls of Congress.

Iowa and the Nation suffered a great loss in the death, on Sunday a week ago, of William S. Jacobsen, of Clinton, Iowa. Davenport and Scott County will always remember with gratitude the faithful services rendered by Representative Jacobsen, for 6 years, from 1937 through 1942. Scott County during that period was included in the old Second District of Iowa, and William S. Jacobsen gave wholehearted and capable service to all his constituents, following the splendid example set by his father, Bernhard Martin Jacobsen, who had represented the same district from 1931 to his sudden death in 1936. These were Democrats, both with the large and with the small "d." In national affairs, and in local affairs, they held to the tradition of rising above party interests, in the spirit of the noble saying of Rutherford Hayes: "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

The Jacobsen family stands for one of the proudest traditions of Americanism—the tradition of the immigrant boy who made good, who served his neighborhood as a storekeeper, his city as a banker and postmaster, and his country as legislator. Bernhard Martin Jacobsen came to this country from Germany as a boy of 14, ignorant of our language, accompanying his immigrant parents. He worked in a sawmill, then in a brickyard, then in a general store, learning English from his fellow workers, then resuming his education as his earnings freed him to devote some time to studies. It is an inspiring story and is good to think that this great tradition established by Bernhard Jacobsen was most worthily carried on by his son William, and that others of this fine Jacobsen family survive to carry on the tradition of patriotism and friendly service. The Jacobsen Building, in Clinton, stands as a monument to the accomplishments of the family, and their motto, "Keep right on smiling," is enshrined in the name of the Jacobsen radio station, KROS–AM and KROS–FM, which, up to now, has been operated by William Jacobsen with his younger brother, Marvin J. Jacobsen.

William Jacobsen has left behind him two sons, Bernhard J. Jacobsen and Maenard W. Jacobsen, who are carrying on the tradition of this outstanding family, a fine example of the contribution of German immigration to the development of Iowa and America.

Discharge Petition on Bill H. R. 501 to Revise McCarran-Walter Imigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have today signed a discharge petition to bring out my bill, H. R. 501, to revise and amend the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I urge all my colleagues who favor a liberalization of our immigration laws to sign this petition as soon as possible so we can get some action in the matter.

The recent dismissal of Edward J. Corsi as special assistant on immigration problems points up again the fact that the McCarran-Walter Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 are unworkable and should either be replaced or drastically revised.

During his brief incumbency in office at the State Department Mr. Corsi tried to make our immigration laws work in a humane way. The opponents of liberal immigration in the Department of State and outside the Department stopped him by slandering his unquestioned loyalty and smearing his record of patriotic service to this country. In so doing, they affronted large groups of Americans all over the country who are interested in a decent immigration law decently administered.

The Corsi affair goes beyond partisan politics. It effects millions of people who placed high hopes in Mr. Corsi's efforts to help liberalize our immigration policy and make it more humane. Now these hopes have been largely shattered because of the unwarranted and shameless treatment Mr. Corsi received at the hands of the Secretary of State.

On April 9, when it became known that Mr. Corsi was being dismissed from the State Department, I dispatched the following telegram to Secretary Dulles:

Was shocked to read that Mr. Corsi, with many years of distinguished public service in New York, was summarily dismissed from his national post. I am not satisfied that his appointment was for only 90 days, nor that security was at all involved with his dismissal. Mr. Corsi's loyalty was never under question before although he held the highest administrative office in New York State by appointment of former Governor Dewey. If, as it is claimed, Mr. Corsi's dismissal was the result of his liberal interpretation of our immigration laws, then the basic principles of our Constitution and laws have been violated. This thing goes beyond partisan politics, and since another Congressman has been accused of causing the dismissal, I demand a complete explanation in order that I may make known all the facts to the Congress and the American people.

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New York State, whether Democrat or Republican, are incensed and aroused over the State Department's disgraceful action. They see it not only as an act of bad leadership and poor advice, but also that it stems from a lack of ethics in Government and from opinionated men in high positions of power. The whole situation is particularly puzzling when we are assured that the problem of security was not involved in Mr. Corsi's dismissal, and that only a short 3 months ago Mr. Dulles referred to Corsi as his old friend and the man best qualified to handle the job as his special assistant on immigration problems.

What has happened since then? How is it possible that within such a short period of time Mr. Corsi should be dealt with so outrageously and fired from his job in such humiliating manner by the very same people who lauded him to the skies? The people of New York are entitled to an explanation of this whole sordid affair. They are not satisfied

with the explanations given thus far by Mr. Dulles, or Mr. Scott McLeod or other State Department officials.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 13, 1955, entitled "Department of Confusion," which clearly explains the state of confusion over this matter in the Department of State. The editorial is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF CONFUSION

Secretary Dulles and the State Department appear somewhat less than satisfied with any one of the reasons they have offered for the dismissal of Edward J. Corsi. Accordingly they now offer a selection, as follows:

1. Mr. Corsi's post was temporary, and has been abolished.

2. Mr. Corsi had completed his assignment.

3. The 90-day period for security clearance had expired and the Secretary therefore lacked authority to keep Mr. Corsi on any longer.

4. Mr. Corsi was unqualified for the job.

5. Mr. Corsi did not want to take on administrative responsibilities.

6. Mr. Corsi wanted to take on too many administrative responsibilities, trying to become actual administrator of the Refugee Act.

Some of these protestations, like 5 and 6, contradict each other, and the others are contradicted by other statements from the State Department itself.

Mr. Corsi's assignment was, in the Secretary's own words, "to help solve the difficult problems presented by the Refugee Act of 1953." Obviously that is no 90-day task; it is the work of a year, 2 years, or longer. Far from having completed his assignment, Mr. Corsi had not completed the preliminaries to beginning it. His security report, by Mr. Dulles' own later admission, had come in before he was dismissed, but the Secretary said there was not enough time remaining to evaluate it.

In this connection, the Department said Secretary Dulles' offer of another assignment to Mr. Corsi should clearly put to rest any implication that his change of assignment involved any question of security. Secretary Dulles himself, however, pointed out that the post from which Mr. Corsi had been removed was "a sensitive one," a remark which had the effect of putting the implication into active motion again.

Mr. Corsi's qualifications for the job were vouched for by Secretary Dulles when the appointment was made January 10. Referring to the appointee as my dear friend, the Secretary called him "the best qualified man in the United States to help solve the difficult problems presented by the Refugee Act of 1953."

The explanations given for Mr. Corsi's dismissal are almost childish in their implausibility. Edward Corsi was United States Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner under President Hoover, and New York State Industrial Commissioner under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. His professional life has been spent in public administration. Secretary Dulles' assertion that Mr. Corsi "indicated to me that he was not interested in and not qualified for administrative work" is therefore amazing, to say the very least. It is lamentable that the person to whom this statement was attributed should have felt it necessary to accuse the Secretary of State of falsehoods.

As of now it seems clear that Secretary Dulles dismissed Mr. Corsi because Representative WALTER of Pennsylvania had accused him of having associated with some Communist-front organizations 20-odd years ago. Mr. WALTER is co-author of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Mr. Corsi says Secretary Dulles "told me he was dismissing me because he had to maintain good relations with Congress" and "it would endanger bills with reference to the refugee program if I stayed."

So once again Secretary Dulles has demonstrated, as in the case of John Paton Davies, that if his appointees are attacked they cannot expect him to stand by them, but can only look forward to being thrown to the wolves. What this will do to morale—which Mr. Corsi says is one of the stiffest problems in administration of refugee relief—should be plain. Its effect on the response of capable men to appeals to serve the Government—at their own risk—should also be plain.

The only possible consequences are deterioration of the quality of the men and women who can be attracted to important posts, and demoralization among those who do accept.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me add that there are implications in this entire affair which may prove damaging not only to the present administration or to a particular party or some individual. I am worried over the damaging effect this scandal may cause abroad and its repercussions there when it is fully realized that the refugee relief program is nothing more than a hoax and a fraud, and that it is administered in such a way as to keep refugees out of this country instead of facilitating their entry. The honor and prestige of our country is involved here.

To prove my assertion, I want to place in the RECORD a United Press story from Rome, Italians Charge Corsi Case Bias, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald last Friday, April 15, 1955. Following is the United Press dispatch:

ITALIANS CHARGE CORSI CASE BIAS

ROME, April 14.—The independent right-wing newspaper, Il Tempo, today said the ouster of Edward Corsi as adviser to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on refugee problems involved racial and religious discrimination.

"Every hope of increased Italian migration to the United States has vanished," as a result of Dulles' action, it said.

Corsi's removal "has caused great surprise and some bitterness in Italy," the newspaper commented.

It charged that a powerful influence has been brought to bear recently to prevent the nonquota emigration of 200,000 persons, recommended by President Eisenhower.

"This was done by well-known racial circles favoring Nordic and Protestant immigration from southern Europe," Il Tempo said.

"When one practices an open policy of racial and religious discrimination, it is hard to talk of democracy in relations with other countries. And when such a policy so openly hurts Italians, after the visit of our government leaders (Premier Mario Scelba and Foreign Minister Gaetano Martino), to the United States, it is hard to talk about deep friendship.

Mr. Speaker, both the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and the Refugee Relief Act have come under serious attack lately. The Corsi incident is just a demonstration of public indignation against these two acts. The McCarran-Walter law has been called discriminatory and un-American. The refugee relief measure has been called a fraud and a phony by Congressman WALTER.

For the sake of America's greatness, its international prestige, and its position of moral leadership among the nations of the world, I urge this Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Act at the earliest possible date, and to make it so workable and fair that no special immigration legislation will be needed in the future.

Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1955, the first day of the current session of Congress, I introduced an omnibus immigration bill, H. R. 501, to revise and rewrite the McCarran-Walter Act. The bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee, but no action has as yet been taken by that committee on my bill. In view of the fact that more than 3 months have elapsed since I introduced my bill, I have asked the Clerk of the House for a discharge petition and have placed that petition on the Speaker's desk.

I want to appeal to all my colleagues to sign this petition so that we can bring this bill out on the floor for early action and a complete revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address which I had the privilege of delivering at the annual businessmen's day to the students of the school of business administration at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Tex., on April 26, 1955, as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS THE SOMETHING-FOR-NOTHING PHILOSOPHY

Mr. Chairman, students of the SMU School of Business Administration, faculty, and alumni, it is a real pleasure to be present with you today. Since your kind invitation was extended me, I have realized how much I have in common with those who are going out into business on their own.

First, I think of my college days when, like yourselves, I was greatly concerned over my future and what career or business endeavor to embark upon. In my case the answer came one night at dinner in a friend's New York apartment, when for the first time I saw a picture show broadcast over the air—television. From the moment of this strange introduction, I knew this was to be my field of business. So it was that after graduation, I plunged into the merchandising and distribution end of this fascinating new industry which, in 1940, was in its marketing infancy.

Another comparison is my situation today when, as you know, I am in an entirely new field of endeavor. I have just plunged into this tremendous task much as will many of our young business people starting out on their own. In the case of a Congressman and the young businessman, both must shift for themselves. The Congressman learns on arriving in Washington and thereafter that while his colleagues are sympathetic, they would never volunteer help but only answer

questions, because they know, as I even now know, that part of the job of being a Congressman is learning to make the adjustments and being left alone to make the adjustments, since each Congressman is an individual coming from a particular district and the strength of our system is built upon the differences which each Congressman represents. Through the adjustment and the struggle, there comes of course a corresponding satisfaction when challenging and new tasks are met and overcome. I appreciate the system in Washington as I have come to learn it.

In much the same way a newcomer to business enters his new endeavor, somewhat alone, where his character and ability are developed through the challenges which are presented. He is a free agent. This is possible because we have free enterprise. We believe in this country in this growth of human personality and character within the framework of a master plan which only the Almighty knows.

My own personal convictions have been tested, as have those of others here present, through those first business endeavors which I was privileged to participate in before the Great War. Then in the war these convictions were further tested, and others came to light that had been lying dormant and were what I now recognize as innate spiritual and religious beliefs. Now, in Congress, my convictions are still tested almost daily, as at this moment in speaking to you, because I am in a position, as a Congressman, where the fundamental ethical, moral and spiritual beliefs, as a yardstick, must continually be applied in making decisions concerning the big issues that face us today.

Through all of the trials and struggles, I have found no reason to change my basic belief in the principles which I was taught going through school. I believe in human freedom, and that means economic freedom. I have come to understand why our forefathers and my forebears believed as they did in free enterprise, competition, the open market place, to establish demand-supply and price, as contrasted with the foreign planned economies and isms they left behind when they left the old country.

So it was that when thinking of talking to you today, the titles that sprung to mind were: "Free Enterprise, the American Way," "Government and Free Enterprise," "Let's Put Business Principles Into Government, and Take Government Out of Business," "The Government in Your Business Future"—but no matter what the title they all started and ended with free enterprise, because within the framework of the definition of free enterprise, as we Americans have traditionally defined it, is found the individual worth and dignity of the man or woman, our spiritual beliefs, the best system for economic growth, the "merit system," individual incentive and initiative. In short, the sum total of American beliefs. To me free enterprise and Americanism are one.

My title finally became "Free Enterprise versus the Something-for-nothing Philosophy." The something-for-nothing philosophy is based on the erroneous belief that government can do for us what we cannot do for ourselves. Forgotten is the fact that ours is a Government of, by and for the people. Through the declared emergencies of a depression and two wars has arisen a Federal bureaucracy of such scope that few, if any, know all the present services offered by Government—many unnecessary to the people. This philosophy spawned on regulations and controls of our economy, through planned deficit financing which resulted in spiraling inflation and cost of living. States rights have been usurped by Federal domination, until the State-Federal proportion of operation and tax income has changed from 75–25 percent to 25–75 percent.

In this something-for-nothing philosophy is found the belief the Federal Government can manufacture, finance, merchandise, market, and compete in every way with private industry, that it can do so without paying tax on its operation which is passed on to private businessmen to pay, who must also pay their own taxes. Simultaneously, the Government often blames free enterprise business which staggers under the Government-imposed regulation and heavy tax, saying that free enterprise is faulty. It is of interest to note that at this moment the Government is still the Nation's biggest electric power producer, the biggest power consumer, the biggest banker, the biggest employer, the biggest insurance company, biggest landlord, biggest tenant, and biggest publisher. In fact, Uncle Sam owns more wheat than the wheat farmers, more grass land than the cattle men, and more trucks than General Motors. Our national debt is $278 billion and we have a hidden debt of $250 billion, an overall tax rate of 30 cents on the dollar.

In the something-for-nothing philosophy, there is the belief that wealth can be redistributed to the point of confiscation by a heavy progressive income tax. This money can be placed in the hands of the low-bracket purchaser who then can stimulate business by buying. This is called the percolate up theory by some. It overlooks the fact that production is necessary or there'll be no goods to buy—and production needs money for plant and equipment to produce, to expand, and to create more jobs.

The advocates of the something-for-nothing philosophy are intentionally or unintentionally disloyal Americans. Some are avowed Socialists. These are the most dangerous because as Americans considering themselves patriotic devoted citizens they are undermining the country's economic strength as a friend—not an avowed enemy such as the Communist we have come to recognize as antithetical to all we believe—and who is dedicated to the overthrow of our country. We recognize communism as an enemy, yet communism is economically a socialistic form of government, and there is the great danger. Too many of our well-meaning socialistic friends of the last 2 decades are playing right into communistic hands. The godless materialism of this philosophy must not be for this great country of ours. As idealists we Americans acquiesce to the goals that social measures propose. It is easy to succumb to the belief first, that government can do it, and second, that we can pay the cost, not only for our own people, but the world. Too often lost in the shuffle is the free-enterprise system that must pay the cost of our grandiose schemes.

The present administration is struggling valiantly to satisfy the increased citizens' demands of its government and at the same time build our economic strength by freeing our business to operate with minimum government intervention or control—of this I approve—but I would counsel this or any administration to always remember an earlier American adage "that government is best that governs least." Our forefathers believed this and they built the free-enterprise system into the world's greatest productive system.

This system was based on freedom—to think, act, and do as an individual—in business as well as government. They recognized that our freedoms were so interrelated that the loss of one meant the loss of all. Therefore economic freedom was fostered in the free-enterprise system. Everyone had a stake in it. They knew and we should remember that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Further, there was no caste system. Unlike many foreign countries, an American was not forced to stay in the same level that he was born into. A man was recognized for whatever he made of himself. The great accomplishments in the production of American industry is testimonial to the many free men and women who dedicated their efforts to business within the free-enterprise system. These are our traditions—our heritage. We must carry them on.

In the United States there is still no limit to your goal. Each of us can become what we are capable of achieving. Surely, we have proven too that what a mind is capable of thinking, a man can do; witness the new duct-fan helicopter, the modern flying carpet. Since 1900 the world has produced airplanes, radio, television, and countless other scientific discoveries. We all know we have just scratched the surface in new inventions and ideas, that untold worlds may open up ahead of us. New ideas and opportunities need only to be thought of and recognized.

The United States has a magnificent future. The Southwest area of the United States may very well have an even more brilliant future than the national average. Its population and industries are growing.

And you have freedom of choice. You can look around and decide—stay put or move along as new horizons open, and let me assure you from my personal experience that there will be countless vistas unrolling before you, challenging you to new effort—if you stay alert.

In your business ventures you are not likely to forget the part that government plays in our lives, and I hope you will not neglect your duties as a citizen. Using myself as an example in the establishment of my corporation and two small individually owned companies in real estate, I often worked 7 days and some nights. My participation in government suffered. Actually, I deprived myself of the right of participating—a right and privilege all Americans should treasure and enjoy. One day I realized with a shock that many of the bureaucratic policies of our Federal Government and our loss of many States rights were contrary to my beliefs. So here I am.

Many other business people are guilty of leaving the charting of their country's course to others. They are so enmeshed in their personal worries they will not take time to vote, much less in political work. Because of this the very men who could inform our people most of the value of our free-enterprise system do not speak out and the result has been the lack of emphasis on the greatness of traditional American enterprise. It is my hope, therefore, that you will always keep an active interest and participation in your government at the local level. Otherwise, you are leaving the decisions to others whose views may not embody your own.

The weakness of our system, as Plato pointed out centuries ago, is the lack of an informed electorate, or apathy on the part of the people. Businessmen in our country by their neglect of citizen participation in governmental affairs have failed to protect free enterprise by influencing legislation.

Businessmen realize through hard-earned experience that private enterprise and Government cannot compete in business. Businessmen operating on a profit system know that deficit financing is an impossibility, and any system based on it is unsound and should be corrected. Businessmen, having learned these lessons, permit their Government in many instances to make mistakes which their experience and judgment could have prevented if they had been taking a part in the direction of their Government.

My final thought then would be some conclusions I reach in forecasting the trend our Government would take if more business people participated in it. I believe the program would be accelerated in getting the Government out of business. I believe that businessmen in our Government would throw their weight behind balancing the

budget, reducing the national debt, reducing taxes, thereby stimulating incentive, further investment, and creating more jobs. They would reduce the gigantic intended redistribution of wealth the Socialists and Communists are so pleased to see us engage in. There would be further incentive for those talented individuals whose property in the form of earnings is almost entirely confiscated in the upper bracket, and whose responsible positions create more jobs by this stimulated effort. The so-called little man who bears taxation's heaviest burden numerically would be given greater relief in his taxes, made possible by reducing the cost of Government. This reduction would be made possible through decentralization and return to the States of many of the Federal activities. The businessman might insist, I believe, that the Government operate within its income. In fact, the businessman might insist upon a constitutional amendment controlling the Government's ability to tax, borrow, and spend, thereby assuring a sound economy by whoever the elected officials were. Businessmen in Government would continue to remove the Federal Government from areas of operation which do not pertain to government.

It is my heartfelt belief that the future greatness of our country is interwoven with the perpetuation, strengthening, and success of our free-enterprise system. It must be kept free. I believe that people with business experience must join together to continue to remind the American people of the advantages that we enjoy, the high level of production and prosperity, the great economic, moral, and spiritual strength resulting from our beliefs. These are the things, I believe, which business people should remember and practice. I hope that all of you will take your part in the good faith to preserve the free-enterprise system.

I have enjoyed this opportunity of being with you and sharing a few thoughts. I wish you all the very best of everything in whatever you undertake. May you be successful and happy, and in return for the blessing of living and working in this great Nation take an active part in its guidance. Thank you.

Red China and the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in early February I was interviewed by Mr. Don Larrabee, the Washington correspondent for the New Bedford Standard-Times. Under unanimous consent I present his article, which appeared in the February 4 issue of the Standard-Times, to be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

PHILBIN WARNS AGAINST SEATING RED CHINA IN U. N., URGES ALL TO BE ALERT TO BANDITRY

WASHINGTON, February 4.—To reward Red China with admission into the United Nations would be a "monstrous travesty upon justice," Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, declared today in an interview.

The Clinton, Mass., Congressman, expressing grave concern over Communist tactics both here and abroad, also blasted the notion that the free world can live in so-called peaceful coexistence with international gangsterism.

"I am greatly concerned about growing Communist strength and every American must be so concerned," PHILBIN told the Standard-Times. "World communism will adopt the tactics it deems necessary to secure world conquest and world control. That is its aim. It will go as far as it can. It will do what it thinks it can get away with.

"When the time is ripe," he added, "and the military timetable permits and its chances for victory seem bright, it will not hesitate to strike along a broad front."

One of the real obstacles to halting the Communist world menace, PHILBIN asserted, is the "indifference and unconcern of many Americans about the affairs of representative government at every level." Not only should Americans be shaken out of their lethargy, but also, he said, the United Nations must inaugurate "cooperative measures" to thwart Communist aggression and check dangerous subversive activities in many parts of the world.

"We have a right to expect the United Nations, if its membership still subscribes to the purposes of the Charter of maintaining the peace and defending human freedom, to move decisively and speedily against Communist malefactors.

"Many people see in recent events the beginning of a move designed to bring Red China into the United Nations. Nothing would be better calculated to shatter confidence of the American people in that body. The idea of permitting a bandit nation, which has secured power and dominion over a great * * * ancient, but helpless people through conspiracy, subterfuge and force * * * to be rewarded for its iniquities by admission into the United Nations would be a monstrous travesty upon justice," said PHILBIN, who is starting his seventh term in the House from the Third Massachusetts District.

The Congressman, a member of the Armed Services Committee, warned the Communist movement has made steady advances in remote areas of Asia, in Africa and South America and in Europe. He said communism will pursue the tactics of infiltration and penetration, playing everywhere on discontent aroused by antiquated colonial systems or capitalizing on social injustices.

Citing Korea as an example of Communist aggressive action, he mentioned Indochina, Burma and the Malayan states as good examples of subversion.

"But the thing for us to remember is that the Communists have their own answer for every situation. They act boldly and do not hesitate to set up a conspiracy anywhere that suits their purpose. This kind of treachery and deceit requires continuous vigilance and a tough-minded attitude on our part. It cannot be dealt with by bleeding hearts or patience-loving, dilatory Fabians urging delay.

"The Fabian approach of trying to wait the situation out is fraught with real peril because every day the Soviet is building greater military strength," PHILBIN asserted.

Turning to the question of Communist activity in this country, the Clinton Congressman made this unequivocal statement: "There is hardly a scientific secret which has not been filched from us through espionage agents and traitors in the innermost, top-secret archives of this Government."

He compared communism in this country to an iceberg—"four-fifths of it is under water." The number of card-carrying Communists is relatively not great, but the "poison of Communist ideas has been spread widely throughout the land."

CLEVER ATTACK MADE

"Pro-Communist and Socialistic-minded people can be found in most segments of American life. Clever and insidious attacks are constantly made upon basic religious, social, economic and political institutions.

"A constant flow of propaganda is directed against the American people at every level, embracing everything from straight Marxism to eccentric notions about the universe.

"All this," said PHILBIN, "is designed to promote hysteria and uncertainty and to undermine the confidence of the people in representative government, in our economic system, in our religious beliefs, our moral ideals, family loyalties, and business structure. The objective is to break America's faith in itself, its principles, its life and its destiny."

He denounced as outrageous the shooting down of American planes on peaceful missions in the Far East, adding: "These incidents of Communist insult and provocation are absolutely intolerable and as completely unconscionable—as well as illegal and inhumane—as the continued imprisonment of American flyers in Red China on trumped-up spy charges."

STRONG ACTION ESSENTIAL

The unanimity of the House vote on the Formosa defense resolution (there were only 3 dissenting votes) was pointed to by PHILBIN as the "first real declaration of determination to face up courageously" to the Communist menace since the end of the Korean war.

This kind of strong, decisive policy and affirmative action is essential, he said, not only to protect Americans but also to maintain our prestige in the Orient.

The Congressman frequently referred to "apathy, indifference, and unconcern" on the part of many Americans over governmental affairs and called it "one of the most disturbing developments of our time." He insisted the Nation must revive the "spirit of patriotism and loyalty and revitalize the commonsense, industry, and enthusiasm of the individual."

PHILBIN has warned about the Communist menace in the past. Records show he was one of the first Members of Congress to point up the spread of world communism during World War II. In his first major speech in Congress early in 1943, PHILBIN predicted the possible realinement of alliances in the postwar period.

While he sees "unfavorable, disturbing spots everywhere," PHILBIN also points to signs that people are becoming more aroused to the dangers, and more aware of the "sham, falsehood, deceit and iniquity of communism."

"The United States," he said, "must not fail to let it be known that she will use her strength if necessary, to protect her way of life. Once that idea penetrates the Communist mind," he added, "there will be no further aggression and then, perhaps, we can take the lead in world councils to establish universal disarmament and control of nuclear substances. This will be no primrose path," said PHILBIN.

Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement

which I had the privilege of making before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H. R. 4560 and related bills to amend the Natural Gas Act which would remove Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over independent producers and gatherers of natural gas, as follows:

My name is BRUCE ALGER. I represent the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, Dallas County. I was elected last year, running on a platform advocating free competition in the marketplace and less Federal control of our economy—a platform quite similar to that of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This action of the electorate made me the first Republican elected to Congress from Texas in a regular election in many years. It also indicated to me that the people of my district likewise realize the vital importance of a return to the free-enterprise principles that made our country great.

My interest in the legislative efforts to correct the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case is more than a desire to correct an injustice to one of the large industries of my State. It is a determination to overcome a new and dangerous philosophy announced in the Supreme Court's decision.

Why should natural gas, the product of an intensely competitive and high-risk industry, be singled out as the only commodity so produced to be brought under Federal price-fixing while in the hands of the producer?

If a bureau in Washington can fix the price of gas, can it not just as easily fix the price of other products?

If natural gas is singled out for Federal price-fixing today, might it not be oil or cattle or cotton or dairy products—or all of them—tomorrow?

If there is any doubt that natural gas is a commodity produced by a highly competitive industry—far removed from the utility status—let us take a look at some of the facts about the demand-supply-price picture. They will show not only that the industry is competitive, but also that the consumer of natural gas inevitably receives his greatest protection from competitive activity.

First, there is a great and growing demand. Natural-gas customers have tripled and natural gas delivered to residential consumers has quadrupled since 1938. Consumption of natural gas has just about tripled since World War II. Today almost 25 million gas customers are residential users. The American Gas Association estimates that an additional 1.2 million users will be added each year in 1955 and 1956 if supplies are available. Countless other potential customers are anxious to see their communities served by natural gas.

Obviously, the efficiency and cleanliness of this fuel contributed to its popularity. Obviously, also, its reasonable prices have been considered among its advantages to the constantly growing gas consuming public.

Competition between producers of gas—as well as between them and other fuels—has been evidenced by the refusal of prices of natural gas to react to inflationary conditions as sharply as have the prices of other fuels. Natural gas is one of the few items in the family budget for which price has remained comparatively stable.

Based on 1935–39 averages for 50 representative cities compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, natural gas in 1953 had an index of 99.6, or just under average prices for the 1935–39 period. Contrast this with 233.4 for anthracite coal, 212.9 for bituminous coal, and 205.5 for No. 2 fuel oil. Contrast this also with the 191.3 overall cost-of-living index for 1953.

If the tremendous demand is not matched by a similar rise in supply, the price of natural gas naturally will tend to rise. But this increase will be even larger if the producers' prices are regulated. Supply is the great consideration, and price-fixing regulations will have a tendency to reduce, rather than increase, the search for new supplies. They also will tend to divert more of the supply from the interstate market into the intrastate, which even now represents half of the total marketed production. Intrastate sales were not made subject to Federal control by the Phillips decision.

With the tremendous expansion of the market made possible by the many large interstate lines built since World War II, the ratio of new supply to net production has diminished rapidly. In the first 5 years after the war new gas supply was proved up at an average of almost 3 trillion cubic feet for each trillion produced. Then the ratio dropped to 2 million for each trillion produced. During the past year, new supply barely exceeded actual production.

Which represents the greater need—to fix prices with a hope of keeping costs to consumers down, as long as the present supply lasts; or to rely on time-tested free competition to encourage wider search for greater reserves to supply the present consuming public and the millions who hope to join today's fortunate consumers?

Developments of recent years clearly show that all reserves possible are essential to meet future needs. Roughly speaking, we have 21 years of supply at the current rate of withdrawal, but that rate of withdrawal may continue to grow.

Certainly an adequate price is essential to prevent waste of casinghead gas, which is produced with oil. Prices for natural gas must be at least enough to pay for the expense of conservation measures. Adequate price also is essential to promote production from wells whose primary product is gas. Leading geologists are convinced that we have not reached the limit in our discoveries of oil and gas. However, the incentive provided will determine to what extent we are able to make additional discoveries.

Because of joint costs and the infinite number of variables, it is impossible to determine a regulated price based on a cost formula, such as would be necessary if gas producing is considered a utility. Gas must be allowed to seek its true price level through free competition with competitive fuels, or it will be found necessary to regulate the prices of these fuels, also, and thus establish a Federal bureau control over all of our energy resources.

If reserves are to keep pace with demand, every producer—not just a few big companies—must have price incentive to search for and produce more gas. The minor or independent producer is the typical wildcatter. He finds the big majority of new fields, and we cannot meet our needs without him. He needs incentive.

There are thousands of these independents in action today. All told, about 8,100 producers of natural gas operate in the country, counting only those who report to the various State agencies. The picture some would paint of a monopoly industry controlled by a few large companies is far from true. Of all the extractive industries, bituminous coal is the only one in which leading companies produce as small a portion of the total as in the natural gas industry. Compared with manufacturers of all kinds, natural gas is less concentrated in the hands of a few companies than 382 out of the total of 452 studied.

The picture of gas production is: First 4 companies, 17 percent; first 8, 28; first 20, 46; first 50, 66; and first 100, 78. There also is a gradual gradation from one size to the next in order, a condition ideal for competitive behavior. Seekers of monopoly can look elsewhere.

The ease of entry into production of natural gas is a sure sign of the absence of monopoly. Natural gas companies even seek additional competitors, frequently looking for partners because of limitation of funds when they spend so much on exploration, title clearance, and leasing.

Competition definitely is present when the producer or gatherer meets the interstate pipeline or transmission company at the bargaining table. The pipeline companies are not so numerous as the producers, but between them they have an interconnecting network of lines covering the large producing areas of the Southwest. With one exception, the various large lines all are connected either directly or indirectly with most of the producing areas of the Southwest. Thus they have widely scattered supply sources to which they can turn if one source prices itself out of the market. Neither the seller nor the buyer has the other "over the barrel."

These active competitive conditions which prevail are pointed up by the price behavior of natural gas. Prices have shown great flexibility and continually have lagged behind the rising cost of living.

Indicating their responsiveness to competitive conditions, prices paid under contracts executed in 1952–53 ranged from 21 to 29 cents per thousand cubic feet in the Appalachian region; from 7 to 18 cents in Panhandle-Hugoton; from 4 to 13 cents in East Texas-North Louisiana; and from 3 to 16 cents in Louisiana-Texas Gulf Coast.

The increased rates paid by consumers today are not due primarily to higher field prices, but to generally higher prices of everything that enters into the distribution, transmission, and production of gas. These include sharp rises in the cost of steel, labor, taxes and many other expenses. Only about a tenth of the total cost to the residential consumer is represented by the price received by the producer for natural gas at the wellhead.

Under free competition, the natural gas producing industry has met every test of service to the consumer. What sound reason is there for fixing the wellhead price that a producer may get for his gas?

Regulating only the "larger producers" is no answer to the problem. Who is the "larger producer"? What if royalty owners, owners of divided interests, small producers feeding into a single gatherer or natural gasoline plant, and others demand payment in kind and insist on separate sales?

Price-fixing is not in the long range interest of the consumer. Putting gas production on a utility status would bring staggering problems and costs, with no benefits and very probably some definite losses.

Consider the staff necessary and the expenses involved if the Federal Power Commision must review 30,000 separate sales transactions, with thousands more each year. Consider the insurmountable difficulties in trying to determine prices on a cost basis. What about loss of incentive to producers? Futility compounded.

No five men can solve all of the problems that have been solved by millions of individual decisions from day to day. The vast machinery for regulating prices would be only one of many costs, both tangible and intangible. The consumer will pay the price, both in taxes and in increased charges for the gas itself.

Regulation in the form of price-fixing is not the answer. The consumer's greatest protection is competitive activity. His true interest lies with a continuing supply. He deserves the benefits of competition.