The Members of the House of Representatives and the Senator from Ohio have, from the beginning of these contests, been giving a luncheon in honor of the essay winners here in Washington in the Capitol Building, and this luncheon for 1955 was given today. The State commander of the American Legion and the State legion auxiliary representatives were present, and most of the Members of Congress and Senators from Ohio were present. Each of the winners was introduced and given a chance to speak. Each of them in his or her speech showed his or her appreciation of what the Legion and the Members of Congress have done for them. And every Senator and Congressman spoke feelingly about the program of the American Legion, and of the ability and fine purpose shown by the winners, all of whom were present.

One of the prize winners was Miss Anna Belle Lanning, of Murray City, Ohio, which is a fine historical town located in the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, which is one of the finest congressional districts in the country, and which is the congressional district which I have had the honor to represent for 30 years.

The American Legion is to be congratulated upon the fine subject which was selected to be the subject about which the essays should be written. The subject was The Effect of Spiritual Guidance in the World Today. No more fitting subject could have been selected in these trying times. The young lady from my congressional district surely discussed this timely and important subject most effectively; her essay is logical and shows that she has a brilliant mind, and has a proper spirit. I am glad to have her fine essay printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I hope that it will be read by the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also hope that this brilliant young lady may be able to continue her education, and thereby be able to take her place in the world as a brilliant woman and as a woman of spiritual guidance and influence. Her prize-winning essay is as follows:

THE EFFECT OF SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN THE WORLD TODAY

Our free way of life was developed by men and women of deep religious faith. America has always been conscious of the need for religion. The founders of our Republic were sincere and profound men, men who looked to God for guidance. Today our religion and democracy are so strong that they can never be conquered by direct and open attack. They can succumb only to indifference and neglect.

Fortunately for America and for the world, there seems to be developing a spiritual awakening that has been growing in the hearts of men.

Every citizen of every political and religious faith must feel a sense of security in realizing that our distinguished President understands the importance of prayer and faith in God. Mr. Eisenhower recently made the statement, "Only a people strong in Godliness is a people strong enough to overcome tyranny and make themselves free and others free."

There is nothing strange about the word "spiritual" today. It's on every tongue, in every newspaper column, and in the title contents of some book on almost every bookshelf. There isn't a phase of life where it doesn't apply.

Effectualness is a noun too little used. What evidence we have so far of the effectualness of spiritual guidance in the world today are sufficient to make the free people of the world very thankful for the spiritual guidance they have received down through the years from men and women who were devout Christians.

Increasing interest in religion becomes more evident as time goes by. For example, at the top of the nonfiction best seller list for most of the year of 1953 was a religious book, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's the Power of Positive Thinking. The revised standard version Bible, published in 1952, had sold more than 2,500,000 copies by the end of its second year. Even the old half-forgotten custom of grace before meals was undergoing a revival. The American Legion and the undenominational Laymen's National Committee conducted campaigns to get Americans to say grace. They sent prayer cards with three graces—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—to thousands of restaurants and eating places where they were displayed on menus or tables. In Los Angeles paper napkins were printed on which were written some old-fashioned prayers for parents to give their children to learn.

While commenting on the progress of religion and spiritual guidance in the world today, we must always be alert to the one most dangerous threat to our spiritual freedom—communism. The best way to keep godless communism out of the world is to have a strong, active Christianity everywhere. Christian citizenship is a rock of Gibraltar that will withstand all outside and inside attacks by communism.

The first and the best place for spiritual guidance to begin is in the home. The Scriptures tell us, and I quote, "Bring up a child in the way it should go, and when it is old it shall not depart from this way." It is the duty of every parent to give their children spiritual guidance from the time they are able to understand the meaning of Christianity in order to protect them from the ungodliness in the world today.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1955

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

Our Father God, 'mid all the traffic of life's busy ways at the beginning of another week of challenge and of toil, we turn unfilled to Thee. From the framing of laws and the forming of policies holding in their reach the woe or weal of the Commonwealth and of the nations of the earth, we would pause amidst all the shattering events and tempestuous emotions of our times at an inner sanctuary where the world's angry voices die and Thou alone art real.

In facing those who have sworn to destroy our liberties and to enslave the world with fetters for the body and the mind, may we be ever jealous for a just peace; but, while we are harmless as doves, we would at the same time be wise as serpents lest we ourselves be the unwitting agents for betraying and destroying the free heritage of the generations following. May we follow the gleam of the highest and best we know, as it leads o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent till the evening comes and the fever of life is over, and our work is done. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 25, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Clyde A. Coggins to be postmaster at Nipton, Calif., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 4393. An act to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 4393 (received from the House today, April 25, 1955). A bill to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5106 (received from the House on April 19, 1955). A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; and

H. J. Res. 256 (received from the House today, April 25, 1955). Joint resolution providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 21, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on April 21, 1955, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and

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

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 21, 1955,

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 21, 1955, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 216) thereon.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour statements be limited to 2 minutes.

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:

REPORT ON NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS DETAILED AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that for the quarter ended March 31, 1955, there was an aggregate of 2,650 Air Force officers in the executive element assigned or detailed to permanent duty at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FOOD AND CLOTHING IN THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on food and clothing in the Government, dated April 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year ended December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON CHINESE EMERGENCY AID PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Chinese emergency aid program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth annual report on the educational exchange operations, by the Department of State, for the calendar year 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ATLANTIC AREA COMMAND, EAST COAST AND CARIBBEAN OPERATIONS, MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Atlantic Area Command, East Coast and Caribbean Operations, Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DISPOSITION OF SHORTPAID (POSTAGE DUE) MAIL MATTER AND DEAD LETTERS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to issue regulations regarding the charges, handling and disposition of shortpaid (postage due) mail matter and dead letters, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the House joint resolution proposing the designation of the rose as the national flower of the United States

"Whereas by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, it is proposed to designate and adopt the rose as the national flower of the United States; and

"Whereas the finest qualities cherished by mankind are reflected in the beauty of the rose, which has been the unofficial flower of the State of New York and appears to be the overwhelming choice of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to adopt, with all convenient speed, House Joint Resolution No. 102 or its companion resolution in the United States Senate, which provides that the flower, commonly known as the rose be designated and adopted as the national flower of the United States, and that the President declare such fact by proclamation, and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly,

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"*Clerk.*

"In senate April 2, 1955; concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate,

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"*Secretary.*"

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate

"Whereas the 21st amendment to the Constitution of the United States vests in the individual States control over the trade in and use of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas in the exercise of such control 46 States, including the State of Rhode Island, have recognized the compelling demand for alcoholic beverages and have enacted laws to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people by allowing only those who are morally responsible to engage in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, and by strictly supervising such production and distribution; and

"Whereas the aforesaid 46 States have levied excise taxes on alcoholic beverages for the purposes of encouraging temperance, reimbursing the States for their costs in maintaining such strict supervision and control, and providing revenue; and in fixing the amount of these excises, States have sought an optimum figure which will achieve a balance between the three enumerated objectives; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has so substantially increased its excise tax on alcoholic beverages that the consumer price of such beverages has risen to several times their cost of production; and

"'Whereas the result of such increase in consumer price has been to divert many sales from the controlled distribution system set up by the State of Rhode Island to the bootleg industry with an accompanying disregard for law, danger to the health of its citizens, and loss of revenue to both State and Federal Governments; and

"Whereas it is the considered judgment that the Federal Government has raised its excises beyond the optimum level consistent with the objectives of taxation and control; and has taken from the State of Rhode Island the power to restore the proper balance: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, in order to eliminate bootlegging, restore respect for law and order, and provide adequate revenues for both State and Federal Governments, does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and enact legislation reducing the present excessively high tax rate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of

Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the General Court of New Hampshire urges the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 5255 entitled, 'A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the construction of the New Hampshire marine memorial' as the first memorial in the United States in honor of men and women who lost their lives at sea in all wars, which is to be erected at Hampton Beach, N. H., now pending in the United States House of Representatives, as introduced by Representative CHESTER MERROW, of New Hampshire; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state transmit certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives of New Hampshire in the Congress, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

"Passed April 12, 1955.

"Attest:

"ENOCH D. FULLER,
"*Secretary of State.*"

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953

"Whereas the recent dismissal of a high official from the State Department of the United States has created throughout the country varied expressions of dissatisfaction in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to make a complete and thorough investigation relative to the operation and administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 by the State Department of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the presiding officer of both branches of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff

"Whereas the bicycle industry represents one of the major industries in several of the small cities and towns of the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas many bicycles are being made and brought into the United States from several foreign countries and the rates of pay in these countries for the fabrication of materials and the building of the bicycles is greatly less than the prevailing rates in the United States, therefore making it impossible for the manufacturer in this country to compete in this business; and

"Whereas the United States Tariff Commission has submitted a recommendation to the President of the United States which would greatly help this industry to survive; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby strongly urges the President to accept these recommendations and to take such action which will result in these recommendations being put into effect at once; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth, and the commission now studying the subject of tariffs."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans, the same as death pensions granted to surviving World War I widows and orphans

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed legislation granting death pensions to surviving widows and orphans of deceased veterans of World War I who had 90 days or more of active military service in the Armed Forces of the United States or who were discharged for disability incurred in active military service in less than 90 days, we believe the same legislation should be passed giving the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to surviving widows and orphans of World War I due to the fact that the surviving widows of World War II and the Korean conflict deceased veterans have young children and are very much in need of assistance in caring for their families: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact necessary legislation granting to the surviving widows and orphans of deceased World War II and Korean conflict veterans the same death pensions as are granted to the surviving widows and orphans of World War I deceased veterans; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby instructed to send copies of this resolution properly authenticated to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress of the United States, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"EDWARD LENO,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"K. A. FITCH,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate steps to correct unwarranted and unfair discrimination in respect to acreage allotments for hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota

"Whereas there has never been and there is not now a surplus or oversupply of hard spring wheat; and

"Whereas the allotment of hard spring wheat acreage throughout the State of North Dakota is so low in many instances that many farmers cannot operate their farms successfully and produce sufficient agricultural products and livestock to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families; and

"Whereas there is unquestionably an unfair discrimination against the small hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota as compared with soft wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary and appropriate steps to provide a premium on milling grades of hard spring wheat and to allocate as a minimum to any operator who has raised 100 acres or more of hard wheat during the past 5 years, an acreage equal to the maximum acreage of such operator, but in no event should such allocation if under 100 acres ever be reduced; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States; to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives; to the Secretary of Agriculture; and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in Congress.

"C. P. DAHL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"EDWARD LENO,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"K. A. FITCH,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution O

"Concurrent resolution opposing repeal of long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

"Whereas there will be proposed and introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

"Whereas the repeal of the long- and short-haul clause would permit railroad companies to assess lower rates and charges for long hauls than for shorter hauls over the same route in the same direction; and

"Whereas the charging of a higher rate for a short haul than for a longer haul, the shorter being included within the longer, is now forbidden on North Dakota intrastate traffic in section 49-0409 of the North Dakota Revised Code of 1943; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation will result in increased freight rates and charges on articles moving in interstate commerce to and from North Dakota, particularly on grain, lignite, and other commodities, to the detriment of producers, shippers, and consumers of the State of North Dakota; that it would encourage discriminations in rates against small shippers in favor of large shippers that would be against the public interest; and would, we believe, be in the end detrimental to the best interests of the railroads themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized and urged to deny the passage of any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, when, as, and if presented for its consideration; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to defeat the aforesaid type of legislation upon presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the

United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution V

"Concurrent resolution petitioning 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

"Whereas the establishment of a jewel-bearing plant adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation has provided much needed job opportunities for Indians residing in the area and has brought into productivity a formerly unutilized labor force and has thereby been an aid to the general economy of the area and to the wealth of the Nation; and

"Whereas the employment records of the jewel-bearing plant located adjacent to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation show that absenteeism and turnover among Indian employees are lower than the national average for similar industries; and

"Whereas the locating of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations is a positive act of providing social and economic opportunities for rehabilitation of and self-help for Indians; and

"Whereas the establishment of such enterprises adjacent to Indian reservations has proved to be beneficial to the Indians residing on and near such reservations, to the State of North Dakota and to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact proper legislation to provide for a thorough investigation and affirmative encouragement for such self-rehabilitating projects which will result in the elimination of dependency and the establishment of a substantial self-supporting status for Indian people; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Director of Defense Mobilization, and to each of the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"K. A. FITCH,
"Speaker of the House.
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

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

"Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and to enact new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas by the treaty of annexation of 1897 ratified by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii on September 9, 1897, the Republic of Hawaii did cede to, and by the Newlands resolution of July 7, 1898, the United States did accept, the title to the public lands and other public property of the Republic of Hawaii upon terms and provisions retaining for the people of Hawaii the beneficial ownership thereof but providing for the free use and occupancy of such property by the United States for its civil, military, or naval purposes; and

"Whereas in the case of Puerto Rico the United States, with some exceptions, returned to the people the title to the public domain shortly after its acquisition thereof and did not retain a right of free use, as shown by the acts of April 12, 1900 (31 Stat. 77), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 77); and

"Whereas Texas, the only other area which has come under the American flag by the voluntary action of its people, did not cede to the United States its public lands or any right of free use of lands, except the existing public works (5 Stat. 797); and

"Whereas in the case of Hawaii for a period of more than 50 years the United States has been making free withdrawals from the Hawaiian public domain for Federal uses and purposes, and has, by the Hawaiian Organic Act, prohibited the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii from altering, amending, or repealing the Hawaiian land laws without the consent of the Congress; and

"Whereas at this time the legal title to the remaining public lands and other public property should be returned to the beneficial owners, the people of Hawaii, and that the legislature should be authorized to enact laws governing the same without the necessity of obtaining the consent of the Congress; and

"Whereas other lands acquired by the Territory of Hawaii are subject to the provisions of section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SEC. 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to enact a bill substantially as follows:

"'A bill transferring to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and enacting new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii

"'Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"'SECTION 1. That the United States hereby grants to the Territory of Hawaii the absolute title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii, title to which is in the United States, upon the taking effect of this act, except as otherwise provided in this act: *Provided, however*, That as to any such lands or other property heretofore set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside upon the taking effect of this act, the United States shall retain title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be, subject, however, to the power of the President to restore such lands or other property to the Territory of Hawaii in the manner heretofore provided by section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C. 511), in which event title to such property shall vest in the Territory of Hawaii: *Provided further*, That when any such public property so taken for the uses and purposes of the United States, instead of being used for public purposes is by the United States leased, rented, or granted upon revocable permits to private parties, the rentals or consideration shall be covered into the treasury of the Territory of Hawaii.

"'As used in this section, the term "public lands and other public property" means, and is limited to, the lands and other properties that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii under the Joint Resolution of Annexation approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), or that have been acquired in exchange for lands or other properties so ceded.

"'SEC. 2. The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, shall be subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the Congress, and in no other manner.

"'SEC. 3. The legislature of the Territory is hereby authorized to transfer, or provide for the transfer of the lands, title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii pursuant to existing law or vested in the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of this act, to any city, county, or other political subdivision thereof, or to any public corporate body constituted by law.

"'SEC. 4. The legislative power of the Territory over the lands owned by or under the control of the Territory and its political subdivisions shall be exercised only by general laws, except in respect to transfers to or for the use of the Territory, a political subdivision, or any department or agency thereof.

"'SEC. 5. The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 (Public Law 31, 83d Cong., 1st sess.; 67 Stat. 29), shall be applicable to the Territory of Hawaii, and the said Territory shall have the same rights as do the States thereunder.

"'SEC. 6. All laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property vested in the Territory of Hawaii, or reserving (except as provided in sec. 2) the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 7. Section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act as heretofore amended (48 U. S. C. 663–677b) shall, until and unless otherwise provided by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, remain in effect as a law of said Territory, subject to amendment or repeal by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii without any requirement that the consent of the Congress be obtained in order to make effective such amendment or repeal.

"'SEC. 8. Except as otherwise provided by this act, section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 9. This act shall take effect on its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 18th day of April 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relating to harbor improvements, island of Hawaii

"Whereas a harbor at Kawaihae, Hawaii, is a vital need of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has approved the project proposed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in House Document No. 311, 81st Congress, 1st session; and

"Whereas the 10-year commerce forecast for Kawaihae, made 5 years ago, would already be exceeded; and

"Whereas the existing pier facility near Kawaihae, which is capable of handling cargo only to interisland barges, is in very bad structural condition, causing hazardous conditions; and

"Whereas large tonnages of raw sugar are now lightered to deep-sea vessels at the

nearby anchorage of Mahukona at great cost; and

"Whereas the total benefit to commerce would be more than $500,000 annually; and

"Whereas responsible private interests will jointly cooperate to finance, install, and operate bulk sugar storage and handling facilities; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii, by its legislature, has authorized the issuance of $1 million in Board of Harbor Commissioners revenue bonds for construction of the initial port facilities; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii are greatly dependent upon ocean commerce, to a far greater extent than any State of the Union; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has received no major Federal harbor improvement in nearly 20 years: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to include in the current river and harbor development appropriation bill an item for providing a harbor at Kawaihae, Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of April A. D. 1955.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Tulsa, Okla., Chamber of Commerce, relating to the construction of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir project, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Maui, Wailuku, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to an annual session of the Territorial Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

Resolutions adopted by the Hemstead Council, Knights of Columbus, Hemstead, and the Lasalle Council, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, both in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Republicans Unlimited, Hermosa Beach, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

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

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway 2 to the national interstate highway system

"Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that 'There shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico'; and

"Whereas the act further provided that 'The routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States,' and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the National system of interstate highways, dated the 2d day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

"Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified, and revised as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and several other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway 2 plays an ever-increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's highways 9 from New York to Montreal and highway 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

"Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of United States Highway 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a 2-lane highway with a 100-foot right-of-way; and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

"Whereas while this is a petition from the State of Minnesota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to, and adjacent to United States Highway 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of United States Highway 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of Minnesota and in the other States served by United States Highway 2: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in regular session assembled (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), Do most earnestly and respectfully request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

"K. S. POLVANG,
"President of the Senate.

"ALFRED F. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate the 30th day of March in the year of our Lord 1955.

"H. Y. SEAVY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives the 12th day of April in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved April 19, 1955.

"ORVILLE O. FURMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President, the United States Maritime Commission and the Congress of the United States to support measures to insure the continued operation of the American marine hospital system for seamen

"Whereas the nature and type of work performed by the seamen on the American merchant marine operating on the high seas as well as on the Great Lakes is such that it is imperative that adequate hospital facilities be provided for them; and

"Whereas large numbers of residents of the State of Minnesota are beneficially employed as seamen on the Great Lakes and on the high sea; and

"Whereas steps have been taken which if carried out would lead to the destruction of the hospital system built up over many years for seamen: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to insure the continued operation of the hospital system for the American seamen; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota, be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the United States Maritime Commission and to each

Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"ALFRED I. JOHNSON,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"KARL ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives, the 10th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate, the 30th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1955.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved April 5, 1955.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

By Mr. MORSE:

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

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

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

"Whereas only about one-third of the State of Oregon has been adequately mapped topographically; and

"Whereas topographic maps are essential for proper planning of engineering, hydropower, geological, property tax assessment, and highway investigations; and

"Whereas the State Mapping Advisory Committee has petitioned the United States Geological Survey to step up topographic mapping in the State according to a priority system, as illustrated on a map submitted with the petition: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein), That this, the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in regular session assembled, hereby does memorialize the Congress of the United States in order to urge that appropriate action be taken to obtain favorable consideration of the petition in the interest of the State's expanding economy and national defense; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by senate March 25, 1955.

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

"Adopted by house April 5, 1955.

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

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL ATOMIC ENERGY POLICY—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the Senate floor I have previously commented on the importance of making available the miracles of peacetime atomic energy to the Nation's great rural electrification system.

I present the text of a resolution which was adopted at the 19th annual meeting of the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative in Madison along this same line.

It is 1 of 9 resolutions which had been adopted by some 400 delegates who met to consider a variety of issues facing the Nation's REA system.

It is my intention in the not too distant future to comment further on the significance of nuclear energy to the Nation's farm and rural people, and preceding these comments, I send to the desk now the text of the WEC resolution. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, preceded by the text of the letter to me from Mr. W. V. Thomas, general manager of the cooperative, and that it be thereafter referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
Madison, Wis., April 22, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER P. WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Enclosed are copies of 9 resolutions adopted by more than 400 delegates from Wisconsin's 30 rural electric cooperatives who assembled March 30–31 for the 19th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative in Madison.

I want to particularly call your attention to resolution No. 13—on monopoly.

The WEC meeting this year attracted the largest delegate attendance in our history. The sessions were marked by an enthusiasm heretofore unparalleled. It was personally gratifying for me to see the determination exhibited by both speakers and delegates for a continuing strong REA program, and for a program of concerted action to strengthen their local organizations.

The 9 enclosed resolutions deal with actual or prospective Federal legislation or policy. I was instructed to forward these resolutions to your attention and respectfully urge your fullest consideration of them. It is our sincere hope that your ultimate position on these matters will conform to the stand adopted by these delegates with what I assure you was unexcelled unanimity.

May I take advantage of this opportunity to thank you in behalf of our officers, delegates, and guests for the very warm greeting you sent us at the meeting.

We wish to thank you for past courtesies and support extended our organizations and to express warmest personal good wishes.

Cooperatively yours,
W. V. THOMAS, *General Manager.*

RESOLUTION NO. 7—ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas nuclear fuels promise to provide a means of leveling off traditionally high generating costs in Wisconsin and particularly isolated rural areas of this State; and

Whereas experiments in development of nuclear energy for production of electric power is now considered entirely feasible and promises within a very short time to be competitive costwise with other types of fuel; and

Whereas the people of this Nation have already spent over $13 billion of public funds for development of atomic energy; and

Whereas the United States is engaged in a race with the Soviet Union in the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy as well as military uses and that the one way will be as important as the other in the years ahead: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the delegates at this 19th annual meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperatives urge the establishment of a Federal atomic energy policy which will insure the rapid development of low-cost power from a program of action which will include participation by public, cooperative, and private power agencies, and that the same protection of the public welfare long established in another field of public resources, that of waterpower, be extended to this new source of energy; now, be it therefore further

Resolved, That we urge that the Rural Electrification Administration add to its staff a sufficient number of nuclear physics specialists as consultants to work in close cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission in order that they might work toward earliest possible practical adaptation of nuclear energy to the generating facilities of electric cooperatives in Wisconsin and elsewhere; now, be it further

Resolved, That we urge the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to add one or more special consultants on nuclear energy in order that our national association may be assured the closest possible liaison with both AEC and REA in this field.

RELEASE OF WATER FOR NAVIGATIONAL PURPOSES, GARRISON DAM, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from the Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc., Minot, N. Dak., signed by Ralph Bartel, general manager, enclosing a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that organization, relating to the release of water for navigational purposes at Garrison Dam in North Dakota.

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

CENTRAL POWER ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.,
Minot, N. Dak., March 26, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached is a resolution passed by a joint meeting of the board of directors of Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., and Central in regard to release of water for navigational purposes at Garrison Dam in North Dakota.

At the present time the precipitation in the Missouri Basin is below normal and the starting of Garrison powerhouse may be postponed because of insufficient water. It is hoped that the Corps of Engineers will use discretion in releasing water for navigational purposes this spring and summer.

Central and Minnkota serve 18 distribution cooperatives in North Dakota and Minnesota, who in turn serve some over 65,000 farm families with their electrical requirements.

Yours truly,

RALPH BARTEL,
General Manager.

JOINT MEETING OF DIRECTORS OF MINNKOTA POWER COOPERATIVE, INC., NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. AND CENTRAL POWER ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

EXCERPT OF MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF DIRECTORS HELD FEBRUARY 25, 1955

There was a general discussion on the question of the policy of the Corps of Engineers in releasing water at Garrison for navigational purposes and its effect on hydrogeneration. It was the opinion of the group that the water was more urgently needed for the generation of electric power in view of the fact that there is a threat of serious power shortage in the upper Missouri area and, in taking into consideration the small amount of freight traffic on the lower river. After a thorough discussion on this matter, on motion by Mr. Weltin, of Central, seconded by Mr. Marsden, of Minnkota, and unanimously carried, it was

"Resolved, That in the allocation of water for power generation use and for release for

nagivational purposes in the lower Missouri River, that the Corps of Engineers be respectfully requested to give prime consideration to the fact that there will be a critical power shortage in the area served by Garrison Dam because of a current water shortage in the drainage basin which is the source of water supply to this dam, and that it is the sense of this meeting that the requirements for power ought to receive first consideration over requirements for releasing water for navigational purposes, and that water should not be released for navigational purposes at the expense of necessary generation in this area."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE McKENZIE COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the McKenzie County, N. Dak., Farmers Union, relating to wheat acreage, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE DELEGATES OF THE MCKENZIE COUNTY FARMERS UNION, IN CONVENTION ASSEMBLED AT CARTWRIGHT, N. DAK., THE 16TH DAY OF OCTOBER 1954

NO. 1

Whereas the reduction of the 90-percent base of parity to a flexible base as low as 82½ percent, and the drastic cut in acreage allotment will reduce the income of the family-type farmer to such an extent that they cannot possibly pay running expenses, and support a family on the farm: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the delegates of this convention, That we urge Congress to take immediate action to fix a base of 100 acres of wheat to be exempt from any allotment—this to apply to all farmers; and be it further

Resolved, That allotments over the 100-acre base be on a graduated base cut, increasing as the total acreage increases.

NO. 2

Whereas Congress has seen fit to remove a definite base for many farm products and passed in its place a flexible scale of support, thereby establishing an uncertain market; and

Whereas this has caused the market on grain, livestock and dairy products to drop far below parity; and

Whereas agriculture is, and always has been, in America the basic industry whereupon all prosperity depends: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge that when Congress meets, immediate steps be taken to guarantee 100 percent of parity on all agricultural products, including livestock and dairy products.

NO. 3

Whereas there is a constant propaganda carried on by those who wish to exploit our national resources for private profits to create distrust in the ability of our Government to handle its business; and

Whereas their assumed fear of Government monopoly and creeping socialism is used only to avert the attention of the real danger—that of control of our Government by powerful corporations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we resent any such propaganda, as a democratic government is a government of the people, by the people and for the people, whose duty it is to provide for the general welfare of its people; and be it further

Resolved, That we recognize that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and that we can only lose democracy in America if we fail to avail ourselves of our rights and duties by not keeping ourselves informed on State and National issues and by not going to the polls on election day and casting an intelligent vote.

NO. 4

Whereas there is again to be introduced in Congress a bill (H. R. 2967) for universal military training, a system that has destroyed every nation that has spent its substance in building and maintaining huge armies; and

Whereas if such a bill becomes a law we will definitely become a military nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are definitely opposed to compulsory military training in time of peace.

NO. 5

Whereas this continuous cold war raging in the world today can never bring world peace but only create more hatred between nations; and

Whereas unless some means can be found to end the cold war it will eventually result in a third world war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Government to take immediate steps, through diplomatic channels, to work out a plan for coexistence with nations whose ideologies differ from ours.

NO. 6

Whereas we in the farmers union recognize that organized labor has proved to be our good friends and supporters; and

Whereas only by joining our forces can either of us hope to get just laws passed by Congress for our own protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we pledge our support to the American laborers in their struggle to maintain a wage scale sufficiently high to maintain a decent standard of living for themselves and their families.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS,
ROY JOHNSON, *President.*
WILLIAM NELSEN,
ERNEST SONDROL,
OLAF ERICKSON, *Secretary.*

CLOSING OF CERTAIN NORTH DAKOTA VETERANS' HOSPITALS—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Post No. 4172, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hillsboro, N. Dak., relating to the closing of veterans' hospitals at Minot, and Fargo, N. Dak.

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

MARCH 20, 1955.

To: Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
From: Members of VFW Post, 4172, Hillsboro, N. Dak.
Subject: Closure of North Dakota Veterans' Hospitals.

Whereas the Hoover Commission, in a report issued on February 27, 1955 has recommended the closing of Veterans' Administration Hospitals at Minot, D. Dak., and Fargo, N. Dak., along with 17 other VA hospitals; and

Whereas the closing of the Fargo and Minot hospitals would create a great and unnecessary hardship on the veterans served by those institutions; and

Whereas the veterans of North Dakota and adjacent area served by those hospitals are as much entitled to VA hospitalization at a point reasonably close to their homes as are veterans residing in more populous areas; and

Whereas the closing of the Minot and Fargo hospitals would require veterans of North Dakota to go either to Minneapolis, Minn.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; or Fort Harrison, Mont., for needed treatment, which points are most inaccessible to North Dakota points, with the exception of Minneapolis, and all of which would require travel of at least 250 miles in practically all cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Post 4172, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located at Hillsboro, N. Dak., in duly convened regular meeting, does hereby urge upon each of the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, to use every means at their disposal to prevent this unwarranted discrimination against North Dakota veterans, and to do their utmost to maintain the operations of the Fargo and Minot VA Hospitals.

Attest:

CLARENCE R. BAKKERM,
Commander.
ARTHUR S. MAGNUSON,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTIONS OF LA MESA (CALIF.) REPUBLICAN CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the La Mesa (Calif.) Republican Club, relating to the treatymaking power, and the repudiation of the Yalta agreement.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF LA MESA REPUBLICAN CLUB, LA MESA, CALIF.

Whereas early in 1945 at Potsdam, Germany, after World War II had been won against Germany, President Harry S. Truman entered into an agreement with the representatives of Great Britain and Russia under which German territory and the city of Berlin were divided into zones of occupation with the city of Berlin completely surrounded by Russian-held territory; and

Whereas the subjects and the terms of that secret agreement have never been revealed by the United States Government nor submitted to the Senate as is required of all treaties under article II, section 2 of the United States Constitution, as follows: "The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur"; and

Whereas at Teheran, at Casablanca, at Cairo, and upon many other occasions the recent Presidents of the United States have assumed the power to enter into agreements with other nations without submitting those agreements to, nor asking the advice of, the Senate, and have kept many of such agreements secret from the American people to this day; and

Whereas the American people have a constitutional right to know the subjects and terms of treaties involving the Nation and the people and neither the President nor his executive subordinates have ever been granted powers to secretly bind the people of this Nation without the advice and consent of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the La Mesa Republican Club in meeting this 1st day of April 1955, That the President reveal at once the full and unchanged terms of the Potsdam agreement and other Presidential agreements involving the welfare of this Nation, and that the Bricker amendment to the United States Constitution be enacted promptly preventing the assumption of powers to execute secret agreements by the President; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Republican Central Committee of California and to such other organizations and individuals as is deemed advisable.

MAMIE K. ALLEN,
President.
CECILE MCCLELLAN,
Secretary.

Whereas in February 1945 the Yalta Agreement was entered intio by Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; by Winston Churchill, Premier of Great Britain; and by Generalissimo Joseph Stalin, Premier of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas that agreement was secretly made without the knowledge or consent of the United States Senate, nor of the Congress, nor of the people of the United States, contrary to article II, section 2, of the Constitution, which read as follows: "The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur"; and

Whereas that secret agreement has never been submitted to the United States Senate for ratification and has therefore never become a valid treaty binding upon the people of the United States, and, in fact, has only become officially and partially known to our Congress and our people 10 years later, in March 1955; and

Whereas by that agreement the aforesaid heads of government consented to Russian domination of many territories, properties, and rights of the Republics of China and Korea and territories of the Japanese Empire and of several nations of Eastern Europe, without their knowledge or consent, thereby aiding in the enslavement of 600 million people by the Communist tyrants—all of which is abhorrent to the Christian ideals of our American Republic and has resulted in the Korean war and the present prospects of war in Asia; and

Whereas the terms of that secret agreement have been flagrantly violated by the Soviet Government, thereby releasing the other parties thereto from any vestige of obligation in an invalid and uncompleted treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the La Mesa Republican Club in meeting this 1st day of April 1955, That the Senate and House of Representatives, by joint resolution, repudiate the said Yalta Agreement, declare it null and void, and publish to the whole world the determination of the United States to take every step possible toward restoration of the liberties of those millions enslaved by Soviet treachery; and be it further

Resolved, That we join with Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND in his advocacy of an unyielding opposition to any further Communist aggression in the Far East, and that the Republics of China and of South Korea be aided in the prevention of such further Communist aggression; and be it further

Resolved, That the Bricker amendment to the United States Constitution be promptly passed by the Senate and House of Representatives and the State legislatures, preventing the assumption of such powers by the Executive, as was attempted at Yalta; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Republican central committee of California and to such other organizations and individuals as is deemed advisable.

MAMIE H. ALLEN, *President.*
CECILE MCCLELLAN, *Secretary.*

INCENTIVES FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION OF DURUM WHEAT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by county presidents of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, at Jamestown, N. Dak., relating to incentives for additional production of durum wheat.

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

RESOLUTION ON DURUM INCENTIVES

We, the county presidents of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, meeting together in Jamestown, N. Dak., March 31, 1955, wish to go on record against the principle, presently advocated by some, offering nonrecourse loans—loans which do not have to be repaid—and offering disproportionately high levels of parity supports to commodities in order to build up supplies. We believe such actions to be against the best interests of sound price support programs. We refer specifically to the current efforts being made to secure additional durum production in North Dakota through such incentive actions.

PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS—RESOLUTION OF MINOT (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minot, N. Dak., Farmers Union Local, favoring 109-percent parity prices for farmers.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Berry bill (H. R. 3654) is another blow below the belt aimed at farmers by this administration. We vigorously condemn the passage of this bill; and

Whereas in the case of perishables such as cattle, hogs, eggs, potatoes, and so forth, we recommend that Congress declare producers to be entitled 100 percent of parity. That they be permitted to produce and market perishables for whatever price consumers demand permits, and that the Federal Government make up by means of compensatory payments any difference between 100 percent of parity and price received. Such legislation would benefit not only farmers but would be to the economic best interest of the entire Nation by helping to achieve full employment and prosperous economic growth of the entire Nation; and

Whereas we demand that farmers be given the same deal as Dixon-Yates contract, a 25-year contract guaranteeing the farmer 109 percent of parity.

Passed unanimously this 15th day of March 1955, by the Minot Farmers Union Local.

HENRY HILLINS, *President.*
LEITH, N. DAK.

REGULATION OF NATURAL GAS PRICES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., endorsing the mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills purporting to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission the matter of regulation of natural gas prices.

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

RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE PASSAGE BY CONGRESS OF H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That we endorse the formation of a mayor's committee to oppose passage by Congress of H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills purporting to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission the matter of regulation of natural gas prices. Further, that we endorse participation by the mayor of the city of Minneapolis in such committee program. Further, that Mayor Eric G. Hoyer be requested to immediately contact the mayors of Minnesota communities now served with natural gas with a view to securing their active opposition to the above-mentioned legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the League of Minnesota Municipalities be requested to immediately contact Minnesota communities, including those expecting future service of natural gas, to undertake active opposition to the foregoing legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to transmit forthwith copies of this resolution to Joseph S. Clark, Jr., mayor of Philadelphia, Pa., Clarence Ludwig, secretary of the League of Minnesota Municipalities, Charles Rhyne, general counsel of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and to each Member of the House and Senate in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed April 7, 1955.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved April 7, 1955.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

OPPOSITION TO CHANGES IN RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the East Central Electric Association of Braham, Minn., opposing the changes in the Rural Electrification Administration recommended by the Hoover Commission Task Force Report.

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

Whereas the task force of the Hoover Commission in their report has recommended that the Rural Electrification Administration be eliminated as a direct Government

agency, and that the REA Cooperatives obtain private financing; and

Whereas this report has created an impression by implication that a 5-year moratorium period at the beginning of the loan term gives less than a 2-percent return on the loans to the Government; and

Whereas the REA program through financing of loans for the construction of rural electric lines has in no way been subsidized by the Government, but are all on a self-liquidating basis; and

Whereas the statement by the Hoover Commission report of a 5-year moratorium on loans is not a true statement, but is actually a deferred interest item added to the principal of the loan; and

Whereas the Government has made a profit on REA loans made to REA Associations; and

Whereas the REA would be required to obtain financing from private sources which would result in an interest rate of from 4 percent to 5 percent, in place of 2 percent now in effect; therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the East Central Electric Association, assembled at their annual meeting this 19th day of March 1955, That we go on record to memorialize Congress and the President to continue the REA Act in its present form; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all the Members in Congress from Minnesota, Senators THYE and HUMPHREY.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS AT MINOT AND FARGO, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution passed by Post, No. 5252, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Pelican Rapids, Minn., stating their opposition to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to close the Veterans' Administration Hospitals at Minot and Fargo, N. Dak.

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

Whereas the Hoover Commission, in a report issued on February 27, 1955, has recommended the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals at Minot, N. Dak., and Fargo, N. Dak., along with 17 other VA hospitals; and

Whereas the closing of the Fargo and Minot hospitals would create a great and unnecessary hardship on the veterans served by those institutions; and

Whereas the veterans of the ninth district and adjoining counties served by the Fargo hospital are as much entitled to VA hospitalization at a point reasonably close to their homes as are veterans residing in more populous areas; and

Whereas the closing of the Fargo veterans' hospital would require veterans of the ninth district and adjoining counties to go either to Minneapolis, Minn.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; or Fort Harrison, Mont., for needed treatment, which points are most inaccessible to northwest Minnesota points, with the exception of Minneapolis, and Minneapolis is over 400 miles from most northwest points: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Post, No. 5252, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, located at Pelican Rapids, Minn., in duly convened regular meeting on April 5, 1955, does hereby urge upon each of the Senators and Representatives from Minnesota to use every means at their disposal to prevent this unwarranted discrimination against Minnesota ninth district veterans, and to do their utmost to maintain the operations of the Fargo, N. Dak., veterans' hospital.

Attest:

Jay S. Hauger, Commander; Carl A. Kantrud, Adjutant; Gilman Risset; Donald Erickson; Melfu I. Salter; Donald Monson; Rex R. Crews; Alvin Brenden; Ralph Ballard; Leonard Hays; James O. Peterson; Earl Gobel; Andrew Christensen; Alf P. Anderson; Harry Siggerud; Orphie L. Holt; Arthur Rust; Orval Jensen; L. E. Christopherson; Orville Kind; Ole Brodalin; Arthur Trosvik.

WITHDRAWAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON COMPLETION OF GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Jamestown requesting the Congress of the United States to withdraw all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to operate at the maximum operating pool level of 1,850 feet, and thereby assure the greatest potential benefits of the project.

This is very important, not only for the good citizens of North Dakota, but since a substantial portion of the State of Minnesota is in the Missouri River Basin, I have particular interest in this project and in its public power resources.

Similar resolutions have been received from the following groups interested in maximum benefit from the operation of Garrison Dam: Minot (N. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce; City Council of Maddock, N. Dak.; City Council of Wahpeton, N. Dak.; Board of Ransom County Commissioners, North Dakota; City Council of Esmond, N. Dak.; Central Power Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Hillsboro (N. Dak.) Civic and Commerce Association; Fessenden (N. Dak.) Civic and Commerce Association; Wells County (N. Dak.) Farmers' Union; Minnewaukan (N. Dak.) Commercial Club; Benson County VFW Post, No. 4251, Esmond, N. Dak.; Anamoose Civic Club, Anamoose, N. Dak.; South Cottonwood Farmers' Union Local, No. 48; Sheyenne Valley Rod and Gun Club, Warwick, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Richland County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Eddy County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, LaMoure County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Ward County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Pierce County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Mountrail County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Bottineau County, N. Dak.; County Commissioners, Benson County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Cass County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Wells County, N. Dak.; Board of County Commissioners, Traill County, N. Dak.; City Council of Rugby, N. Dak.; City Council of Harvey, N. Dak.; City Council of Casselton, N. Dak.; City Commission of Devils Lake, N. Dak.; City Commission of New Rockford, N. Dak.; City Council of Bottineau, N. Dak.; City Council of Carrington, N. Dak.; City Council of Streeter, N. Dak.; Board of City Commissioners, Mandan, N. Dak.; Board of City Commissioners, Fargo, N. Dak.; City Council, McClusky, N. Dak.; City Council, Cooperstown, N. Dak.; City Council, Minot, N. Dak.; City Commission, Hillsboro, N. Dak.; City Council, Lakota, N. Dak.; City Council, Anamoose, N. Dak.; Board of City Commissioners, Turtle Lake, N. Dak.; City Council, Oakes, N. Dak.

Mr. President, I am bringing the attention of the Senate to these resolutions because they supplement the resolutions I have received from my own State of Minnesota. The western part of Minnesota has a great stake in the extra power reserves that would only be available with the high-level dam and I support the resolutions for the 1,850-foot pool back of the Garrison Dam.

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

Whereas through the combined efforts of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, the Bureau of Reclamation, the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, and other interested agencies, it has been determined that the maximum operating pool level for the Garrison Reservoir should be established at 1,850 feet for greatest efficiency and to assure the greatest potential benefits of the project; and

Whereas approximately 300,000 people living in the James River and Sheyenne River Valleys of North Dakota and additional 200,000 along the James River in South Dakota would receive the greatest benefits from the maximum operating level of the Garrison Reservoir; and

Whereas the people in the James and Sheyenne River Valleys future water supply is contingent on the operation of the Garrison Reservoir it is therefore resolved that we ask the Congress of the United States to see that no restrictive phrases should be retained in the bill covering appropriations for the Garrison Reservoir: Be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations and chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Works; to the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Public Works, and chairman, Public Works Appropriations; and to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Attest:

W. F. SHARP, *Mayor,*
O. L. OCHONAN,
City Auditor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

S. 1763. A bill relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 217).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 222).

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 14. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas (Rept. No. 218); and

S. 148. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge, to the State of Iowa (Rept. No. 219).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 653. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 220); and

S. 933. A bill to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 221).

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

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a 36.759-acre tract to the Vineland School District of the County of Kern, State of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 223).

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

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 224).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1271. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 227); and

S. 1272 A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 228).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution favoring cooperation of the people in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness (Rept. No. 225);

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week (Rept. No. 226).

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 229)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is my privilege to submit to the Senate the favorable report, with amendments, of the Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 8, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution authorizing governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives caused by disaster, whenever such vacancies total more than half of the authorized membership of the House.

In submitting this report, it seems to me that this joint resolution is a timely recognition of an existing gap in the constitutional provisions providing for representative government. This is no criticism of the Founding Fathers, for they could not have been expected to anticipate the technological advances in warfare whereby whole cities, including the seat of Government of the United States, may be destroyed.

While all of us believe in and support, the provisions of the Constitution which make the Congress responsive to the electorate, nevertheless, in our day and time we must realize that it is possible for a large part of the membership of the House of Representatives to be destroyed, thereby rendering that body incapable of exercising its constitutional functions. Of course, the Senate might likewise lose a large proportion of its membership in an atomic attack. But the Constitution provides a mechanism whereby governors may appoint persons to serve as Senators until the people can fill the vacancies by elections, so that the Senate could be reconstituted within a short period of time. But governors have no such authority, under our Constitution, insofar as Members of the House of Representatives are concerned. It seems to me that it would be a reprehensible omission if the Congress did not take as much cognizance of its own ability to function in time of disaster as it does of the other aspects of the problem created by the development and perfection of atomic weapons. During those fateful days, no State or district should be compelled to be inactive while representatives of the remaining districts consider and enact legislation vitally affecting their lives.

Mr. President, I submit the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 8, and express my fervent hope that the Senate will consider the resolution at an early date.

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

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution and ask that it be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to Constitutional Rights, the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized from May 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON ARMY SIGNAL CORPS—SUBVERSION AND ESPIONAGE (S. REPT. NO. 230)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report entitled "Army Signal Corps—Subversion and Espionage," prepared by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which was ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 231)

Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the annual report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Brig. Gen. Robert Alexis McClure, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States;

John J. Murphy for appointment as chaplain of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of captain;

William C. Fisher and sundry other persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. John William Harmony and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy.

Mr. BYRD. In addition to the above reports, I report a group of 1,333 routine nominations in the Army in the grade of captain and below, and 670 nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps in the grade of captain and below. Since these names have already appeared in the RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Shih Lu Chang and sundry other candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

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

Robert C. McFaddan, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana, vice Julius J. Wichser, resigned.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; and

S. 1779. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1780. A bill to require that a State home for disabled veterans must make at least 50 percent of the beds in such home available for domiciliary care in order to qualify for Federal assistance under the act of August 27, 1888; and

S. 1781. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to acquire, distribute, and administer Salk infantile paralysis vaccine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1782. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Missouri River between Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving such river for navigation between such points; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

S. 1783. A bill for the relief of Mary Palanuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1784. A bill for the relief of Max Schaffner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1785. A bill for the relief of Gennaro DeLucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1786. A bill to permit the States to tax wine and distilled spirits purchased on, or for delivery into, military reservations and other Federal areas, unless purchased for use or resale by the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1787. A bill for the relief of Edith Kalwies; and

S. 1788. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth M. de Mik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1789. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels; and

S. 1791. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 54 Stat. 164, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1792. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes; 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. LEHMAN:

S. 1793. A bill for the relief of Balbino Acusin Ariasa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1794. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to redefine the term "refugee," to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 1795. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1796. A bill for the relief of Martha Fries Moskal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1797. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard and the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles C. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1799. A bill to amend section 203 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 1800. A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1801. A bill for the relief of Milan Kovacevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1802. A bill to extend the Small Business Act of 1953 for 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO CREDIT FOR CERTAIN INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS PAID FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to 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. 1778) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Higher education has become a necessity, not a luxury, in America today.

The nature of our society has become so complex that we can no longer afford to have an under-educated people. We need technicians in all fields of endeavor. What is more, we need people trained in the humanities—people whose horizons have been broadened to understand the world in which we really live today.

We of America prize ourselves on our educational system—the finest in the world.

The fact of the matter is, however, that there are great numbers of promising American youngsters who do not get the benefit of higher education. Of those young Americans in college and studying for higher degrees, very considerable numbers of them experience real difficulties trying to make ends meet during their years of education.

There are innumerable parents in America today who have to sacrifice a good deal in order to put their youngsters through college, even though many of the youngsters earn part of their way by after-hour vocations.

I believe that the United States Government, as a part of its tax policy, should encourage, not discourage education.

I believe that it should give a break to people who want to improve themselves by getting higher education. It should give a break to parents of youngsters who want to see their children get the benefit of the world of learning.

It is for this purpose that I am offering this bill today. It is comparable to numerous other bills already introduced in the House of Representatives.

Its key phrase is that "there shall be allowed to an individual as a credit against (his over-all taxes) an amount equal to 30 percent of the aggregate amount paid during the taxable year by such individual to institutions of higher education as tuition or fees * * *"

The amendment would go into effect to cover tuition paid after December 31 of last year; that is, it would include 1955 payments.

This is but one of numerous changes in the Nation's tax laws which I feel are necessary in order to liberalize the tax program

and provide a square deal for those who are overly burdened by it.

It is useless for us to talk about a shortage of engineers, a shortage of doctors, and of other professionals; it is useless for us to talk about our competitive race for technical superiority against the Soviet Union unless we simultaneously take active steps to promote higher education in our land.

This suggestion today, in the form of the bill which I am introducing, is but one phase of meeting the overall problem of modern education.

I shall offer from time to time other proposals which I hope will receive the sympathetic consideration of the Congress.

INCLUSION OF LAWYERS UNDER OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a long time I have been deeply interested in expanding the coverage of the Nation's old-age and survivors insurance system.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the coverage of the act to one particularly vital group on the American scene. I refer to the members of the American bar. This bill will offer them the right of optional coverage for a 2-year period.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement, which I have prepared on this subject, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point to be followed thereafter by typical expressions from bar associations from my State recommending coverage.

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

The bill (S. 1779) to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement and related matters, presented by Mr. WILEY, are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Nation's social security system has proved itself.

It has become a part and parcel of the American free enterprise system serving to help sustain it from economic shocks of loss of income, serving to ease the problem of insecurity in elderly years.

Congress acting in accordance with President Eisenhower's wise suggestion has added more groups under OASI coverage.

Only a relatively few groups now remain outside the system, and this is largely at their own request.

Of late, however, there are more and more indications that many groups which have heretofore desired to be outside the system, now desire coverage under it.

The American bar is one such group.

MY CONSULTATION WITH WISCONSIN BAR

I have personally inquired of the position of the Wisconsin Bar Association, of county bar groups and individual attorneys at law. I find more and more county bar associations and more and more individual lawyers indicate to me that the overwhelming proportion of their numbers want to be included.

A very sizable number however, do not want compulsory coverage.

Under the circumstances, I believe that optional coverage should be granted, since optional coverage is apparently generally preferred.

But what of the Federal Government's attitude toward optional coverage?

The traditional problem in connection with optional coverage is that it has raised significant administrative problems, but, more important, serious financial problems from the standpoint of the trust fund.

Older individuals—soon to retire—tend to want to come in under the social security system and to draw considerable benefits therefrom on the basis of relatively few premiums paid in. On the other hand, younger individuals prefer not to be included now, since they will be paying in for many, many years before drawing benefits, ordinarily.

ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES VOLUNTARY, WANTS MANDATORY COVERAGE

Therefore, the Social Security Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have opposed optional coverage, preferring that coverage be on a mandatory basis for young practitioners and old alike.

I believe, however, that optional coverage as in the instance of clergymen, is both feasible and desirable.

That is why I am offering a voluntary coverage bill today.

A provision has been included in my bill to require individuals to decide upon their personal inclusion within 2 years. This is an essential requirement in order to ease and simplify the very considerable bookkeeping and cost problem of the Social Security Administration.

This means, in effect, that a young man coming out of law school and passing the bar examination, would have 2 years in which to make up his mind whether or not he wanted to be included. So would an older practitioner.

While the 2-year limitation for the decision one way or the other may appear rather strict, in point of fact, it is the very minimum. The Social Security Administration feels this minimum is essential as a safeguard to it in the problem of administering the complex program efficiently.

The Administration, I may say, remains opposed to optional coverage at all. But at least, this 2-year requirement will go part of the way in order to meet the Administration's objection.

THIS BILL PROVIDES BASIS FOR FURTHER REVIEW

This bill today is not by any means offered as the last word on the subject. I hope instead that it will help stimulate the Congress and the people toward a careful review of this whole problem of coverage.

As an attorney-at-law myself for over 30 years, I know that few groups play so crucial a role in our free-enterprise economy as do American lawyers.

I FAVOR TAX ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SAVINGS FOR OLD AGE

Included in the new consideration which I am suggesting today, should be the question as to how, under the tax laws, we can promptly and more equitably encourage individuals to save up for their own retirement income in later years.

This problem is particularly applicable in the case of attorneys, doctors, dentists and other professionals. Most of them try to build up nest eggs for their later years, but find themselves so heavily taxed in their productive years as to be unable to build up sufficient income.

MANY LAWYERS ALREADY INCLUDED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Insofar as attorneys are concerned, I should like to point out that already, a great many lawyers are covered under the personal security systems. Attorneys working for the Government are included in the Governmen't civil service retirement system; attorneys working for large corporations are covered under the OASI; attorneys with careers in the Armed Forces are covered under military retirement plans.

From an actual or other standpoint, I do not see any fundamental reason why, from the intrinsic nature of the legal profession, attorneys in practice for themselves should remain excluded, provided they want to come in.

I hope, therefore, that this optional coverage will be rapidly considered, and I hope that more and more members of the American bar will crystallize their thinking as to their precise wishes in this matter.

THANKS TO BADGER BAR

I want to thank the Wisconsin Bar Association for its expressions to me on this subject and to thank all of the many other bar groups and individuals for their helpful comments.

Many responded to an inquiry as to lawyers' own preferences which I had placed in my weekly newsletter to Wisconsin. These responses to the newsletter inquiry were virtually 100 percent in praise of my effort to bring the problem to the fore.

There follow now excerpts from a letter which I had requested from a legislative attorney of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, describing application of my new bill.

Then come the grassroot expressions from Badger bar groups.

EXCERPTS FROM HEALTH DEPARTMENT LETTER

The Department letter incidentally reiterated that the Department does not favor voluntary coverage.

Nevertheless, the Department advised by way of background to my bill for voluntary coverage:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Before enacting the social-security amendments of 1954 the Congress gave careful consideration to President Eisenhower's proposal that old-age and survivors insurance coverage be extended to self-employed lawyers and other self-employed professional groups not covered by the program. Conflicting viewpoints in regard to the coverage of certain of these self-employed professional groups, including lawyers, were presented to the Congress. In some cases the Congress apparently was not certain that a majority of the members of particular groups wanted to be covered. These groups, and among them self-employed lawyers, therefore, continue to be specifically excluded from coverage under old-age and survivors insurance.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare believes that, generally speaking, the need of lawyers for old-age and survivors insurance protection is comparable to that of many self-employed persons and wage earners who are now covered under the program.

* * * * *

You also expressed a desire to have some indication of the amount of coverage required for self-employed lawyers, now at or near age 65, to be eligible for old-age insurance benefits. To be eligible for such benefits, an individual must be fully insured. He is, generally, fully insured if he has not less than one quarter of coverage for each two of the calendar quarters elapsing after 1950 (if he was then 21 or over) and prior to the quarter in which he attains age 65 (or dies). He must, however, have a minimum of six quarters of coverage. The maximum required is 40 quarters of coverage.

A self-employed individual is credited with 4 quarters of coverage for each year in which he has net income from such self-employment equal to $400 or more. If he has less than $400 of such income, he earns no quarters of coverage from it.

In order to avoid a serious handicap to the groups newly covered under the amendments to the Social Security Act enacted last year, an alternative method of securing fully insured status was provided. Under this method, an individual is insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and prior to July 1, 1956, or, if later, the quarter in which he became 65 (or died) are quarters of coverage.

Under these rules, the following are some examples of the number of quarters of coverage required to be eligible for retirement benefits:

Number of quarters of coverage to be insured

Attains age 65 on or before:	
June 30, 1954	6
June 30, 1955	[1] 8
June 30, 1957	[2] 12
June 30, 1959	[3] 16

[1] Or, under the alternative method, 6 consecutive quarters of coverage after 1954 and before July 1, 1956.

[2] Or, under the alternative method, 9 consecutive quarters of coverage after 1954 and before April 1, 1957.

[3] The alternative provision is no longer beneficial since it would require more than 16 consecutive quarters of coverage after 1954 in this and all cases of attainment of age 65 at a later date.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS FROM UNITED STATES BAR GROUP

RICE, RICE & RICE,
SPARTA, WIS., *January 17, 1955.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a member of the house of governors of the Wisconsin Bar Association, I have polled all the members of the Monroe County Bar Association on the question of social security for lawyers, and I find that 14 members are for it and 1 is against it.

Yours truly,

Z. S. RICE.

FUGINA, KOSTNER, QUINN & WARD,
Arcadia, Wis., January 5, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I understand that a bill will be introduced in Congress to extend social security coverage for lawyers. Members of the Tri-County Bar Association, to which we belong, are heartily in favor of this, and I hope you will do all in your power to secure its passage. As it stands today, the elimination of lawyers from coverage is very unfair. With best wishes to you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE E. FUGINA.

SAUK COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
February 15, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have polled the members of our bar association to determine their views upon social security coverage for attorneys.

Of the 24 members responding out of a total membership of 30, 6 reported in favor of compulsory coverage for attorneys while 18 were opposed. Of these 18, 16 approved optional social security coverage for attorneys.

We trust that you will take this expression of opinion as well as those of the other associations throughout the State into account at such time as the Congress considers this matter.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. KARCH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

LA CROSSE COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
La Crosse, Wis., February 7, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The La Crosse County Bar Association was polled in the month of January 1955 as to whether the members would be in favor of attorneys being included under the social security system.

The following results were obtained: Of 65 members polled 44 were in favor of such inclusion and 21 were opposed to such inclusion. Stated in percentages 68 percent of the members polled were in favor of being included under social security while 32 percent were opposed.

Very truly yours,

G. M. SNODGRASS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MANITOWOC, WIS., *November 23, 1954*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: By unanimous vote of the members in attendance at a meeting of the Manitowoc Bar Association Wednesday, November 17, 1954, the secretary was instructed to inform the United States Senators from Wisconsin and all of the Congressmen from Wisconsin that the association was in favor of having attorneys included under the Social Security Act.

The Secretary was also instructed to inform the secretary of the State Bar Association and the office of the American Bar Association of this action.

Very truly yours,

DONALD J. BERO,
Secretary, Manitowoc County Bar Assoc.

WAUPACA, WIS., *January 5, 1955.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In December 1954, at a meeting of the Waupaca County Bar Association and at numerous meetings prior thereto, the Waupaca County Bar Association have adopted resolutions favoring the extension of the benefits of social security to lawyers.

I certainly hope that you will use your good efforts to have the benefits of social security extended to the lawyers at this session of Congress.

I also want to take this opportunity to inform you that I, along with a lot of others in this State feel that you are doing an outstanding job as Senator from the State of Wisconsin, and I believe I voice the sentiment of the thinking people of this State.

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL MCHENRY.

WAUSAU, WIS., *February 16, 1955*

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to congratulate you on the good work you are doing down there in Congress and hope you will continue to do so.

With all the spending of public money outside of the United States it has occurred to me that it might not be amiss for Congress to amend the old-age assistance law and provide assistance to all persons over 65 years of age. For your information, the Marathon County Bar Association passed a resolution at the last meeting urging old-age asistance for lawyers and the resolution provided it should be compulsory. There was no dissenting vote.

Personally I think it is a good law and I think it should apply to the lawyers, doctors, and any others who have been left out as well as those who are now being taken care of, and I feel justly sure that you agree with me.

On behalf of the bar association of Marathon County may I urge you to use your influence to amend the law to so provide old-age asistance to the lawyers of the country.

Wishing you the best of success.

Yours very truly,

LUKE F. BURNS.

KENOSHA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Kenosha, Wis., February 21, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: A recent poll of the members of this organization indicates that the major sentiment is opposed to compulsory social security for lawyers.

It would further appear that some type of voluntary plan would be the most acceptable to this group.

We urge that you give our position consideration at such time as any legislation of this nature is introduced in the Senate.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. MALLOY, *Secretary.*

DISTRIBUTION OF SALK INFANTILE-PARALYSIS VACCINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that on yesterday the Washington Star published an article stating that it might be 4 or 5 weeks before there would be distribution of the vaccine to combat poliomyelitis, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to acquire, distribute, and administer Salk infantile-paralysis vaccine.

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

The bill (S. 1781) authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to acquire, distribute, and administer Salk infantile-paralysis vaccine, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY OF MISSOURI RIVER BETWEEN GARRISON DAM, N. DAK., AND SIOUX CITY, IOWA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Missouri River between Garrison Dam, in North Dakota, and Sioux City, Iowa, for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving the river for navigation between such points. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with a statement I have prepared, entitled "Missouri River, Proposed Preliminary Survey To Determine Whether Navigation May Be Extended Between Sioux City, Iowa, and Garrison Dam, N. Dak." I may add that the St. Lawrence Seaway does not help the farmers of the Midwest as much as it would if navigation on the Missouri River could be extended all the way to Garrison Dam, which would result in the saving of millions upon millions of dollars in freight charges paid by the farmers, businessmen, and laboring men of the Northwest.

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. 1782) to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the

Missouri River between Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa, for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving such river for navigation between such points, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army shall cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Missouri River between Garrison Dam in North Dakota and Sioux City, Iowa, for the purpose of determining the advisability of improving such river for navigation between such points.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $75,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

MISSOURI RIVER—PROPOSED PRELIMINARY SURVEY TO DETERMINE WHETHER NAVIGATION MAY BE EXTENDED BETWEEN SIOUX CITY, IOWA, AND GARRISON DAM, N. DAK.

Rivers are the mothers of civilization. Through the pages of history flow the great stream names of the world: Tigris-Euphrates, Nile, Danube, Volga, Yangtze, Po, Rhine—rivers fabulous and lore laden.

But it is not of those rivers in faraway lands that I intend to speak today—but of a stream in North America that has channeled the lives of men—that has conditioned the thinking, the economy, the ways of life of a State and a Nation, the Missouri, also called by persons living along its banks The Big Muddy.

The watersheds of the Missouri and the Mississippi enfold all the creeks and rivers so important to our soil, wildlife, transportation, and well-being.

The waterway formed by the Mississippi River from its mouth to its confluence with the Missouri River in the vicinity of St. Louis and thence up the Missouri River to its headwaters is the longest river in the world—and the Missouri River is by a considerable margin the longer of the two rivers which form this waterway. Over 2,460 miles in length, the Missouri River originates on the slopes of the Continental Divide in Yellowstone National Park and southwestern Montana and it winds a tortured course to the north, south, and east. On the way, it drains all or a part of 10 States and flows through 7 of them. The natural basin of the Missouri River covers 516,000 square miles or 17.3 percent of the entire continental United States.

At the turn of the 19th century, the area between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains was primitive land which had successively been the property of the Spanish and French Governments. In the year 1803, ownership of the vast region known as Louisiana Territory was transferred once again, this time to the United States. Our Government regarded the acquisition of the area now known as the Missouri River Basin, which formed a part of the Louisiana Territory, as secondary in importance to the control of the trade outlet at the mouth of the Mississippi River.

In 1764 St. Louis was established as a fur depot and for many years commerce on the Missouri, moving in canoes, pirogues, bullboats, mackinaws, and keelboats were tied to the fur trade. It was not until 1804–06 when Captains Meriwether Lewis and William Clark of the Corps of Engineers made their memorable exploration that the real importance of the Missouri River Basin was discovered. The Missouri River, together with its 30 major tributaries played an important part in the development of the basin. As a natural trafficway, it provided the only conveyance for many commodities, and supplied a profitable living for rivermen who plied their craft upstream as far as Fort Benton, Mont., in spite of frequent Indian attacks, treacherous currents, floating debris, and many other hazards.

With the coming of the railroad, however, traffic on the Missouri declined. In the year 1884, the Federal Government established the Missouri River Commission and endowed it with responsibility for improvement work in the interest of navigation on the Missouri River. After extensive experimentation and study, the Commission initiated regulation work adapted to the characteristics of the Missouri River.

In 1902 the improvement work was assigned to the Corps of Engineers and this organization has been responsible for all projects concerning the Missouri ever since; but it was not until 1927, 25 years later, that any consideration was given to navigation projects on this great river.

During the years 1929 to 1934, comprehensive studies were made by the Corps of Engineers of the principal river basins in the Missouri River watershed. These studies, prepared under the provisions of House Document 308, 69th Congress, formed a basis for later, more detailed investigation and planning. Construction of the Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir was authorized in 1933 and in the Rivers and Harbors Acts of August 30, 1935, and May 18, 1938, Congress approved construction of the dam and appurtenant works and a suitable powerplant for the production of hydroelectric power, for the purpose of improving navigation on the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth, and for other purposes incidental thereto.

In the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1946, Congress took cognizance of the fact that destructive floods constitute a menace to the National welfare and the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of navigable waters or their tributaries, for flood-control purposes, if the benefits accruing exceed the estimated costs and if the lives and social security of people are adversely affected.

The history of the Missouri River Basin development program is in a sense the history of the settlement of the West, of the pioneer farmers and their government, who, through good years and bad, through flood and drought, developed a system of agriculture dictated by the climatic adversities of that region.

The Missouri River is the last major stream of the Mississippi system to be improved and it has been harnessed step by step and made to work for man. Today this river is no longer the untamed, rampaging dangerous and unpredictable stream it used to be. It has been brought under control so that now navigation on this great river is possible to within 128 river miles south of Sioux City. But this is not enough. Not nearly enough when you consider that the area of the Missouri River basin comprises 17 percent of the entire continental United States and that 10 million people live there. The potentialities of this great region of our country are practically unknown.

This is the region we must look to in the future. With the discovery of petroleum in the Williston basin, large reserves of lignite in North Dakota, large reserves of low-grade manganese in South Dakota, huge quantities of yet untapped mineral resources in the upper basin, all of which commodities will eventually be brought into commercial use—think of the savings if this freight could have been transported by water rather than by rail.

According to a detailed survey made by the Corps of Engineers, even today, without taking into account any of these minerals, approximately 4 million tons of freight were available which could have been transported economically by water if navigation had been possible.

As a concrete example, let me give you a few statistics to prove how water traffic has increased from 1950 to 1953:

	Tons
1950	1,609,304
1951	2,201,011
1952	2,853,562
1953	2,942,483

The principal items of freight traffic reported for the year 1953 were as follows:

	Tons
Waterway improvement material	1,852,392
Sand, rock, gravel	330,710
Crushed limestone	203,243
Motor fuel	41,556
Steel products	39,605
Wheat	23,289
Molasses	14,583

Of course the reason for this increase in water traffic must be obvious to anyone—water transportation is cheaper. In the Wall Street Journal of February 8, 1955, under an article entitled "Rivermen Hail the 'Fencing in' of Mighty Missouri; They See Thirtyfold Tonnage Boost in Next 10 Years," it is alleged that wheat moving by barge from Omaha to St. Louis goes for $2.25 per ton, whereas the rail rate is $8.40; that steel from St. Louis to Kansas City is shipped by barge for $2.58 per ton, but by rail at $11.96. Now the Missouri River Basin is admitted to be the greatest grain growing area in the world—just think what this saving in the cost of transportation would mean to the farmers.

The extension of navigation on the Missouri may be justified on yet another ground—that the railroad companies are discriminatory in their rates and are not equipped to handle the freight during peak seasons. In some harvest seasons, there develops a boxcar shortage which results in grain spoilage. Barges on the river would provide extra capacity for such peak shipping seasons.

And so I ask you, What are we going to do about it? Are we going to sit here and let these farmers continue to be robbed? Let the railroads say what they will or will not ship and when they will ship it?

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind but what these wheat growers living along the banks of this great river are entirely at the mercy of the railroads. If the farmer does not agree to pay this exorbitant rate, the railroad won't ship his crop and even if he does agree, the railroad can't ship it if there isn't space.

Well, the answer to what we should do is a very simple one.

Let us authorize the United States Army Engineers to make a further survey to determine the feasibility of the extension of navigation between Sioux City and Garrison, N. Dak.—this one stretch is our most immediate need. If navigation is established between these two points, these small farmers will have a fighting chance against the railroads. The day that barges can go all the way up this river to Garrison, N. Dak., then we will see rail rates drop—then we will see plenty of shipping space made available to everybody who wants it.

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, competition and fair play are synonymous.

Now, Mr. President, I would consider myself most remiss if I did not pay tribute to the Corps of United States Army Engineers. I think these men have done a splendid job. To them the Missouri is a challenge—yes—but no mystery; they have learned from long experience how to cope with this most unpredictable of our streams. And what they have done on the Mississippi and the Ohio, they can do on the Missouri—make it

navigable for the benefit and for the economy of all the people living in that region.

Mr. President, I have given this project a great deal of thought; I have held consultations with the United States Army Engineers—and while these men do not give curbstone opinions, they did not intimate to me that there were insurmountable obstacles to navigation between Sioux City and Garrison, N. Dak.; neither did I get the impression that they considered this unsound economically.

So let us turn to the United States Army Engineers once again, authorizing them to make this survey to determine whether or not navigation may be extended, so that this great area may be fully developed and all its inhabitants may enjoy low-cost water transportation.

INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury explaining the purpose of the legislation.

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. 1789) to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 31, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this proposal is to induce a necessary orderly flow of promotion in the officer ranks of the Coast Guard by providing effective means for achieving a reasonable degree of continuing forced attrition of officers in the grades of rear admiral and captain. Existing statutes are inadequate to accomplish this purpose.

A system of forced attrition as proposed is necessary to provide an essential flow of promotion in officer grades in the Coast Guard. In the absence of remedial legislation the prospect is for stagnation in the higher grades and resultant progressive stagnation in the lower grades. Lack of timely promotions will adversely affect the initiative and morale of officers in lower grades. Moreover, the essential flow of young, able, and vigorous officers into top management positions will be retarded. In turn, the efficiency of the Coast Guard will suffer.

Briefly, the proposal provides that rear admirals with 7 years service in that grade or 35 years total commissioned service will be involuntarily retired. For captains, a continuing system of selection is provided whereby captains with at least 8 years service in that grade and 30 years total commissioned service would be considered for further retention on active duty by annual boards. Seventy-five percent of the eligible captains would be retained annually; the remaining 25 percent would be involuntarily retired. There are provisions for retaining on active duty a required number of needed officers in each grade who would otherwise be retired. The Commandant, Assistant Commandant, and Engineer-in-Chief would be exempt from the proposal while serving in those statutory positions. A memorandum is attached explaining in more detail the need for and nature of this proposal.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "COAST GUARD," FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This proposed legislation is designed to induce a necessary orderly flow of promotion in the officer ranks of the Coast Guard by providing an effective means for achieving a reasonable degree of continuing forced attrition in the top grades of captain and rear admiral. Before presenting a sectional analysis of the proposal, it is desirable to first demonstrate the need for the legislation in terms of the retirement and promotion situation potential without it.

At the present time there are 15 admirals in the Coast Guard (14 rear admirals and one vice admiral—the Commandant). Of these 15 admirals, 3 are serving in statutory appointments as Commandant, Assistant Commandant, and Engineer in Chief, respectively. For purposes of this discussion a base figure of 15 admirals is used throughout.

A study was recently made of the retirement expectancies of the admirals presently on duty and the promotion outlook for captains in relation thereto. This study was based on the assumption that all present admirals would remain on active duty until reaching the statutory retirement age of 62. In terms of this study, the situation to be reasonably expected in the future unless relief is afforded in the form of the proposed legislation is briefly described as follows:

The last of the 15 admirals now on duty would retire for age in 1967. During the 13-year period 1955–67 the average attrition rate of those officers would be about 1.2 per year.

Presently, the average age of all admirals is about 55; in 1961 this would have increased to about 57; by 1967 the average age would be about 59.

Presently, the average admiral has about 32 years of total commissioned service; in 1961 this would have increased to about 35; by 1967 the average total service would be about 38.

Until recently, the average captain selected for flag rank has been promoted to the grade of rear admiral in about his 30th year of total service at about age 52; in 1961 the typical captain possessing excellent qualifications for the higher grade could not expect promotion until about his 34th year of service at about age 56; by 1967 a similar well-qualified captain could not anticipate promotion to the grade of rear admiral until about his 36th year of service at about age 58; this latter officer could then expect only about 4 years' service or less as an admiral before being forced out by age-62 retirement.

While this forecast is based on the rather extreme expectancy of age-62 retirement alone, it is not believed that attrition from other causes would alter the picture to any significant degree. Thus the outlook is for progressive stagnation in the grade of rear admiral and a resultant growing stagnation in the lower grades.

The proposed legislation will provide the relief needed. Once the forced attrition principle of the proposal becomes fully operative the following comparative results should obtain:

The rate of attrition of admirals should increase to about three per year.

The average age of all admirals on active duty would remain fairly constant at about 54½ years.

At any given time, the average admiral on active duty would have about 32½ years total service.

The typical captain with excellent qualifications for the higher grade could expect promotion in about his 30th year of service at about age 52; he could expect to serve in the grade of rear admiral for at least 5 years.

For purposes of a similar study for captains, a base figure of 150 is used, representing the approximate number of captains presently on active duty. First, if the extreme case is taken that all present captains will remain on active duty until reaching the statutory requirement age of 62, the following will briefly demonstrate the expected retirement and promotion situation relative to that grade if remedial legislation is not obtained:

By 1959 there will be as many captains with over 30 years total service as there will be captains with less than 30 years service.

By 1963, and continuing thereafter, all 150 captains in the Coast Guard will have over 30 years service.

In 1963 and thereafter the typical qualified commander could not expect to be promoted to captain until he was in about his 32d year of total service at about age 54.

Since the extreme situation is assumed in the foregoing analysis—that all captains will remain on active duty until age 62—the conclusions will probably be subject to some adjustments in actual practice. However, even assuming that the attrition rate for captains is five per year from all causes (as reasonably confirmed by recent experience in the matter), the forecast is that by 1961 there will be as many captains with over 30 years service as there will be captains of less than 30 years service. By 1966 and afterward there will be a constant ratio of about 130 captains with over 30 years service to about 20 captains with less than 30 years service.

It can be seen that the outlook without remedial legislation is very unfavorable because stagnation in the grade of captain will result in proportional stagnation in the lower grades. The orderly flow of promotion to higher ranks will be retarded. Discontent, lack of incentive, reduced initiative, and poor morale will follow. There will be an inadequate flow of young able officers into top management posts.

The proposed legislation will provide the means of materially correcting this situation. Once the forced attrition principle becomes fully operative the future situation will develop as follows:

Beginning about 1963 there would be a constant ratio of about 30 captains with over 30 years' service to about 120 captains with less than 30 years' service—a very desirable balance between the experience of maturity and the drive of the more youthful.

Almost immediately the flow of promotion would assume required orderly proportions, so that the average qualified commander could reasonably expect promotion to the grade of captain in about his 25th year of commissioned service, at about the age of 47.

Section 247 of the proposed legislation provides for the involuntary retirement of any rear admiral on June 30 of the fiscal year in which he completes either 7 years' service as a permanent rear admiral or a total of 35 years' active commissioned service. No

board action would be required to effect the retirement.

Section 247 also contains a provision that the Commandant, with the approval of the Secretary, may retain on active duty from year to year any rear admiral who would otherwise be retired. This provision is required to permit the retention of any such officer when the retention is necessary in the public interest.

Section 247 would not apply to any officer serving in a statutory appointment as Commandant, Assistant Commandant, or Engineer in Chief. However, an officer who has completed his duty in a statutory appointment and resumed his place on the regular list of rear admirals would come under the involuntary retirement provision; all time served in those appointments would be included in any computation under that provision.

While the same general principle of forced attrition would apply to officers in the grade of captain, circumstances require the application of a somewhat different concept of forced retirement for that grade. Retirement would not be automatic. Rather, section 248 of the proposal provides a basic method for retaining on the active list as "best fitted" a prescribed percentage of those captains who during any fiscal year complete both 8 or more years' service in the grade of captain and 30 or more years' commissioned service, including appropriate constructive service. The captains to be retained would be selected by an annual board consisting of five or more rear admirals, whose function it would be to select as "best fitted" for retention on the active list 75 percent of those captains who have previously completed or who will complete both of the service requirements during the fiscal year in which the board convenes. The 25 percent not selected for retention would be retired on June 30 of that fiscal year. However, here, too, there is a provision for retention on the active list, in the public interest, of captains among the 25 percent who would otherwise be retired. An officer so retained would not again be eligible for consideration for retention by any subsequent annual board. He would be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which last retained under this authority.

The Congress in recent years has provided each of the other armed forces with legislation designed to meet the same general problem that now faces the Coast Guard.

The results to be expected from this proposed legislation would closely parallel the results now being obtained by the Navy through operation of its selection and promotion laws.

MORE LIBERAL PROPELLING POWER ALLOWANCES IN COMPUTING NET TONNAGES OF CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury explaining the provisions of the proposed legislation.

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. 1790) to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

APRIL 1, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill "to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels."

The purpose of the draft bill is to amend the admeasurement laws to authorize a more liberal deduction from gross tonnage for propelling machinery space on vessels having relatively small engine rooms. Existing law, by restricting sharply the deduction for propelling machinery space on vessels having relatively small engine rooms as opposed to that allowed in the case of vessels with larger engine rooms, tends to penalize efficient design of engine rooms and to restrict freedom of design leading to increased seaworthiness and safety. The draft bill is designed to remove that impediment.

There are enclosed a memorandum which sets forth in more detail the provisions of the proposed legislation and a comparative print showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill. It will be appreciated if you will lay the proposed bill, the accompanying memorandum, and the comparative print before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House.

A draft of a bill containing a similar proposal was submitted to you by this Department in a letter of January 11, 1954, and was introduced in the 83d Congress, second session, as S. 2814. That bill passed the Senate on April 19, 1954, but no action was taken in the House of Representatives on that bill or on the companion bill H. R. 7791, before the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING A DRAFT BILL ENTITLED "TO AMEND SECTION 4153 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE MORE LIBERAL PROPELLING POWER ALLOWANCES IN COMPUTING THE NET TONNAGES OF CERTAIN VESSELS"

For some time it has been the view of the Treasury Department and other interested agencies of this Government that there is great need for a revision of our present system of determining the gross and net tonnages of vessels, since the present method tends to restrict freedom of design leading to increased seaworthiness and safety. To devise a new system which will be simple, easily administered, and will not restrict freedom of design, and yet which will be acceptable to the principal maritime nations of the world, will require considerable time and study.

One of the troublesome matters in the existing system of admeasurment at the present time is the basis upon which the deduction for propelling machinery is determined in computing net tonnage. The maximum deduction of 32 percent of the gross tonnage is allowable only if the tonnage of the propelling machinery space, including light and air space, is more than 13 percent of the gross tonnage of a screw-propelled vessel or more than 20 percent of the gross tonnage of a vessel propelled by paddle wheels. In any case in which the tonnage of that space is not more than 13 percent of the gross tonnage of a screw-propelled vessel the allowance for propelling machinery space is only 1¾ times the tonnage of that space, while if the tonnage of that space is not more than 20 percent of the gross tonnage of a vessel propelled by paddle wheels, the allowance is only 1½ times the tonnage of that space. The result has been to penalize efficient design of engine rooms in the latter cases.

Notwithstanding the fact that our ultimate goal is a new and better system of admeasurment acceptable to all maritime nations, it is the view of the Treasury Department that, as an interim measure pending attainment of that goal, action should be taken to alleviate the present situation.

The proposed bill is designed to accomplish that purpose by liberalizing the allowance for propelling machinery spaces in the latter cases, while allowing the owner of a vessel, the construction of which was begun on or before the date of enactment of the bill and thus presumably designed to take maximum advantage of the present formula, to determine for himself whether that allowance is to be computed under the present system or the new.

Under date of June 7, 1954, the Secretary of State transmitted to this Department a copy of a note from the British Embassy informing this Government that an amendment to the existing laws of Great Britain on the tonnage measurement of shipping had been enacted and approved March 9, 1954, effective July 1, 1954. The British Ambassador further stated that the proposed amendment had been agreed to in principle by all of the 26 countries with which the Government of the United Kingdom had agreements for the reciprocal recognition of tonnage certificates except Italy, with which country Her Majesty's Government were still in correspondence, and the Soviet Union, which had not indicated its attitude to that date. The governments which have ratified the Convention for Uniform Tonnage Measurement of Ships, signed at Oslo, Norway, on June 10, 1947, namely, the Governments of Norway, Iceland, The Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden, have amended the convention and their laws to incorporate a similar proposal. In view of the universal agreement in principle and the action or proposed action of the other principal maritime nations, it is important that the proposal receive favorable consideration at an early date.

LIGHTS REQUIRED TO BE CARRIED BY MOTORBOATS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats.

Legislation of this character has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury. I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary explaining the purpose of the bill.

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. 1791) to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 54 Stat. 164, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 7, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bil, "To amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 54 Stat. 164, relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats."

The proposed new paragraph (e) of section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, would require any motorboat propelled by both sail and machinery to carry the lights required for a motorboat propelled by machinery only. Paragraph (c) of section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940, 46 U. S. C. 525b(c), now requires that a motorboat propelled by sail and machinery carry the same lights as a motorboat propelled by sail only. Collisions have occurred involving motorboats complying with the present rule. In the interest of safety the rule should be changed to that proposed. The rule for a motorboat under such circumstances would then be similar to the corresponding rule of other systems of Rules for Preventing Collisions. See sections 62, 144 (c) (iv), 242, and 302 of title 44, United States Code. Paragraph (c) of section 3 has been redrafted to retain unchanged the requirements for lights to be carried by motorboats when propelled by sail alone.

The proposed new paragraph (f) of section 3 would authorize any motorboat to carry the lights required by the Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1948 (otherwise known as the International Rules of the Road, in lieu of the lights required by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940. Under existing law a motorboat operating both on the high seas and on waters subject to the Motorboat Act is required to carry the lights required, respectively, by the Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1948, and section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940. The construction cost of such a boat is increased by the installation of two systems of lights. Moreover, the changeover from one system of lights to the other when crossing the line of demarcation is a troublesome burden. If the operator of a motorboat neglects to change lights and is involved in a collision, he has the burden of proving that the statutory fault of carrying improper lights could not have caused the collision. It is the considered opinion of the Coast Guard that a motorboat can, with safety, carry the lights required by either the International Rules or the act of April 25, 1940, when operating on waters subject to the latter act.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,
H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL ASSUMPTION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE OBLIGATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, for many years, group life insurance has been available to Federal employees through various beneficial associations. The Government did not pay any part of the premiums or otherwise participate in these programs. However, in the minds of the employees, there was a semblance of Government sponsorship. Agency names were a part of the association's titles; agency officials held office in the associations, and association business was conducted by Government personnel in Government quarters.

While policies in these associations were strictly private agreements, to which the Government was not a party, a plan was nevertheless included in the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 for the purpose of enabling these nonprofit associations to arrange for the Federal Group Insurance Fund to assume the life insurance of its members who were retired or otherwise separated from the Federal service.

Congress was advised by the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Department that the plans set forth in section 10 of the act were practical and workable with regard to assumption by the Federal Group Insurance Fund of the policies held by retired and separated Federal employees with the various beneficial associations.

Mr. President, it has developed that the advice given Congress by the Civil Service Commission and the Treasury Department was not correct, and that section 10 of the act is not workable, and will not accomplish the purpose in mind.

Secondly, Congress was advised by these agencies that there was no reason to protect the association insurance of active Federal employees, who were eligible under the new program, because they could obtain replacement insurance in a larger amount and at a lesser rate under the Federal program. Here again the Congress received bad advice. The argument that active employees would lose nothing completely overlooked the following facts:

First. The reducing feature in the amount of insurance an employee can retain after age 65 under the Government-sponsored plan reduces the insurance of a lower salaried employee below the amount he would receive under his nonreducing association policy.

Second. Should the active employee lose his Government employment, he would then have not only lost his association insurance, but also his Government insurance, since the latter ceases upon termination of employment.

Mr. President, there is little wonder that under these circumstances many present and former employees are confused and worried regarding their group life-insurance policies in the various beneficial associations. Because of my understanding of their present predicament, I wish to give them a word of advice and assurance. First, I caution them against allowing their policies to lapse. They should, by all means, keep their policies in force by making their premium payments as they fall due. Second, I want these employees to know that I have introduced legislation to correct this situation; and finally, that the legislation will be acted upon by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service as promptly as possible.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 10 the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, setting forth reasons why section 10 of the act should be amended, and explaining what the proposed amendment will accomplish, be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the proper committee.

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. 1792) to amend section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes, 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 statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 should be amended because:

(a) It requires the nonprofit associations of Federal employees to transfer to and deposit in the Government insurance fund all assets of their life insurance funds as a condition to assuming life insurance agreements for only those members who are retired or otherwise separated from the Government service.

(b) It requires compliance within 1 year after August 17, 1954, the date of the approval of the act.

(c) Assuming that the associations could comply with section 10, it would require the cancellation of insurance protection for all members who are actively employed by the Government, notwithstanding the fact that such members have for many years paid dues in order to provide insurance benefits for their dependents (many for more than 25 years). Also, it would require the forfeiture of their entire interest in the assets of the associations.

(d) The present act requires reduction in insurance at the rate of 2 percent per month after employees attain the age of 65 until the original amount of their insurance is reduced to 25 percent.

(e) It is apparent that no thought was given to the rights of all members to share in the assets of these associations.

(f) Under the law a majority of the members of an association cannot dispose of all of the assets of the association contrary to the wishes of the minority. (*Hill et al* v. *Bland, et al.*, 10 Fed (2d) 623, decided by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia 1925. Writ of certorari denied by the Supreme Court of the United States.)

(g) As interpreted by the Civil Service Commission, this section requires the unanimous consent of all members of any association to transfer and deliver its assets to the Government fund. The impossibility of obtaining such unanimous consent is readily seen from the fact that a number of the asssociations have large memberships, many of whom reside in different parts of the United States and its possessions. Communications to the members of nine associations, representing a large number of active Federal employees, as well as those retired or otherwise separated from Federal service, have failed to elicit replies from a very substantial minority. Unanimity of opinion exists among counsel that judicial proceedings to determine the rights of the membership in the assets would require the naming of all members of the associations as parties, the issuance of process and publication

against thousands of individual members, and extensive legal services before the case could be presented to the court for adjudication, all of which would involve the expenditure of large sums, with the possibility of long delays and protracted appeals, making it virtually impossible to comply with the time limitations set forth in section 10. The Civil Service Commission recognizes that the larger associations composed of thousands of members may have difficulty in obtaining unanimous consent as required by its interpretation of section 10, and this is an understatement of the problem as it actually exists.

For these reasons, as a practical matter, section 10 is impossible of performance by any association which has a substantial number of members.

The proposed amendment will:

1. Remove the inequities created by section 10.

2. Remove the necessity of a judicial determination of matters arising under section 10.

3. Permit all members, whether presently employed, retired, or separated from Federal service, to continue their insurance at present dues rates, and thereby provide more adequately for their dependents.

4. Authorize the Civil Service Commission to arrange with nonprofit associations for the assumption of their insurance obligations.

5. Permit the associations to continue in business until such time as their assets, after payment of expenses, have been applied toward the liquidation of insurance obligations.

6. Terminate the right of such associations to provide or obtain any additional insurance for their members after the approval of the proposed amendment.

7. Provide that the operation and management of each association shall be subject to the supervision of the Commission under rules and regulations adopted by it, without any expense whatsoever to the Government.

8. It will not require the Government to make any contribution for many years, as the reserve funds of the associations, together with monthly dues, will be ample to pay insurance claims for a long period of time. Any contribution by the Federal Government would be negligible if at the time the Government takes over the obligations of the association it merges the operation with the Government Insurance Fund.

PURCHASE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit State and local governments to purchase Federal surplus property. This proposal has been endorsed by the representatives of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of County Officials, the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing, and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, in addition to the American Municipal Association.

Under existing law, property declared to be surplus by one Federal agency is first made available by purchase by any other Federal agency at a schedule of rates fixed by the General Services Administration. Any property not so purchased is then screened for disposal as donable surplus for educational and health agencies. The remaining property is then offered for sale under the terms of the Federal Service Act of 1949.

The bill would not interfere at all with the first two steps mentioned above. It provides, however, that after it has been screened for health and education purposes the remaining surplus property will be made available to States and local agencies at the same scale of prices that such property is made available to other Government bodies.

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

The bill (S. 1799) to amend section 203 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY CONGRESS FOR SUCCESSFUL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SALK POLIO VACCINE

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas, in 1949, Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins of Harvard University discovered a method of growing poliomyelitis virus in nonnervous tissue kept alive in flasks and test tubes; and

Whereas the said Drs. Enders, Weller, and Robbins were awarded the 1954 Nobel prize in medicine and physiology in recognition for such discovery; and

Whereas such discovery led to work by other investigators, resulting in present-day methods for mass producing the poliomyelitis virus needed for the manufacture of vaccine; and

Whereas such discovery made possible the recent development of a successful vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to the said Drs. John F. Enders, Thomas H. Weller, and Frederick C. Robbins, in behalf of the people of the United States, its gratitude and appreciation for their great contribution to the development of a successful vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DELEGATION TO ATTEND THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas a Parliamentary Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will meet in Paris in July 1955; and

Whereas among other items it is planned to discuss at the Conference the question of future cooperation by the NATO members, including their parliamentary bodies; and

Whereas the Congress has taken a leading part in the formation of the Organization and in its support through the enactment of measures to strengthen its capacity to defend the North Atlantic area against Communist aggression; and

Whereas the presence of Members of the Congress at the Conference will be a tangible demonstration of the continuing desire of the American people to support the Organization and to promote closer relations with and between the members of the Organization; and

Whereas such a conference can contribute to the strength of the North Atlantic area in the maintenance of peace and security and the mutual interests of its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members meeting in conference in Paris in July 1955, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the House, the Senate, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. MANSFIELD) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas a parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will meet in Paris in July 1955; and

Whereas among other items it is planned to discuss at the conference the question of future cooperation by the NATO members, including their parliamentary bodies; and

Whereas the Congress has taken a leading part in the formation of the Organization and in its support through the enactment of measures to strengthen its capacity to defend the North Atlantic area against Communist aggression; and

Whereas the presence of Members of the Congress at the conference will be a tangible demonstration of the continuing desire of the American people to support the Organization and to promote closer relations with and between the members of the Organization; and

Whereas such a conference can contribute to the strength of the North Atlantic area in the maintenance of peace and security and the mutual interests of its members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That not to exceed 14 Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly with the representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members meeting in conference in Paris in July 1955, for discussion of common problems in the interests of the maintenance of peace and security in the North Atlantic area. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed

for the purposes of this resolution, half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House, and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than four of the appointees from the respective Houses shall be of the same political party.

The expenses incurred by Members of the House, the Senate, and by staff members appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $15,000 for each House, respectively, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members. Payment shall be made upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the respective House or Senate delegation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I have just submitted authorizes United States participation in a parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which will meet in Paris in July of this year.

Joining in submitting the resolution are the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The resolution is exactly similar to one already introduced in the House by Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

This would be the first time that legislators of NATO would meet in joint session to consider problems that mutually affect their countries. The proposal originated with Norway, and has now been approved by Canada, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Iceland. Only the United States and Portugal have not yet accepted, and it is of extreme importance that we do so. It is probable that Western Germany, now that it has been added to NATO will be invited.

The resolution provides for a delegation of 14 Congressional Members, half from the House and half from the Senate, to be appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President.

The State Department has indicated that it favors the proposed action, and has expressed the view that it could contribute materially to the strength of the Atlantic alliance.

When Communist bodies are bending every effort to create divisions within the Atlantic Alliance, when there are frequent irritations and misunderstandings, we cannot over-emphasize the importance of the elected representatives of the people of all these nations sitting down together and discussing their common problems.

This is not only the best way to achieve mutual understanding among legislators, but also the best way to make NATO live in the minds of the people of all our nations.

I hope the resolution will be passed at an early date, as it is urgently necessary that this Nation leave no stone unturned to strengthen the North Atlantic Alliance.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SCIENTIFIC COMMISSION WITHIN UNITED NATIONS TO STUDY EFFECT OF NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS—REPRINTING OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Wednesday, April 20, 1955, when announcing the cosponsors of the 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, I included the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on the list, as is shown in the text of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20 on page 4782.

The name of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was inadvertently omitted from the list of cosponsors when it was printed. The Senator from Montana indicated an early interest in the resolution for a United Nations study of the effects of atomic radiation. I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, which is only a one-page resolution, be immediately reprinted with Senator MURRAY's name included as a cosponsor.

The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has requested that he also be included as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22. I ask unanimous consent that Senator SPARKMAN be included as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 when it is reprinted.

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

COAST GUARD CONTRACT PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS, DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE, REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on March 30, 1955, there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary H. R. 3885, a bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts.

At a meeting of the full committee on April 25, I was authorized to ask unanimous consent to have the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of this bill and that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Armed Services, in view of the fact that that committee handled identical legislation in the 83d Congress.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3885, and that the bill and the letter of January 26, 1955, from the Secretary of the Treasury, be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill is referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 1644, A BILL TO PRESCRIBE POLICY AND PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 12, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1644, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 681 BY INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as chairman of a task force of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, I announce that public hearings will be held on S. 681 to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion. These hearings will begin on Friday, April 29, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 135, of the Senate Office Building and will continue on Tuesday, May 3.

All persons desiring to testify on this bill are urged to communicate as soon as possible with Mr. Richard Arens, associate counsel of the subcommittee, who is preparing the schedule of witnesses. The address of the subcommittee is Room 135A, Senate Office Building, and the telephone number is Republic 7-7500, extension 3306.

All witnesses are requested to file 24 hours in advance of their appearance several typewritten copies of their statement and to confine their oral presentation to a summary of about 15 minutes.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN STEPHENS WOOD, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John Stephens Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Sub-

versive Activities Control Board, for a term of 3 years expiring March 4, 1958, vice Watson B. Miller, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

CONVENTIONS WITH ITALIAN REPUBLIC ON DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand there are certain treaties with the Republic of Italy involving double taxation, now at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaties and that they be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive C, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955, and Executive D, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the conventions, together with the President's messages, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's messages will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's messages are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit Executive C, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Convention with Italy, signed March 30, 1955, relating to taxes on income.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit Executive D, 84th Congress, 1st session, the convention between the United States of America and the Italian Republic for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on March 30, 1955.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 25, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Convention with Italy, signed March 30, 1955, relating to taxes on estates and inheritances.)

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. BRICKER:

Address entitled "The Romance of Roads," delivered by Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 23, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Senator MCCARTHY at a testimonial dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, at New York City, on April 20, 1955.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., on the ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, on March 27, 1955.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "Dillard Wins Praise as United States 'Ambassador'," written by Jack Clowser, and published in the Cleveland Press of February 16, 1955.

FOREIGN POLICY ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last Saturday night the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], delivered a foreign-policy address which should have far-reaching effects.

With his usual clarity of vision, the Senator from Georgia explored the major problems that lie before the United States and the free world. He issued a challenge for bold and courageous thinking on the vital issues of war and peace.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this statement will receive the careful consideration of every policymaking official of our Government. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text, as published in the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF SENATOR GEORGE'S ADDRESS TO EDITORS ON FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

I was sitting here thinking of the enormous power that you editors of this country have—a great power for good or evil, and I was impressed with the fact that, being Democrats and Republicans, you don't always agree with yourselves. There is enough disagreement always to make for the safety and security of this country.

I am very glad you are here in Washington and yet I am not quite sure why you are here. Maybe it's because Washington is not running a race with any other city in the Union. Maybe it might be appropriate to call it the "windy city" and why you have come here to be bored by speeches of a public man who would be glad to go to you in any part of this country is a bit beyond me.

When I first came to the city, there was an old gentleman in the Senate for whom I had very great respect—John Sharp Williams. He hurried me into the cloakroom one day and quoted to me from some philosopher, the exact name of whom I don't remember, but anyhow, his quotation ran like this:

He said—and he was speaking to his son: "I want you to go to all parts of the world. Especially I want you to visit all the capitals of the world and see what little wisdom the world is actually run with."

I thought it was something a little sacrilegious. I couldn't quite understand it, but in the course of years I could begin, dimly at least, to see what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who had studied at home and abroad, stated to me.

AMERICAN ATTITUDE TRACED

Now, I suppose you want me to talk to you a little bit about foreign affairs. Since Mrs. George is here, I am under strict admonition not to talk very long about anything. I am quite sure you will appreciate that.

From the beginning, of course, we have had relations with other peoples, but prior to World War I our foreign relations were hardly known to the masses of the great American people.

These relations and the relations growing out of them occupied the attention of the President, the Secretary of State, and a small group of men in the United States Senate, and intellectuals—men and women throughout the Union.

Even after the outbreak of World War II we said: "Aren't we separated from all that clash and all that confusion by 3,000 miles of ocean and do we not live under other political institutions, and are we not dominated by other social and economic ideas?"

Well, we very soon found the answer. The ranchers and cotton growers and manufacturers soon found their markets declining and all but disappearing. And in every accounting and banking house in this Nation, business, temporarily at least, came almost to a standstill. For the first time, Americans in all walks of life began to realize that every important public act committed on the other side of the globe directly affected the welfare and well-being of the American people.

At that time and prior to that time and from the beginning, we had the policy of what you and I know as isolationism. We were protected by two great oceans. The British Navy was the unquestioned mistress of the seas, and behind that navy and those two oceans, we enjoyed an immunity seldom found to a young and struggling people, for a long, long time.

World War I came and ended, but we did not reserve the power unity which enabled us to win that war. It fell apart. We were conscious, of course, of how slightly our interests were affected by international affairs, but the unity which enabled us to win that war fell apart.

MISTAKES OF WAR CITED

At the end of the Second World War, the power unity was again dissolved and almost dissolved because the American people, true to their traditions, true to their innermost longings, wanted to get back home and wanted to get the boys back home and wanted to settle back into a normal life.

That war, of course, was marked by certain mistakes. All wars are, in point of policy or strategy, and we made some mistakes.

I think it may now be said, since the Yalta papers have been published, that we made a great mistake in insisting upon the complete destruction of the great producing nation in Europe—Germany.

Then, after Japan came in and before the end of the war, we again insisted upon its destruction—the complete, utter destruction

of a great producing nation. Thus we insisted on the destruction of the greatest producers in the world, outside of ourselves, unmindful of the fact that at the moment we were creating economic and political vacuums.

We were right, I think, in insisting upon the utter destruction of Hitler militarism as it had been developed in Germany and as it had lived in Japan.

At any rate we did, and at any rate, these two great powers were destroyed. We made a peace treaty with Japan and Japan is now slowly coming back. We made but recently a treaty with West Germany under which sovereignty is restored to West Germany. But more than that, she is entitled to come into NATO. She will come into NATO on May 5, according to present schedules.

Both Germany and Japan are moving back industrially and commercially, especially West Germany, and I do not believe any of us can understand what is going on in Europe and what has gone on there for several months without a realization of what Germany's return to the sisterhood of states in that area of the world means.

Many of the actions taken by our Soviet friends undoubtedly are predicated upon the entry of Germany into NATO; upon the rearming under restrictions of West Germany.

The coming back of West Germany will not be immediate, but ultimately it will mean the organization of all Western Europe and the retreat of the Soviets back to their ancient boundaries, with possibly the exception of one satellite which cannot be defended by Western Europe. Ultimately and at no great distant date, with the return to strength of Japan, there will commence again the age-old struggle—for northern Korea and the rich area of Manchuria. That struggle will be between what we now call the Chinese People's Republic and Japan.

GREAT SIGNIFICANT FACTS

Moscow is 6,000 miles away from that battlefront, and that battleground, and so two great significant facts have come to pass. They are: The peace treaty with Japan and her entry into world affairs; the peace treaty with Western Germany and her entry again into world affairs.

These are two important facts, I believe Justice Holmes once said that a single package of human history is better than a whole volume of logic.

At any rate, many men and women in this audience tonight will see the day when our Russian friends will go back to their ancient borders and boundaries and when again there will be reestablished a power group in the Far East that will give some stability to that area.

Although you may disagree with me, I would be less than frank if I did not say to you that in my considered judgment, whatever it is worth, the great hope for stability in the Far East is somehow, sometime the revival, and I will not say consolidation, but the solidification of the efforts of Japan and India, the latter the most populous country outside of the Chinese People's Republic, in all of Asia.

I know that you would say that oil and water can't mix and sometimes we are all a bit worried with Mr. Nehru. Sometimes he takes some 20 courses, and yet he stands very definitely for something in the Far East. Also, very definitely, when there is a great commercial power, which again can live and thrive in Japan, and with Japan reaching out for markets, both for her fabricated goods, and particularly for her raw materials, there will begin to be order in the Far East.

I am not speaking to you about tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. I am simply saying to you what in the course of human events must be the pattern which we will see again both in Western Europe and in the Far East.

We made the supreme mistake perhaps, at the end of World War II, in assuming that because we had fought side by side with our Russian friends to win that war and because we had come to know them, that they must be on the whole, people with aims and purposes and aspirations much or very similar to our very own.

Perhaps we were not justified in reaching that easy conclusion, but we did reach it. We acted upon it, and that is past history. There is no need to discuss it here.

We, of course, know that Russia is still actuated with the old Russian imperialism, plus the communistic ideologies of the 1917 revolution. Capitalism or the capitalistic system could, of course, not be tolerated and outside capitalism could not be tolerated because it is in the way of Communist expansion.

Now, what is the state of the world tonight? Some interesting things have been going on.

In Austria, a treaty has now been hurried to a conclusion and the four powers are invited to witness this ratification, and its signing.

That could mean but one thing. A study of Russian budgets ought to show us that it can mean but one thing and that is that Russia is tremendously concerned with the rearming of West Germany and the taking of her place in the NATO group.

A little while ago we were very much disturbed because the Colombo group had called a conference down in Indonesia. The nervousness in some high places in Washington stems from the fact that we said we would have no friends in that conference and that resolutions would come out of that conference solidiying the yellow and black races against the white man everywhere. So there was nervousness here.

Then we began to speak in more optimistic language about that conference and only last Saturday I was rash enough, perhaps unwisely, to say that I thought the heads of state should have something to say about that conference; that at least we should have an understanding of what that conference meant and what its real objective was, and that I believed there would be some friends of the western powers there.

You have heard the speeches that were made within the past week. You have noted the utterances they have made, and while perhaps those speeches do not represent the rank and file of the Asiatic states represented there, they nevertheless do represent the thinking of some of their leaders. And then, just last night and this morning you read that Chou En-lai had said he had no purpose to go to war with the people of the United States; that he was not, at least, planning such a war, and indicated that he was willing to sit down and talk with us.

Now I have been thinking, myself, for many weeks, for many months, that after a period of great wars, and particularly of great revolutions—fairly shaking the foundations of the old civilizations—that a people into whose hands leadership has been thrust, or to which leadership had come, must be able to make some adjustments to meet the changing conditions of the world.

You may recall that not too long ago I said that I believed the time was rapidly approaching when the heads of government of the four great powers could sit down and talk about the problems of Europe and the tensions in Europe; the tensions indeed, which shadow all civilization with some degree of a prophecy of doom.

Day by day the conviction that grew—at least to my way of thinking—is that we should have the conference first with our friends, with those nations who have been uniformly friendly to us, and with those nations in the southeast of Asia—those in the security organization who are our friends.

Why?

Because I think it important that we know precisely their thinking on the important problems that have arisen in the Far East and precisely what readjustments, if any, we should be willing to make to meet changing times and changing conditions.

That is not appeasement. It never has been and never will be appeasement for any strong power to say that we are willing to sit down and talk about the problems that concern you and concern the world.

LAW CASE RECALLED

As a young lawyer, I had a very important case, I thought, and I went to see an old gentleman who was involved in that litigation, but largely as a witness, and I said, "I have come to talk to you about this matter." He said, "I can't talk to you young man. You are on the other side."

I said, "Of course, I am on the other side, but I want to talk to you. I can't learn anything or do anything unless I can talk to the men who are on the other side of this problem."

I then said something which I have always regretted when he again reminded me he was on the other side and couldn't talk, and which I attributed to my youth and inexperience. I said, "Why won't you tell me; are you afraid that you will tell me the truth or that you will tell me a lie?"

I have always regretted that because I had a profound respect for the old gentleman and through the years I have always regretted it.

I am coming now to this point: I do not know, and I doubt if anyone can know, what degree of sincerity is in the mind and heart of Chou En-lai, but I do think the things he saw and witnessed down in Indonesia since the last Sabbath has opened his mind, and when he says that he is willing to talk, then I will unhesitatingly say that this Nation should be big enough and great enough through its highest officials to talk to him.

It is time that we were relieving the tensions of this world, if we can, and that when we know what our friends think and say, what position they have, in what conclusions they concur in about the trouble spot in the Far East. We should not be unmindful of that concurring judgment and opinion of our friends.

Indeed, I do not think that any nation can be unmindful of the opinion and judgment of its friends.

I am not talking about what the President should do or should not do with reference to his position now or hereafter in the Formosa area.

From the beginning I have said and taken one position, and I believe it is right, and I still believe it is right, and that decision is with the President himself.

AN UNSWERVING CONVICTION

In that conviction I have not wavered and will not waver. But I have also expressed the belief, and I believe it profoundly, that when and if a fateful decision must be made by the President as to whether or not he will defend any island or islands in the area of Formosa, that he will get all the information that he can from his Joint Chiefs, from his military leaders, from every agency of information that is available to him. And if I do not mistake the man, he will then go into his closet and face to face with his Maker, he will make his own decision.

I say now that out of a world conference there can come good in Europe, and a conference with our friends will be helpful to us. I say that we ought to be willing to talk with the Chinese People's Republic or their leaders, because we certainly owe a high obligation to all mankind everywhere. Out of that conference might come not a final solution but a first step which will lead to a second and third step toward the solution of some of the problems of our present time.

I know very well that there are many good friends of the United States who believe that the time has come when we should give more attention to our home affairs and when such aid and assistance we might give to other countries should be very definitely marked in behalf of the essential American interests which we are seeking to serve.

With that general thought, no American can quarrel, but I say to you tonight and I hope that you editors and managing editors will bear in mind that this is no time to say that there will be no further aid or assistance given to those people of the world that are struggling to make themselves strong.

I change my mind as I go along, frequently. I am glad I do because it is probably the only proof that I have that I am in existence.

But I change my mind about economic aid because undoubtedly tonight in many wide areas of this earth, especially in the Asiatic and African countries, point 4, if you please—technical assistance if you wish to be more technical in describing it—is of far greater value and promises more than military aid to people who love peace and who don't want a war.

But this is no time to turn away from our international obligations; whatever those obligations are it is not time for us in the present and congenial state of the world to grow soft in our ability to carry out and execute those programs that we regard as vital.

No foreign policy will receive any respect unless the people who put it forth have the strength and the will to carry it to execution.

NOT TIME TO TURN BACK

In an atomic age, that means strength in being, because the nuclear weapons of this modern age have destroyed the productive capacity of the people on which great reliance could have been placed, but you must have something ready and presently at hand.

So this is not the time for us to turn back in our efforts to continue militarily strong, nor is it the time for us to lose interest in the economic soundness and strength of the whole free world.

How can the free world be strong, militarily and economically unless through the cooperative efforts of all free peoples, ourselves included?

How can we turn back the clock to another day and say that the trade and commerce of the world, especially the free world should again be circumvented and departmentalized to the point almost of the stagnation of that commerce and yet hope all free nations to become economically strong and prosperous?

Upon their prosperity and strength will depend their ability to maintain their own military equipment, their own military strength.

We didn't seek world leadership. You don't get it by seeking it. World leadership comes to a nation, if it comes at all, because of the superb and supreme heroism of its people, because of their devotion to duty, private and public, with a tireless energy to bring it about.

Above everything else, it comes to a nation when it is great enough and big enough and strong enough, when mighty impulses are running through the world, to rise to the challenge of stirring times.

So it came to us. Would we pass it up? Can we pass it up? Future generations would hold us responsible and rightly responsible for failure to grasp the high responsibilities resting upon us.

The road which we are traveling may be long and hard and thorny. Indeed, it is hard and long and thorny. But it is worthwhile, my friends, to travel along the highway that can lead us, and will lead us, if we keep our courage and our faith, finally there—to a world in which the normal things of mankind and of human life may be again enjoyed and appreciated.

I thank you.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say I have read the address of the Senator from Georgia in full, and I think it was an extraordinarily clear, foresighted statement. I agree entirely with the majority leader that the address should be read, studied, and thought about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished acting minority leader.

FOREIGN DAIRY PRODUCTS DO NOT CONFORM TO UNITED STATES HEALTH STANDARDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Mr. J. F. Shager, of the Cheese Producers Marketing Association of Monroe, Wis., an important message today raising a very significant issue. It concerns the failure of foreign dairy products to conform to the high and exacting sanitary codes to which our American dairy products must comply.

On many occasions I have pointed out this aspect of the American dairyman's problem in his competition with foreign dairymen.

My own State has always prided itself on its dairy standards as the highest in the Nation. It is small wonder that the dairymen of my State are deeply troubled in having to compete with products from overseas which do not remotely have to bear the costs of complying with similarly high standards.

I send to the desk the text of Mr. Shager's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. I hope that it will receive the most sympathetic consideration of Members of Congress.

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

CHEESE PRODUCERS' MARKETING ASSOCIATION,
Monroe, Wis., April 21, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER L. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to compliment you on your efforts to increase the consumption of fluid milk by the armed services and all dairy products as well. We are behind you in these efforts to give our servicemen stationed in this country all the good food they wish.

However, we are also concerned about dairy products that are produced in foreign countries that are in the trade agreement extension bill. We certainly agree that we must trade with other countries, but when we admit their products we feel that the milk should be produced under the same sanitary requirements that is expected of our dairy farmers. These sanitary codes that we abide by and are administered by the various States or Federal Government should be applicable to all countries that wish to sell their product in our markets. We have these sanitary codes to protect the health of our consumers and their health should not be jeopardized for the sake of political trade agreements and at the expense of the American dairy farmer.

You have always fought for the Wisconsin dairy farmer's economic welfare as well as all American dairymen, but there are times when arguments are presented that leaves little room for rebuttal. We know that those exporting countries of dairy products usually have a lower standard of living and can take less in dollars for their products and still improve their lower standards. Also their monetary exchange is usually to their advantage.

It is unnecessary to ask you to vote in the dairyman's favor, however, I hope you can exert some influence on those Senators that may represent other interests in these trade agreements and unwittingly make the American dairy farmers bear more than their fair share of such a program.

Thanks again for your past support and your continued support in the future.

Sincerely yours,

J. F. SHAGER.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN TROOPS AT THE ELBE RIVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is one of the great anniversaries of history.

Ten years ago today, American and Russian troops joined at the Elbe River and accomplished one of the most important military meetings of all times.

From the standpoint of World War II, the juncture was decisive. It meant a fatal blow to the ambitions of the Nazi dictators, and represented the thrust that shattered the forces of the Axis Powers.

But the importance of the Elbe River meeting went far beyond its military significance. For the first time since the Bolsheviks had seized power, the common people of Russia met Americans as friends, and their reaction was a promise of ultimate deliverance for a world beset by dictators.

Every account of the historic meeting establishes unmistakably the ecstatic nature of the event. Language barriers were no handicaps as American and Russian GI's stretched forth the hand of friendship.

Cigarettes and watches were swapped back and forth as the men who had conquered fascism chattered excitedly to each other in their different languages. The fact that they could not understand the words was beside the point—they understood the feeling, and it was deep and far-reaching.

The Communist dictators immediately realized their problem. The meeting on the Elbe was necessary to win their war; but it had also revealed to their downtrodden people that Americans were friends, and not the demons that were described in the Communist propaganda. As soon as they could, they began to withdraw their soldiers from all contacts with Americans. It was the only way they could maintain among the Russian people the distorted concepts which they had so carefully spread for so many years.

Ten years later, the world has changed drastically. The fine flush of enthusiasm displayed on the Torgau Bridge has evaporated under the chilling winds of the cold war.

But one fact has been established for all time to come. It is that the people of the world can solve the problems of peace. They do want to live in concord and friendship, and the day the Iron Curtain is penetrated will mark the end for all time of the Communist dictatorship.

THE DISCHARGE OF EDWARD J. CORSI

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a letter which I addressed to the Secretary of State, in connection with his recent discharge of Mr. Edward J. Corsi. I believe the issues raised by this letter are significant, and I await the Secretary's reply. I also want to commend the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for his leadership in calling hearings of his subcommittee in the Senate Judiciary Committee, so that the facts may be brought to light.

It is a matter of profound regret to me, and one of serious loss to the prestige of our Nation, that our refugee immigration program is stalled virtually in dead center. I commend Mr. Corsi for his energetic efforts to help revitalize that program and bring it to life. It is unfortunate that the administration thought so little of the program that they were constrained to manufacture a pretext in order to prevent Mr. Corsi from carrying out his assignment.

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

APRIL 12, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DULLES:

I am very much interested in the case of Mr. Edward J. Corsi. It is apparent to me, despite your assurances that Mr. Corsi's "change of assignment" does not involve "any question of security" that this case represents another aberration in the administration of the security program. You will recall that the Senate Committee on Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I am acting chairman, has been holding hearings on this whole question of Government security.

I note the statement in the State Department's press release of April 11 that:

"Under the department's administrative regulations it was impossible initially to offer him a position for a longer period than ninety days."

I assume that the administrative regulation in question is section 391.42 of the Department's Regulations and Procedures on administrative operations dealing with security of employees. This provision, as I understand it, bars employment of an individual in any sensitive position in the Department unless a full field investigation has been conducted, but provides as an exception to this:

"That in case of emergency a sensitive position may be filled for a period not to exceed 90 days by a person with respect to whom a full field preappointment investigation has not been completed if the Secretary of State finds that such action is necessary in the national interest."

I note also that the ninety-day limitations is unique to the State Department, since section 3 (b) of the Executive Order, upon which your Department's provision is based, uses the phrase "limited period" rather than any specific time limitation.

It seems to me that your interpretation of section 391.42 makes you a prisoner of your own regulations, which you have authority to amend and from which you have authority to grant exceptions. It is not conceivable to me that any sound Government administration would permit a technicality of this kind to deprive the Government of the service of a useful official. It would appear, moreover, that the 90-day period was selected since it affords an opportunity for completion of the required investigation, and that in those cases in which an investigation lasts beyond this period, it would be sensible to extend the period rather than disrupt the lives of the employees concerned who assumed they were obtaining regular and not temporary employment, and who assumed, if they were even aware of the 90-day provision, that investigation would be completed within this period.

I should very much appreciate your furnishing me with the following information, which, I believe, is essential to an understanding of the Corsi case:

1. Was Mr. Corsi's original position classified as "sensitive"?

2. Is the new position which was offered to Mr. Corsi on April 8 classified as "sensitive"?

3. Did the office of security of the Department commence a full field investigation? If so, on what date? Was this investigation completed? If so, on what date?

4. Was the investigation referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation because of the existence of derogatory information relating to matters described in sections 392.2b–g of your regulations, which deal in general with subversive activities or interests, or derogatory information indicating that Mr. Corsi has been subject to coercion, influence or pressure to act contrary to the interests of the national security?

5. If the investigation was referred to the FBI, for any reason, on what date was the referral? Has the FBI investigation been concluded?

6. Has Mr. Corsi's security investigation presented any unusual or difficult problems which result in a longer time for completion than investigations normally require?

7. Have there been any State Department cases since promulgation of Executive Order 10450 in which an appointee has been permitted to remain on the job for longer than 90 days before his full field investigation has been completed?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday last the New York Times carried a very fine editorial entitled "On Foreign Aid." It is a thoughtful, objective, and highly intelligent discussion of the problems with which we are faced and the opportunities which have come to us through the full use of foreign aid, both military and economic. I believe it is an editorial which should be carefully studied, not only by the Members of the Congress, but by the American people generally.

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:

ON FOREIGN AID

President Eisenhower stated the case for our continued assistance to those who can make use of it in the fewest possible words in his message to Congress, when he said:

"The other free nations need the United States, and we need them, if all are to be secure."

In this sense the word "foreign" is misleading. This is United States aid, given in the interest of the United States. We are one of those "all" that need to be secure. We are not "giving." We are investing in our security and in the world in which we wish to live.

The amounts that have been suggested are not large in proportion to our resources. We have frequently, without qualm, expended much larger amounts when we were convinced that there was real necessity. All that was required was this conviction of need.

This is what is required now. We can do the right thing with our resources if we are able to bring them to bear. What we must understand is that the field is ready for our effort. This is not a matter merely for statistics or cost sheets. It is not just a matter of combating communism, worthy as that may be. It is a matter of changing the way in which persons live. We can be secure when they live worthily. We are endangered when they live at the margin. Our help can make the difference in many cases. This is the need.

No people, anywhere in the world, are now "foreign" to us. We may differ in language and customs, in law and behavior, but these differences are minimal. We wish to be and to remain free. And that is as true in Nyasaland as it is in Manhattan. This freedom is threatened, there and here. If we plan and work for its defense we are not engaged in a "foreign" operation. It affects us.

This, moreover, is the real background for the immediate practical benefits that can and will accrue from a farsighted generosity. We have had an excellent example of these latter in the recovery of Western Europe under the Marshall plan. That recovery has been of direct practical benefit to the United States in terms of trade as well as in security. It can be argued that some money was wastefully spent. It cannot be argued that the investment, as a whole, did not get results.

The same thing is potentially true in Asia, where the emphasis is now placed. There is a crying need for our effort and our means. This chance for us is more than for a propaganda gesture to offset some of the things that are being said at Bandung. It is a chance to invest in human welfare and progress in half the human race. There are skills to be exported. There is a need for the simple medical powerplant that fights disease. There is need for better agronomy, better marketing, better use of waste. There is need for more food and better food so that men are not crippled by hunger. There is need for more and better education so that men are not handicapped by the inability to read and to understand what has been written.

We have at our command the resources to change the lives of literally millions of persons and to change them for the better. We cannot afford to let good intention bog down in technicality or partisanship. The President has charted a course that is not merely wise and humane. It is conservative in the face of the need.

A POLICY OF PRUDENT STRENGTH AND PATIENCE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the United States gets through the next few years without getting into a major war, the credit must go in large measure to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He has been standing up against pressures from many sources.

Some people think these are times for "nose-punching." Ike does not. The President knows that one blow can lead to another.

Some people think we should put a ship of the shores of Quemoy and Matsu

nearest the coast of China, and defy the Reds to touch it. Ike does not.

The President does not believe in giving custody of the world's peace to those in Chou En-lai's Red China who take pride in face-saving, or to Chiang-Kai-shek's Nationalists who want to return to the mainland of Asia, even though that would require soldiers from the homes of America, and might embroil the world in atomic conflict.

Some admirals and some generals—but not many—think we should regard war as inevitable, and should strike a "preventive" blow. Ike does not. The President knows that war is war, regardless of whether it is called preventive or defensive.

Some people believe that, basically, the longing for peace is in the hearts of the common people everywhere. The President is on their side.

Therefore, President Eisenhower steadily pursues a policy of prudent strength and patient dealing with the vexing problems which arise from day to day. One by one, he meets them—Korea, Trieste, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Western Germany, Formosa. Not always are the solutions perfect. Not always are they exactly what we would like if we were dictating terms as a conqueror might. But they are "live and let live" solutions which, over the span of years, may work better than one-sided dictation.

Mr. President, it is a privilege to work in the ranks of the party that placed Dwight Eisenhower in the Presidency in these times.

EAST VERSUS WEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there are many magnificent scenic spectacles in this great land of ours, the United States of America. During recent weeks, the Travel Section of the New York Times has sponsored a series of debates, between the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself, as to which region, the East or the West, contains the most outdoor grandeur.

Naturally, my preference is for the West. Senator FLANDERS favors the East. The debate has been in the friendly fashion which is characteristic of most people of good will, and I feel privileged to have been asked to participate with so eminent a Member of the Senate as the junior Senator from Vermont. The debate was arranged by Paul J. C. Friedlander, travel editor of the New York Times, which is one of the Nations eminent newspapers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Vote for the West," written by me and published in the New York Times of March 20, 1955; an article entitled "War Between East and West," written by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and published in the New York Times of April 17, 1955; and an article entitled "Final Skirmish in the Battle of the Senators," written by me and printed in the New York Times of April 24, 1955.

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

[From the New York Times of March 20, 1955]

VOTE FOR THE WEST—ROVING SENATOR COMPARES THE VIEWS FROM EASTERN AND WESTERN TRAINS

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time in my life, I have been traveling extensively through the eastern portion of the United States. Most of this travel has been by train, some by automobile. It has taken me into most of the States between the Great Lakes and Manhattan Island.

What I have seen, either through the windows of pullman cars or through the windshields of automobiles, has scant resemblance to the magnificent landscapes of the American West, where I was born and raised. Indeed, it is clear that the native easterner who has been touring only in his own segment of the Nation doesn't know what he is missing.

I purposely took the 18-hour Gotham Limited of the Pennsylvania Railroad from Chicago to New York so I could ride over the Allegheny Mountains in broad daylight. I hardly realized when the divide of the range had been crossed. The long train twisted up some bare, eroded ridges in the State of Pennsylvania, and then presently we were back in flat country once more. It was no experience at all, so far as scenery was concerned. I felt let down and disappointed, particularly when measuring the view by western standards of scenery.

SCENIC POINTS

I thought of the Great Northern's Empire Builder, winding through wooded canyons on the boundary of Glacier National Park, with deer and elk dotting the slopes. I remembered the time I pilgrimaged via the Rio Grande system from Denver to Salt Lake City, over the magnificent hump of the Rockies. I recalled with nostalgia the breathtaking corridor of the Columbia River Gorge, where Union Pacific trains follow a water-level route past the glacial spires of Mount Adams and Mount Hood. And I mourned for the forlorn eastern wayfarer, who must content himself with the pygmy knobs of the Alleghenies, which would barely rank as foothills where I come from.

Practically all of America's scenery—particularly that lining railroad tracks and automobile highways—is concentrated within the 11 States which stretch from the Rocky Mountains westward. On a train out West, a pilgrim may start reading with the best of intentions, but the panorama outside the window will soon compel him to put down his book or his magazine.

VARIETY OF SIGHTS

Waterfalls, glaciers, rock pinnacles, foaming rapids—these pass the windows of a western train like pickets on a fence. A blasé traveler may possibly become weary of the plethora of magnificent sights from a train rumbling through Colorado or Idaho. But in the East, the tour promoters must exploit each ravine or gully as if it were the Grand Canyon. The Pennsylvania's horseshoe curve is nice to see, yet it is a pretty tame spectacle, indeed, by comparison with the spiral tunnels of the Canadian Pacific, near Yoho Valley.

The West is a land of cosmic dimensions and this, too, the eastern nomad may find it hard to appreciate. In my own State of Oregon, when I was riding toward Washington to take the oath of office, the Union Pacific's crack streamliner City of Portland hurtled along for 8 hours before it reached the Idaho border. Yet, on the short 4-hour Pennsylvania Railroad run between New York and Washington, I never cease to marvel at the fact that we cross six different geographic sovereignties—the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York.

BIG STATES

To be in six separate sovereignties out West, one would have to take passage on a fast train for the better part of 2 days. Many of the Eastern States are of cubicle size, but virtually all the States of the West are measured by endless horizons. Oregon contains more than twice the land area of the State of New York, yet has only as many residents as the borough of the Bronx. This, too, is a distinguishing factor between American journeys, east and west.

In the East, travelers are sophisticated about such vast cities as Philadelphia and Cleveland. They barely look up from their newspapers or bridge game when the train rolls into the station of one of these metropolises. But, out West, the appearance on the main line of Wenatchee, Wash. (population 14,000) or of Pendleton, Oreg. (population 15,000) is the signal for passengers to get off the train, to promenade on the platform and to buy oranges, souvenir folders, and postage stamps.

VAST DISTANCES

The distances in the Western States require far longer trips than in the East, but I still am puzzled by the greater luxury of western trains for one simple reason. Travel in the East, to this dyed-in-the-wool westerner, at least, is a bore. Looking out the window you see either the backside of factories or a drab and flat countryside. In the West the glories of Mother Nature are at their best.

Yet western trains, despite the stirring spectacle visible from their windows, are more comfortable and attractive than their eastern counterparts. There is more space per passenger; there are more lounge cars and domes; more observation chairs. In addition, the food on western diners is cheaper in price and the menu more varied. On the eastern lines there is nothing like the variety that marks the Southern Pacific bill of fare between Portland and San Francisco, and that of the Great Northern between Seattle and Great Falls.

I must confess a prejudice, having been born and raised in the West. Perhaps I do not take into account the fact that eastern railroads must handle far more people. When Oregon is as populated as New Jersey or Pennsylvania, it may be that our trains will not have quite as much room for lolling and luxury. It could even be that our scenic vistas will be less free and untrammeled than they are today. But this isn't likely to occur during my time.

WAR BETWEEN EAST AND WEST—THE SENATOR FROM VERMONT OFFERS A FEW WORDS TO SET STRAIGHT THE RECORD AND HIS COLLEAGUE FROM OREGON

(By RALPH E. FLANDERS, United States Senator from Vermont)

(On March 20 this section published an article by United States Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, from Oregon, decrying the lack of majestic scenery to be seen from the railroads and highways of the Eastern States as compared to what the Northwest offers its tourists. Defenders of the East, both in and out of public office, reacted with the quick vehemence of a Rocky Mountain brown trout rising to a Presidential dry fly. This page is devoted to some of the more pertinent rebuttals which offer small comfort to Senator NEUBERGER'S constituents. He promises a reply to this symposium in a future issue.)

The article by Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon has led me to hope that a few words from me might bring to him a great deal

more of enjoyment as he travels about our country.

First, I would suggest that he make a point of visiting every State in the Union. I had done that by 1922. As a popular speaker and as a United States Senator, he should have no difficulty in wangling invitations which would enable him to cover the country while he is still young.

It would be my advice, however, that he gradually cure himself of his obsession for vastness which seems to be the primary element in his appreciation of the American scene. I, too, love the vastness of America but would not confine my admiration to that one element. I suppose it is because the West is vast that the transcontinental trains are made so roomy and comfortable. If you have to stay 2 or 3 days in 1 train, the railroad company must treat you well, and I for one am frank to say that they do. The long distance travel of the West, whether in quarters, service, or food, is superior to that offered by our short runs here in the East.

HOMEMADE HAPPINESS

There are long, long, dreary stretches in the West, but there is no need to be discouraged by them. I remember once riding a slow train on the Milwaukee through South Dakota. At a station where we stopped for lunch, I talked with a little 6-year-old girl who was very, very happy. In the rotogravure section of a newspaper she showed me the picture of Helen Wills, the tennis player, with the well-known visor which shaded her eyes. This little girl had made herself a visor out of a piece of cardboard and some string. Hers was a homemade happiness. If one is interested in people, one can find interest in travel even where the scene is not particularly exciting, as is the case in so many parts of the West.

I am saying nothing against South Dakota. The ability and enterprise of the people of that region have made a rich State out of one which had few natural attractions.

Senator NEUBERGER speaks somewhat patronizing of crossing the Allegheny Divide between Cresson and the Horseshoe Curve without noticing when he had done so. Does he find anything spectacular in crossing the Continental Divide between Laramie and Rawlins? We don't find something spectacular everywhere, either in the East or the West.

I am sorry that he did not have a more interesting time from Altoona on. Whether he was headed for Philadelphia or Baltimore, the train winds through some very lovely country. If one is to enjoy the whole of the United States, he should have his mind attuned to pastoral beauties as well as to wild and rugged scenery.

THE PLAIN PEOPLE

If he went through Lancaster County, he should know that he is in one of the richest counties of the United States. He might get a glimpse of the Amish people with their plain dress and characteristic buggies. A part of the charm of that journey has passed away since I first made it many years ago when they still maintained depots at such picturesquely named stations as Highspire and Birdsong; but in any event, it is lovely.

I cannot help wondering if interesting scenery from his own point of view is not very limited indeed. Coming East, does it not cease for him at the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains? Are there not, particularly on the northern routes, hundreds of miles between the Rockies and Sierras or the Coast Range which lack interest for him? Certainly to one of New England birth it is a bit disconcerning to drive along the southern edge of the really magnificient State of Wyoming and find that it takes 2 hours to get a new view. Up where I was born there is a new and charming view at every turn in the road. We do not have vastness; vastness in itself is a wonderful thing, but it is not the only thing.

A fundamental difference between West and East is this: Out West the landscape is wonderful in the large. But don't look at it too closely. It won't stand detailed inspection. Back East the scene is not grand, but you can get as close to it as you wish, down to the least blade of grass, and find it beautiful.

As I understand it, the Senator has an engagement in Vermont very shortly. It would be my hope that he might visit my native State (where "spring lingers indecently in the lap of winter") at a time when the buds have shaken out so that he can see a landscape which is truly a God-made park.

He will find many things of interest about that region. One of them is our timberline, which is as good as any timberline in the West. We have it down lower where you can get to it easily. It runs between 3,800 and 4,000 feet above sea level. It is true that the mountains do not rise above that line into the eternal snows. That is somethings for which we have to go west, but our timberline is as good as anybody's.

There are many fine mountains in the West. I think perhaps my favorite is Mount Shasta, particularly as I used to see it from the old Siskiyou Tunnel route. The train would make a turn around a mountain and you said goodby to Shasta. A few minutes later it was looking at you over the top of that mountain. Again you lost it around the next mountain and again it peered up at you over the top—and so on, as I remember it, for hours.

TWO-HUNDRED-MILE WINDS

We have nothing like that in the East, but I would respectfully call attention to Mount Washington which, with the whole Presidential Range, has a grandeur of its own to the discerning eye. It has more than that. It has the highest recorded wind velocities in the world. If one wants to be sure of experiencing 200-mile-an-hour winds plus, he must come to Mount Washington.

The western folks used to be a little scornful of this and erected a weather station on one of the mountains up back of Denver. Hopefully they kept it manned for 2 or 3 years and then quietly, without fanfare, dismantled it. Mount Washington still holds the record.

In good time I am sure Senator NEUBERGER will shake himself clear of his provincialism and become a good American. The way to do that is to learn to appreciate that which every State in the Union has to offer.

FINAL SKIRMISH IN THE BATTLE OF THE SENATORS—NEUBERGER OF OREGON GIVES GROUND BEFORE VERMONT'S FIGHTING FLANDERS

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

WASHINGTON.—Now that I have been properly put in my place by a bipartisan phalanx led by Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS (Republican of Vermont) and Gov. Averell Harriman (Democrat of New York) I return to the wars in behalf of the superiority of western scenery over that of the Eastern States.

First, however, I must retreat sufficiently to confess that I never intended to give the impression that all the eastern outdoors is unworthy of having 20/20 vision wasted upon it. If I conveyed any such idea, I herewith apologize. The East has its beauty spots and its great moments. Yet, I still stubbornly claim that western grandeur would win in any fair and unbiased competition.

Probably I had better explain what I mean by West. Perhaps that is the source of some of the tension between me and my fellow officeholders. Senator FLANDERS scolded me for what he called the "dreary" landscape of South Dakota. Let me assure my colleague that I must travel about 1,400 miles eastward from Oregon to get to South Dakota. That is substantially equal to the distance he will have to pilgrimage westward from Vermont to reach the same State. But I am not blaming New England for South Dakota. In fact, South Dakota contains some idyllic dales and glens in the Black Hills which I will pit against Vermont (or even Oregon) any time Senator FLANDERS wants to match panoramas.

WHERE ARE THE DAKOTAS

To me, West describes that portion of the United States stretching from the Divide of the Rocky Mountains to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. East, in my opinion, refers to the landscape between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic's surf. South Dakota fits in neither category. It is Middle West.

Senator FLANDERS extolled the marvels of the East, "down to the least blade of grass." We have lovely grass in the West, too, but we never feel that we have to brag about it. Indeed, it is just about identical with the kind of grass that grows in the East, so nobody in America need rent a roomette or fill a gas tank to look at grass, even that recommended by a United States Senator.

I concede that there are many imposing places tooled by nature in the East—Niagara Falls, the Adirondacks and the Presidential Range, Cape Cod and the Great Smokies, to mention merely a few. Furthermore, I agree with Senator FLANDERS and Governor Harriman that you cannot necessarily compare the gentle beauty of the Catskills with the stark glacial majesty of Mt. Hood or Mt. Rainier.

If there is any single lesson which this foray into scenic rivalry should have taught me, it is that each part of America happens to be marvelous and wonderful to the people who live there. Vermont is gorgeous to a Senator from Vermont, and Oregon is in a class by itself to a Senator from Oregon. And South Dakota surpasses all other States in outdoor attractions, if you are a storekeeper or schoolteacher or auto mechanic residing in South Dakota.

I ought not to have forgotten this from World War II. When our outfit was bivouacked in the wilds of the Yukon, men did not yearn for Bali Bali or the Isle of Capri—they ached to be home, wherever that might be.

GI's from the Bronx talked of the Bronx as though it might be the Swiss Alps and full of wonders. Others described glowingly some remote crossroads village in Georgia or Tennessee. And I recall the homesick corporal from Chicago who, when he heard the order to get down out of our truck because we were at an outpost named Burwash Landing, sighed mournfully: "All I want to hear is some conductor call out, 'Change here for Dearborn station'."

That is the way the scolding letters have been since I wrote my original article running down the scenery of the East. A housewife in New Jersey says I just must see the sunset from her front porch. A truck driver in Richmond insists I ought to ride through the Blue Ridge Mountains on the leather seat beside him. An office employe of the Chesapeake & Ohio thinks I have shirked my duty in not rumbling past wooded hills to White Sulphur Springs aboard a Chesapeake & Ohio passenger train.

A New York City physician demands testily to know which mountain cordillera can rival the man-made spires of Manhattan poking through the mist at dawn. A college co-ed in Ohio writes that the massive Canadian Rockies frightened her, but she considers the gentle knolls of her native State to be "just right."

When a Senator from Vermont joins in singing "for purple mountain majesty, above the fruited plain," there comes into his mind's eye a modest dome surmounted by a cog railway. But a Senator from Oregon,

intoning the same hymn, thinks of a pinnacle of ice and basalt where none except the sturdiest can set crampons.

Since writing my first article on this subject, I have engaged in some laboratory work. I have traveled back and forth across the continent via five different railroads and a Convair plane of the United States Army Air Force, as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I resolved to look out the window with other than insular feelings.

A NEW PERSPECTIVE

I saw the palisades of the Hudson not as a partisan of the Pacific Northwest but with a new detachment. Suddenly I became aware that, while not sharing the proportions of the cliffs stockading the Columbia, these sheer crags have a grandeur all their own. The Delaware is not as picturesque a river as the Salmon or the Rogue, but on the banks of the Delaware our freedom and independence were won, and surely that counts for something, especially in these tense and troubled times.

So I meekly sheath my local pride and promise that never again will I contrast the uplands and rim rock of eastern Oregon with the swales of Central Park. For the last time I have compared the piers of the East River with the lava ramparts towering above the Deschutes. I would pull Senator FLANDERS in a rickshaw from Washington to Montpelier before I again would dare to claim that the cascades of Oregon are twice the height of the Presidential Mountains of Vermont.

Perhaps I can retain some shred of my shattered dignity. Will my critics allow me to boast that the West is lonelier than the East? In 1953, my wife and I camped alone on the Lewis and Clark Trail in Idaho. We never saw another person. I appreciated not only the resourcefulness in the outdoors of my farm-reared spouse, but also I understood what America must have been like during the epochs before the white man came. I doubt if this experience would have been possible in the crowded States of the East.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

Under the previous order, the calendar will now be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate was announced as first in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DONALD HECTOR TAYLOR

The bill (S. 26) for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Donald Hector Taylor shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

RICA, LUCY, AND SALOMON BREGER

The bill (S. 29) for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUPE M. GONZALEZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 36) for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lupe M. Gonzalez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SELMA RIVLIN

The bill (S. 42) for the relief of Selma Rivlin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Selma Rivlin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EVANTIYI YORGIYADIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 68) for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Evantiyi", to strike out "Yorgiadis" and insert "Yorgiyadis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evantiyi Yorgiyadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiyadis."

URSULA ELSE BOYSEN

The bill (S. 71) for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Else Boysen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARGARET ISABEL BYERS

The bill (S. 89) for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margaret Isabel Byers shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

NEJIBE EL-SOUSSE SLYMAN

The bill (S. 90) for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUZIA COX

The bill (S. 91) for the relief of Luzia Cox was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luzia Cox may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

AHTI JOHANNES RUUSKANEN

The bill (S. 93) for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ESTHER CORNELIUS, ARTHUR ALEXANDER CORNELIUS, AND FRANK THOMAS CORNELIUS

The bill (S. 94) for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

PETER CHARLES BETHEL (PETER CHARLES PETERS)

The bill (S. 95) for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

XANTHI GEORGES KOMPOROZOU

The bill (S. 99) for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou was considered, ordered to be engrossed for the third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Xanthi Georges Komporozou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 154, Senate bill 99, which was passed a few moment ago, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report, which I think is a very interesting one on this bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 99) for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Xanthi Georges Komporozou. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 44-year-old native and citizen of Greece who last entered the United States as a visitor on July 29, 1950, accompanying her employers, Lt. Col. and Mrs. Joseph McChristian, West Point N. Y. Mrs. McChristian is the daughter of Gen. and Mrs. James A. Van Fleet. She suffered an attack of pulmonary tuberculosis 3 years ago and the beneficiary of the bill has taken charge of the McChristian children.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated June 25, 1954, to the then chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to S. 3150 which was a bill passed by the Senate in the 83d Congress for the relief of the same alien, reads as follows:

JUNE 25, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request of the Department of Justice for a report relative to the bill (S. 3150) for the relief of Xanthi George Komporozou, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the New York, N. Y., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would grant this alien the status of a permanent resident of the United States upon payment of the required visa fee. It also directs that one number be deducted from the appropriate immigration quota.

The beneficiary is chargeable to the quota of Greece.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Commissioner.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE XANTHI GEORGES KOMPOROZOU, BENEFICIARY OF S. 3150

Xanthi Georges Komporozou is single, a native and citizen of Greece, and was born on October 3, 1909, at Manolas. Her only entry into the United States was on July 29, 1950, at New York, N. Y., when she was admitted as a visitor, accompanying her employers, Lt. Col. and Mrs. Joseph McChristian, West Point, N. Y. She has received four extensions, the last one to expire on May 27, 1954.

Miss Komporozou has been nursemaid to Lt. Col. and Mrs. McChristian's three children since December 1949. She has cared for the children since Mrs. McChristian's attack of pulmonary tuberculosis 3 years ago, and has been practically a mother to the 3 children. Mrs. McChristian is the daughter of Gen. and Mrs. James A. Van Fleet.

Miss Komporozou has no assets, but little formal education, and has educated herself by having tutors and by self-teaching. Miss Komporozou speaks classical Greek fluently and has taught the McChristian children the Greek language.

She has no relatives in the United States. Her two sisters and a half brother reside in Greece.

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, the author of the bill, has submitted the following information in connection with the case:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
April 1, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you know, on March 17 I introduced S. 3150, a bill to grant permanent residence to Xanthi Georges Komoporozou, and this bill is now pending before your committee.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of a letter to me from General Van Fleet, as well as a copy of a letter from the general's daughter to him, both of which are self-explanatory.

This appears to me to be a meritorious case, and I will appreciate anything you may do to secure early consideration of S. 3150.

With kind regards, I remain

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

AUBURNDALE, FLA., *March 15, 1954.*

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SPESSARD: I have a great favor to ask of you.

It is to ask you to introduce special legislation which will authorize the retention in this country, and to become an American citizen, of a Greek nurse who has been in my family in this country for nearly 4 years.

The reason for special legislation is the fact that the Greek quota for entry into the United States is small and is oversubscribed for many years to come. I believe her case is outstanding and merits special legislation.

Her name is Miss Xanthi Georges Komporozou, born in Manolada, Greece, October 3, 1910.

Miss Komporozou is presently living with my daughter, Dempsie, wife of Col. Joseph A. McChristian, United States Army, at West Point, N. Y.

Miss Komporozou holds passport No. 5900 issued by the Greek Government in Athens, Greece, June 14, 1950. It is valid until May 9, 1955, but the current visa No. 963210 is valid only until May 27, 1954.

Miss Komporozou's parents are dead. She has no living relatives and no home. She desires to become an American citizen.

I am enclosing a statement concerning Miss Komporozou, submitted by my daughter Dempsie.

Colonel McChristian was raised in Miami Beach and is also a friend of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS.

With warm regards to you and Mary,

Cordially,

JAMES A. VAN FLEET,
General, United States Army (Retired).

WEST POINT, N. Y., *March 10, 1954.*

Gen. JAMES A. VAN FLEET,
United States Army (Retired),
Auburndale, Fla.

DEAR DADDY: Here briefly are the facts, most of which you know already, about Xanthi.

She is Miss Xanthi Georges Komporozou, born in Manolada, Greece, October 3, 1910. She is presently in possession of passport No. 5900, issued by the Greek Government in Athens, June 14, 1950. It is valid until May 9, 1955, but her visa No. 963210 is valid only until May 27, 1954. Her parents are dead and she has no (relatives) and no home. She wants more than anything in this world to become an American citizen. The Greek quota is small and already oversubscribed for years to come.

Her integrity, loyalty, superior ideals—in fact all the qualities which would make her an ideal American citizen—are, of course, the very reasons we found her in the first place. You recall this was just before Christmas, a little over 3 years ago, in Greece, and the Communists had made public threat to assassinate you, and they did get the man near you. You were under constant police guard and we were all scared to death for fear something would happen to you or to your grandchildren. And with your third grandchild due any day we, or rather mother, appealed to the lady-in-waiting to the Queen—Mary Carolou—to find someone who could be trusted completely. Mary Carolou sent us Xanthi Komporozou, who had been in her own home for many years.

When we returned to the States in July 1950, we were able to bring Xanthi with us on a temporary visitor's visa for 6 months. When she was due to return to Greece she was midway in extensive dental work and we were able to extend her visa for another 6 months.

During this time we were transferred from Norfolk, Va., to West Point, N. Y., and on arriving at West Point it was discovered that I had contracted tuberculosis in Greece. I know you well recall that terrible experience.

The same day that I entered Fitzsimons Hospital in Denver, in April 1951, you were suddenly sent to Korea to command the Eighth Army. It seemed pretty glum—in fact, downright unsolvable, since it meant 2 years minimum hospitalization for me and no small amount of anguish about our 3 children.

Any ordinary person would have left in a hurry, but Xanthi quietly put aside her own life and plans and took up all of our burdens. Our case was presented to the immigration officials in New York and they were very kind and agreed to extend her visit.

Two years later I came back from the hospital and you came back from Korea. Then in October 1953 it was discovered that my tuberculosis was not cured and the doctors recommended surgery, which was performed at great expense at Harkness Pavilion, Presbyterian Hospital in New York City.

This time we were fortunate to get a letter from the National Employment Service saying that they could not furnish anyone to take Xanthi's place to care for the children and so her visa was extended until May 1954. But during all these past many months, which by now is almost 4 years, Xanthi Komporozou has become not just irreplaceable, but inseparable from us as a loved member of the family. Not only has she cared for the children completely and nursed them when they were ill, but she has loved them as her own and in truth, could not be much more loved by us all had she been born into the family.

She has taught the children the Greek language and Greek philosophy. She has won the admiration of all who know us at West Point. That she would be a credit to our country goes without saying. Her health is excellent. She is known by many people of prominence. Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America stated from his pulpit that she was an example to all Greeks in this country.

And so I am appealing to you, Daddy, because of Xanthi's loyalty to your family at a dangerous time in Greece and because of her 4 selfless years of devotion since—thus freeing your mind when the country needed you both for Greece and for Korea. I believe all of this deserves rewarding and all who know her feel it justifies special legislation allowing her to remain as a citizen in the United States.

These are the facts concerning Xanthi. You may use this letter as you wish.

With love,

DEMPSIE

(Dempsie Van Fleet McChristian, wife of Col. Joseph A. McChristian.)

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (S. 99) should be enacted.

HERMINE LORENZ

The bill (S. 100) for the relief of Hermine Lorenz was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hermine Lorenz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LEON J. DE SZETHOFER AND BLANCHE HRDINOVA DE SZETHOFER

The bill (S. 118) for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

DAVID WEI-DAO LEA AND JULIA AN-FONG WANG LEA

The bill (S. 119) for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

VASILIOS DEMETRIOU KRETSOS AND HIS WIFE CHRYSSA THOMAIDOU KRETSOS

The bill (S. 120) for the relief of Basilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vasilios Demetriou Kretsos and his wife, Chryssa Thomaidou Kretsos, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

SULTANA COKA PAVLOVITCH

The bill (S. 121) for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sultana Coka Pavlovitch shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIN VOLEJNICEK

The bill (S. 130) for the relief of Antonin Volejnicek was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonin Volejnicek shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIO RIBEIRO

The bill (S. 162) for the relief of Antonio Ribeiro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Ribeiro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BORYS NAUMENKO

The bill (S. 192) for the relief of Borys Naumenko was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Borys Naumenko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LOUISE RUSSU SOZANSKI

The bill (S. 193) for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Louise Russu Sozanski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

OLIVIA M. ORCIUCH

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of Olivia M. Orciuch, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, Calendar No. 208, House bill 1252, is an identical bill. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 196 is indefinitely postponed.

REV. LORENZO RODRIGUEZ BLANCO, AND REV. ALEJANDRO NEGREDO LAZARO

The bill (S. 234) for the relief of Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco, and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Lorenzo Rodriguez Blanco and Rev. Alejandro Negredo Lazaro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

ANDREAS GEORGES VLASTOS (ANDREAS GEORGES VLASTO)

The bill (S. 238) for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANDREW WOLFINGER

The bill (S. 283) for the relief of Andrew Wolfinger was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrew Wolfinger shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Theodore Sjerslee, a United States citizen.

MRS. DIANA COHEN AND JACQUELINE PATRICIA COHEN

The bill (S. 320) for the relief of Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Diana Cohen and Jacqueline Patricia Cohen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

ANNI MARJATTA MAKELA AND SON, MARKKU PAIVIO MAKELA

The bill (S. 321) for the relief of Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anni Marjatta Makela and son, Markku Paivio Makela, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MALBINA ROUPHAEL DAVID (NEE GEBRAEL)

The bill (S. 322) for the relief of Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Malbina Rouphael David (nee Gebrael), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

VITTORIA ALBERGHETTI, DANIELE ALBERGHETTI, ANNA MARIA ALBERGHETTI, CARLA ALBERGHETTI, AND PAOLO ALBERGHETTI

The bill (S. 341) for the relief of Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vittoria Alberghetti, Daniele Alberghetti, Anna Maria Alberghetti, Carla Alberghetti, and Paolo Alberghetti shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ARTHUR SROKA

The bill (S. 353) for the relief of Arthur Sroka was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Arthur Sroka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARIA BERTAGNOLLI PANCHERI

The bill (S. 397) for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri was considered,

ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

LUCY PERSONIUS

The bill (S. 439) for the relief of Lucy Personius was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lucy Personius, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Glen C. Personius, citizens of the United States.

GEORGE PANTELAS

The bill (S. 449) for the relief of George Pantelas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of George Pantelas. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said George Pantelas shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

DR. LUCIANO A. LEGIARDI-LAURA

The bill (S. 467) for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of the first paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

URHO PAAVO PATOKOSKI AND HIS FAMILY

The bill (S. 473) for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski and his family was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Urho Paavo Patokoski; his wife, Toino Esteri; and their three minor sons, Iimo Matti Juhani, Paavo Esa Antero, and Pekka Jouko Kalevi, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

JAMES JI-TSUNG WOO, MARGIE WANCHUNG WOO, DANIEL DU-NING WOO AND ROBERT DU-AN WOO

The bill (S. 570) for the relief of James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo and Robert Du-An Woo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, James Ji-Tsung Woo, Margie Wanchung Woo, Daniel Du-Ning Woo, and Robert Du-An Woo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

MARTIN P. PAVLOV

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Martin P. Pavlov was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martin P. Pavlov shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HILDEGARDE HILLER

The bill (S. 587) for the relief of Hildegarde Hiller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hildegarde Hiller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALICK BHARK

The bill (S. 604) for the relief of Alick Bhark was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alick Bhark shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CERTAIN ALIEN SHEEPHERDERS

The bill (S. 633) for the relief of certain alien sheepherders was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santiago Hormaechea, Jose Lecanda, Rufino Merino Jimenez, Panagiatis Demitreos Zeras, Fernando Macuaga Madariaga, Manuel Lopez Trabazo, Luis Uriarte Otaolea, and Antonio Yrigoyen Arrachea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, there is no objection to the passage of the bill which has just been passed. I so indicated by not offering an objection. However, I wish to go on record now as stating that if, in the future, bills covering certain types of occupations are announced on the call of the calendar, I shall object.

SANDY MICHAEL JOHN PHILP

The bill (S. 644) Sandy Michael John Philp was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sandy Michael John Philp shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as precribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

ANTONIOS VASILLOS ZARKADIS

The bill (S. 650) for the relief of Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonios Vasillos Zarkadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted

to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROBERT A. BORROMEO

The bill (S. 676) for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Robert A. Borromeo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHRISTOS PAUL ZOLOTAS

The bill (S. 707) for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Christos Paul Zolotas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROMANA MICHELINA SERENI

The bill (S. 713) for the relief of Romana Michelina Sereni was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Romana Michelina Sereni shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALFIO FERRARA

The bill (S. 714) for the relief of Alfio Ferrara was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfio Ferrara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

PIETRO MEDURI

The bill (S. 760) for the relief of Pietro Meduri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Meduri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MOJSZE HILDESHAIM AND ITA HILDESHAIM

The bill (S. 827) for the relief of Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mojsze Hildeshaim and Ita Hildeshaim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JACOB GRYNBERG

The bill (S. 867) for the relief of Jacob Grynberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jacob Grynberg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JOSE PEREZ GOMEZ—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 892) for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez was announced as next in order.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the next call of the calendar.

HENRY DUNCAN

The bill (S. 1014) for the relief of Henry Duncan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Duncan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

EDWARD NAARITS

The bill (S. 1044) for the relief of Edward Naarits was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the time limitation provided for in section 330 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward Naarits shall be deemed to be within the purview of the said section provided his petition for naturalization is filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act.

BLANCA IBARRA AND DOLORES IBARRA

The bill (S. 1180) for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SLAVOLJUB DJUROVIC AND GORAN DJUROVIC

The bill (S. 1197) for the relief of Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Slavoljub Djurovic and Goran Djurovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

GUISEPPI CASTROGIOVANNI, HIS WIFE AND CHILD

The bill (S. 1350) for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni and his wife and child was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guiseppi Castrogiovanni, and his wife and child shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State

shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ANTONIO JACOE

The bill (S. 1367) for the relief of Antonio Jacoe was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (9), (17), and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Jacoe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

LISELOTTE WARMBRAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon, and "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Liselotte Warmbrand may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANNA SCHMID

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 236) for the relief of Johanna Schmid which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Johanna Schmid, the fiance of Edmond J. Bolz, Jr., a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Johanna Schmid is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Edmond J. Bolz, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Johanna Schmid, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Johanna Schmid, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Johanna Schmid as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN ZAFRED URBANIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 407) for the relief of Helen Zafred Urbanic, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Helen Zafred Urbanic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Urbanic, citizens of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRISKA ANNE KARY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 504) for the relief of Priska Anne Kary, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Priska Anne Kary may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION S. QUIRK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 758) for the relief of Marion S. Quirk, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, in line 11, after the word "available", to insert a colon, and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marion S. Quirk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZEV COHEN (ZEV MACHTANI)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 844) for the relief of Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zev Cohen (Zev Machtani) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CASIMERO RIVERA GUTIERREZ ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 974) for the relief of Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "Act", to insert a comma and "upon payment of the required visa fees.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Casimero Rivera Gutierrez, Teresa Gutierrez, Susana Rivera Gutierrez, Martha Aguilera Gutierrez, and Armando Casimero Gutierrez, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The 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 was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions of chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of Restricted Data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed $10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, with a view to making it the unfinished business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 220, H. R. 5239, the agriculture appropriation bill, with the understanding that the bill will not be taken up until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the call of the calendar be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered; and the next bill on the calendar will be stated.

RETIREMENT, CLERICAL ASSISTANTS, AND FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES TO FORMER PRESIDENTS

The bill (S. 1516) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I object, not on the merits of the bill, but because I believe it is a bill that ought to be debated by the Senate. Therefore I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS — BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The Senate proceeding to consider the bill (S. 1628) to provide relief of farmers and farm workers 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, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 3, line 10, after the word "area", to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; in line 12, after the word "be", to strike out "necessary" and insert "advisable"; after line 13, to strike out:

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, whenever he determines that the normal production from the acreage allotment for the principal crop produced on any farm, together with the normal production of other crops grown on such farm, is insufficient to provide a livelihood for the operator of such farm and his family, to increase such acreage allotment to the extent necessary to enable such operator to produce sufficient agricultural commodities to provide such livelihood.

In line 23, to change the subsection letter from "(c)" to "(b)", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment thus causing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economics of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed, or damaged,

the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, may cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be advisable to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I object to the bill, on which the amendments have now been agreed to, because I believe the bill establishes a new policy and is a subject that should be debated. I, therefore, object to its consideration on the call of the calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I express the hope that the majority leader will set a time for the consideration of the bill. It is absolutely necessary that the Senate act upon it as soon as possible. It must be enacted very shortly if it is to do any good at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I share the hope expressed by the Senator from Louisiana. The bill should be considered and passed at an early date. It is already rather late for its consideration. I doubt whether it would be beneficial to many areas which were adversely affected by the severe weather conditions which recently occurred. I believe the bill should be brought up promptly, so as to give us an opportunity to go on record with respect to it, and so that we may see how Senators feel about assistance of this kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last week I mentioned to the distinguished minority leader that there were some bills reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which I would propose to take up after the calendar had been called today.

I have conferred with the acting minority leader and with the distinguished Senator who made the objection to its passage on the call of the calendar. If it is agreeable with them, I shall move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill as soon as the call of the calendar shall have been concluded.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I certainly hope that will be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall ask that the bill be taken up as soon as we have disposed of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1079) to provide for the sale of certain lands in national forests was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. BIBLE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests, which went to the foot of the calendar, go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is a bill which was recommended by the Department. I had been expecting to oppose the committee amendment. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nevada will state why he would like to have the bill go over until the next call of the calendar.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the colleague who is associated with me on the Calendar Committee desires to study this particular bill and has some comments to make concerning it. I was hoping he would be on the floor before we proceeded to the call of the calendar this morning.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I do not wish to deprive any colleague of an opportunity to study a bill the first time it is called on the calendar. I desire to observe, however, that I think the bill has considerable merit, and I believe it is meritorious in the way in which it was introduced. I hope the colleague to whom the distinguished Senator from Nevada has referred will give very careful consideration to the bill as it was originally introduced. I hope the study may lead him to support the bill in its entirety and without the committee amendment striking out a portion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Calendar No. 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests, will go over to the next call of the calendar.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN—BILLS PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that objection is made by the minority calendar committee to the present consideration of Calendar No. 212, S. 1372?

Mr. PURTELL. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill as drawn provides for an indefinite period, without limitation, for the making of supplementary advances on loans at the time the extended period expires.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the minority calendar committee if at the conclusion of the calendar call this bill be considered by the Senate.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that there will be any objection to placing in the bill a time limitation of the kind the Senator from Nebraska has reference to.

Mr. HRUSKA. A 2-year limitation would be agreeable to us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I believe this bill involves a new policy, and therefore I object to the bill being considered at this time. I believe it should be debated on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the Senator if I moved to take it up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. I would have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN OKLAHOMA TO THE CITY OF WOODWARD, OKLA.

The bill (S. 998) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Woodward, Okla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described land situated in Woodward County, Okla.:

Beginning at a point 66.0 feet south and 283.0 feet west of the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 35, township 23 north, range 21 west, Indian meridian, and running thence south 273.0 feet, thence west 150.0 feet, thence north 273.0 feet, thence east 150.0 feet to the point of beginning, all lying in the northwest quarter of section 35, township 23 north, range 21 west, Indian meridian, and including an area of 0.940 acre more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be made subject to (a) the condition that the city of Woodward, Okla., pay into the Treasury of the United States, in return for the land conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of such land to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after appraisal of such land, and (b) such other conditions, limitations, or reservations as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF RICE QUOTA MARKETING PROVISIONS

The bill (H. R. 2839) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICE ALLOTMENT HISTORY

The bill (H. R. 4356) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that after the call of the calendar, H. R. 1573 be considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and several other Senators are very much interested in this proposed legislation, but we are not in position to debate it today. I gave Senators assurance that if it were objected to today on the call of the calendar it would be taken up at an early date.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if it is to be passed, it will have to be passed within the next few days in order to relieve the situation of the farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from South Carolina that I shall be glad to talk to him about a convenient date when the measure can be considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Texas.

OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT TIN SMELTERS AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, pursuant to the provisions and authority of Public Law 125, 80th Congress, as amended, the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., shall be continued in operation until June 30, 1956, and so long thereafter as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to have conducted a study and investigation for the purpose of recommending the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States; and, in connection with such study and investigation, the Federal Facilities Corporation, or any other designee of the President, is requested to show the plant and facilities to any interested persons and to provide them with all necessary and appropriate information within the limits of security considerations upon which to base appraisals and to formulate proposals to the Government for the future operation of the smelter by the Government or under private lease or ownership arrangements.

SEC. 3. The President is requested to report to the Congress prior to March 31, 1956, the findings of this study and his recommendations with respect to the future operation of the tin smelter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

I strongly urge passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

This resolution proposes to continue operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., until June 30, 1956, and thereafter as authorized by Congress.

The resolution also requests the executive branch to conduct a study in order to be prepared to present to the Congress recommendations regarding the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States—whether under Government ownership or private ownership.

Unless this resolution is enacted, operation of the tin smelter will end on June 30 of this year. This, I am convinced, would be contrary to our national interests.

The United States is in this position: It is the largest single consumer of tin in the world; it must depend on foreign sources for virtually its entire supply of tin.

There is only one tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere—that is in Texas. There is only one principal source of tin ore in the Western Hemisphere—Bolivia.

These two facts are of great significance, taken in conjunction with each other.

For the sake of our national security; as an aid to maintaining the free economy of the nation of Bolivia; and to lessen the risk of our being subjected to price gouging by those controlling foreign tin supplies, continued operation of the North American tin smelter using South American tin ore is essential.

I urge that the Senate adopt the resolution approved by the Committees on Armed Services and Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the regular call of the calendar. The bill passed to the foot of the calendar will be stated.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

The bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and and stockmen was announced as next in order.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have some remarks to make which are not related to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Michigan if he will withhold his remarks. There are only two more bills remaining on the calendar.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, with reference to Senate bill 1372 there is in course of preparation language which will permit of the imposition of a time limitation with reference to supplementary loans.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the first period and insert a comma, and the following: "but no such loans shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, is further amended by striking the word "two" from the first sentence of said subsection and inserting the word "four" and by adding after the first sentence of the said subsection the following new sentence: "After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection, but no such loans shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 210, Senate bill 1628, to provide relief for farmers and farm workers 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1628) which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand the committee amendments have been agreed to. The bill vests the Secretary of Agriculture with power to proceed in cases of disaster such as are outlined in the bill. There is nothing compulsory on the Secretary. Being wholly a discretionary measure, I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill would provide relief to producers in areas suffering natural disasters by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to allot them additional acreage for the production of commodities subject to production controls. The disaster which gave rise to this bill was the freeze which occurred in many States in late March. Producers, farm workers, and others in these areas will suffer severe hardship if substitute crops cannot be planted. In many cases the planting of substitute crops is prevented by acreage allotments, and this bill would provide a measure of relief in those cases.

The committee amendments, first, make it entirely discretionary with the Secretary as to the amount of relief, if any, to be accorded to any and all producers; and, second, strike out a provision requiring additional allotments to provide all farmers with a livelihood.

The additional acreage allotted under the bill for any crop for any year would be limited to the smaller of first, 500,000 acres or second, 3 percent of the national allotment for such crop.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina if the bill as reported from the committee is agreeable to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All of the amendments have been adopted, and the matter is left discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. It is discretionary, not mandatory. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1628) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment thus caus-

ing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economies of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed, or damaged, the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, may cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be advisable to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate passed Senate bill 1628, Calendar No. 210, a bill to provide relief of 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 oher natural causes. I had filed an objection to the bill, but it was inadvertently overlooked. Therefore, Mr. President, at this time I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know that the objection of the Senator from Delaware to the bill was overlooked, because the able members of the minority calendar committee objected to consideration of the bill when it was called on the calendar. However, at the conclusion of the calendar call, the majority leader asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1628, Calendar No. 210; and it was under that procedure that the bill was passed.

Of course, the Senator from Delaware is perfectly within his rights in submitting the motion to reconsider; but the majority leader hopes that at the conclusion of action tomorrow on the agricultural appropriation bill, it will be agreeable to the authors of Senate bill 1628 and to the distinguished Senator from Delaware to have the Senate proceed to act on his motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. If that is agreeable, I should like to have the RECORD so show at this time, so that Members may be on notice that this question is likely to come up then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is agreeable to me, and I wish to have this understanding, because I understand there is a possibility that the Finance Committee will be in session tomorrow afternoon, in which event, before my motion is taken up, I would wish to be notified. I shall be in the city. If we can be notified in advance, I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Texas in having the motion brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then let the Senate be on notice, first, that the Senator from Texas assumes the responsibility of notifying the Senator from Delaware that consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill will be followed by consideration of his motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed. We hope his motion will be taken up by the Senate late tomorrow afternoon or else on Wednesday, depending on the time the Senate consumes in acting on the agricultural appropriation bill.

If the majority leader had known earlier today that the Senator from Delaware wished to be notified when the Senate proceeded to consider Senate bill 1628, the majority leader would certainly have notified him. But the Senator from Texas knows that the Senator from Delaware does not contend that Senators on this side of the aisle failed to carry out any such agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; but I did not understand that the bill was to be considered today.

Except for any other understanding the majority leader may have, I would be willing to have my motion considered this afternoon. But in view of the understanding which has been had, I am willing to have my motion go over until tomorrow, although I do not wish to agree that consideration of the motion will follow the Senate's action tomorrow on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware may be assured that the Senator from Texas will personally notify him before a motion to take up his motion for reconsideration is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I will notify the Senator from Texas, too.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say that when Senate bill 1628 was passed over, during the call of the calendar, as acting majority leader I discussed the bill with both Senators on the minority calendar committee, who approved having the bill brought up later, following the calendar call; and I also discussed the bill with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I understood from them that there was no objection to the bill, with the amendments which are now in it. That is the reason I did not object when the majority leader asked for the consideration of the bill following the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from Delaware. I think it is a position which was apparently not known to any Member of the Senate when the bill was being considered.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] stated to the majority leader that the bill had been reported unanimously. The minority calendar committee objected to the consideration and passage of the bill on the call of the calendar. The Senate then proceeded to consider it after the call of the calendar had been concluded. Several Senators spoke on the bill. Every Senator had an opportunity to speak. The distinguished Senator from Delaware was occupied in a very important meeting of the Finance Committee and was not aware that the bill was being considered at that time. He is perfectly within his rights to move to reconsider.

All the majority leader wishes to do is to serve notice on the Senator from Delaware and other Members of the Senate that as soon as the unfinished business, namely, the agricultural appropriations bill, is disposed of, it is proposed to proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Texas will assume the responsibility of personally notifying the Senator from Delaware when that is done.

BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senate now to consider Calendar 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That bill has been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has gone over to the next call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider Order 213, H. R. 4647, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of

the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4647) which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments on page 1, line 8, to strike out "five per centum" and insert "2 per centum or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment," and in line 11, after the word "for," to strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (i)."

On page 2, line 4, after the word "acreage", to insert a comma and "and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950–1954 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945–1949 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 per centum shall be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 4647

This bill, with the committee amendments, would make several increases in 1955 rice-acreage allotments. First, it would increase each State allotment by 2 percent. Second, it would provide each State, and each of those counties whose base acreage had risen 2 percent since 1950, with a minimum 1955 allotment, equal to its 1950 allotment. Third, it would increase each State reserve for new producers and new farms to a minimum of 500 acres.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve hardship resulting from the sharp reduction in rice acreage required by the 1955 allotment. In an effort to take care of the various hardships which have arisen in the various rice-growing areas the committee has proposed amendments which incorporate the substance of Senate bills 1061 and 882, which provide respectively for the State and county minimum allotments just described. As shown in the committee report the areas which would benefit from these minimum provisions have increased their acreage devoted to rice production since the base period applicable to 1950, but now would receive sharp cuts below their 1950 allotments because of the expansion of rice production in other areas.

In order to avoid unduly increasing the national rice acreage the committee amendments would also reduce to 2 percent the 5 percent general increase in State allotments provided by the bill as it passed the House.

The provision for increasing the State reserve is of particular significance in South Carolina where the two price producers have established a rice mill. These producers have previous production history in Georgia and Texas but not in South Carolina. Unless they can obtain a reasonable 1955 allotment on a new farm basis they may be forced to move their rice mill to Texas. This would cause difficulties for all rice producers served by the mill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a question. Were the amendments to H. R. 4647, Calendar No. 213, unanimously agreed to by the committee; and was the bill with the amendments as reported by the committee the bill which was passed today?

Mr. ELLENDER. The answer to the Senator's question is in the affirmative.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as I understand, the amendments were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. There was no opposition to this bill being reported.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the unfinished business now the agricultural appropriation bill, Calendar No. 220, House bill 5239?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has been made the unfinished business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What happened to Calendar No. 216, H. R. 4356; Calendar No. 217, S. 153; Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573; and Calendar No. 219, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. By unanimous consent, the bills which have just been passed were called up after having been placed at the foot of the calendar. The minority calendar committee had asked that they go to the foot of the calendar until amendments could be drafted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was detained in the Committee on Foreign Relations and was not aware of the progress which had been made with the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 217, S. 153, and Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, were called but were passed over. Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Were S. 153 and H. R. 1573 placed at the foot of the calendar or were they objected to?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were objected to.

Mr. STENNIS. Since the Senator from Minnesota was not present when those bills were called, I may state that I was the Senator who, through the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], interposed objection to Calendar No. 217, S. 153, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. I shall be glad to discuss that bill with the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Minnesota that Calendar No. 216, H. R. 4356, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history, was passed, and Calendar No. 219, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex., was agreed to.

Calendar No. 217, S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, were passed over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to advise the Senator from Minnesota that I interposed objection to the passage of Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, but that I expect the bill to be considered by the Senate at an early date. The Senate may wish to consider it at this time, but I have objected to its passage on the call of the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I express the hope that before the end of the day, I may be able to have a personal conference with my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in reference to Calendar No. 217, S. 153 and with my good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, to see if action cannot be taken on those bills.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to dash the hopes of such a young and good-looking man as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. But so far I am concerned, I am not prepared to discuss H. R. 1573 today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then it may be necessary to return to a consideration of S. 153, Calendar No. 217.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, has the call of the calendar been completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed.

The unfinished business is Calendar No. 220, H. R. 5239, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before Senators begin to make speeches, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 211, S. 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been speaking with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who had a very legitimate objection to the passage of the bill on the consent calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask the Senator from Vermont if my under-

standing is correct that he is referring to Calendar No. 211, S. 1079?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. I wish to explain that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acted rather hurriedly on the bill and took more out of it than it should have. It is my purpose to restore certain language that should be contained in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar 211, S. 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1079) to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that, if he will offer his amendment, the Senate can now take action on it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have an amendment prepared by the committee counsel. The committee amendment struck out, on line 7, after the word "strip", the following: "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas, when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes."

The last three lines of the bill should remain as they were originally printed. The Secretary of Agriculture would thus be required to make a finding that such lands were suitable for private ownership. The last three lines read: "when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes."

The bill is intended to apply only to little strips of land isolated from the national forests and which, in effect, are a nuisance to administer. The bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of such land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "(1)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand correctly that that is the amendment to the committee amendment which the Senator from Vermont desires to offer?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The bill will then read:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell at not less than the appraised value, and under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, lands in the national forests which are isolated parcels or narrow projecting strips, when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, am I to understand that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is offered in the nature of an amendment to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does it also strike out the "(2)" in line 7?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand, the amendment, as amended, strikes out "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota restate his question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My question is merely this: Does the amendment to the committee amendment strike out the words "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that we may have the question answered properly, the Chair will ask the clerk to restate the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, in lieu of the amendment as offered by the committee, it is proposed to strike out the following: "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That meets the hope I had expressed when the bill was called on the calendar. I hope the bill as now amended will be passed, because it restores the basic language.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont satisfies the objection which the calendar committee had to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. With this amendment, the bill will really be what the committee intended to present. However, this was the last bill taken up at the committee meeting. We were all in a hurry to finish, and we struck out a little more than we intended to eliminate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the leadership to have the Senate remain in session today as long as it is necessary to permit Senators to make speeches.

Tomorrow it is intended to take up the agricultural appropriation bill, which was reported to the Senate on April 21.

If the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill is ready, it is likely that it will be taken up promptly. However, I desire the Senate to be on notice that since the agricultural appropriation bill was reported on April 21, it is intended to have it taken up shortly after the morning hour tomorrow, and to continue with its consideration until it is disposed of, unless the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill should intervene.

CONSERVATION ACREAGE RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recently agreed to designate a subcommittee and to hold hearings on the Conservation Acreage Reserve Act of 1955, S. 1396, of which I am the sponsor, and which is aimed at getting some of our surplus acreage out of grain production and back into grasslands. Because of the growing recognition of need for some such approach, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this measure in advance of such hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD at this point two letters from Ben C. McCabe, one of Minnesota's most experienced leaders in the grain trade, regarding this problem. One of the letters is to Gabriel Hauge, Administrative Assistant to the President, and the other is to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, each calling attention to the problem I have mentioned and urging action along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. President, I also ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD along with these letters the reply sent to Mr. McCabe in behalf of the Department of Agriculture by Marvin L. McClain, Director of the Department's Grain Division, together with a further letter by Mr. McCabe to Mr. McClain.

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

MARCH 28, 1955.

Mr. GABRIEL HAUGE,
Administrative Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAUGE: During the President's first year I had quite a little correspondence with you in reference to the farm program advocated by Secretary Benson. I was quite critical of the Secretary, but I think the thing to do is to let bygones be bygones on that deal and let's look at the present situation.

The change in the farm price support laws has led to a rather chaotic condition in commodity markets reflected in the continual drop in farm commodity prices and consequently farm income while at the same time the prices of the things the farmers buy have held steady or have risen. We, of

course, have not seen the end of this farm squeeze yet.

Under the present law, price supports will continue to decline for the next year or two. I haven't seen anything that would indicate that the Secretary is worried about the situation; but we who live and work out here in the Great Plains area are tremendously worried, not only about the present situation but what probably will develop in the coming months unless the administration takes some prompt constructive steps.

I think it is well to remember that during the world war and later at the time of the Korean crisis, the farmers were asked to produce at a maximum level. Of course, that is when the 90 percent of supports came into the picture, but the need for large crops was met by our increased farm production. Millions of acres of previously unseeded land was plowed up and used in production of agricultural crops. That was a good deal like the opening of Pandora's box. The trouble is now to get these acres back into grassland again.

I think the administration should take prompt action to urge on Congress legislation to accomplish this end.

I want to call your attention to the fact that on February 9 Senator THYE, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated S. 1023 to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities under the authority granted the Secretary under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

On March 10 Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated as S. 1396 to establish a conservation acreage reserve to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources.

Of course, these two bills don't answer all the needs, but I think they provide the basis for at least a start in meeting this tremendous problem which faces us.

Acreage quotas, I am afraid, will not alone fill the bill except as a stopgap measure. They tend to cut down the acreage the farmers can produce crops on until the farmer has a hard job making a living and is inclined to vote against quotas. In that case we would see an extremely sharp drop in farm commodity prices and, consequently, farm income, and I don't believe that that would happen without a severe repercussion on our whole economy.

However, the acreage controls and marketing quotas have been holding the line, but we have done little or nothing to really meet the situation. A large part of the acreage that was put into production during the war years will have to be taken out of production to a large extent. Either the Federal Government will lead the way in constructive action or else we will have the reduction made through farmers going bankrupt because of low prices.

I would plead that you bring this matter to the attention of the President and his advisers and urge that the administration take prompt action leading to the adoption of measures such as sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY and Senator THYE to meet this present emergency. No time should be lost.

Yours very truly,

BEN C. MCCABE.

MARCH 28, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: While I have been a Republican all my life, I was quite critical of your approach to the farm price problem. Certainly the farm price-support law did not solve all the problems by any manner of means. However, it was a vehicle that could have been used to hold up farm income while necessary adjustments were made. Nevertheless, we will have to face the situation as it is today and let bygones be bygones.

It is necessary to remember that during the World War and later at the time of the Korean crisis, our farmers were asked to produce at a maximum level. Millions of acres of land was broken up and seeded to agricultural crops. This was like the opening of Pandora's box. At the end of the emergency it was then necessary to meet the problem of how to get these things back into the box again—in other words, how to get these acres back into grassland again.

Acreage allotments and marketing quotas are in this situation more or less a stop-gap solution. They tend to cut down the acreage the farmers can produce crops on until the farmer has a hard job making a living and is inclined to disregard or to vote against marketing quotas. In that case we would see an extremely sharp drop in farm commodity prices and, naturally, farm income would drop too. I don't believe that that would happen without a very sharp repercussion on our whole economy.

I want to call your attention to the fact that on February 9 Senator THYE, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated as S. 1023 to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities under the authority granted the Secretary under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

On March 10 Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced a bill designated as S. 1396 to establish a conservation acreage reserve to promote conservation and improvement of agricultural soil and water resources.

Now these two bills would not, even if they became law, provide all the answers; but certainly they would be needed and very constructive steps in meeting the present critical situation.

Under the present law, price supports will probably continue to decline for the next year or two in a rather serious proportion and then, if our farmers in desperation do not vote for marketing quotas and support prices drop to 50 percent of parity, we could have a real chaotic condition.

I cannot believe you, as Secretary of Agriculture, or the President can be unaware of the dynamite contained in this situation. If we are going to try to meet this approaching problem, I believe it is absolutely necessary that you and the administration come out vigorously for proper steps to head off a calamity. Either the Federal Government will lead the way in constructive action or else we will have the reduction made through farmers going bankrupt because of low prices.

I hope that the administration will take vigorous steps to urge Congress to adopt proper legislation to meet this situation which is critical now, but may become chaotic in the near future unless prompt action is taken. No time should be lost.

Yours very truly,

BEN C. MCCABE.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BEN C. MCCABE,
The McCabe Co.,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. MCCABE: Thank you for your letter of March 28, addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which you call attention to the serious price and income problems facing agriculture at this time and suggest that, to meet this situation, consideration be given to programs of soil conservation and acreage retirement.

We agree with your view that acreage allotments and marketing quotas are not the best answers to the problems of readjustment facing agriculture at this time, and that the idea of using economic incentives rather than governmental controls to restore a balance between production and markets should be given serious consideration.

Programs providing for the rental of diverted acres, such as you refer to, have been carried out in the past. In the 1933 through 1935 period, rental payments were made to producers who complied with production adjustment contracts under which the Department of Agriculture specified the uses to which the land could be put. These programs proved to be successful in bringing about desired acreage diversion. In 1933, slightly over 10 million acres were diverted, requiring payments of $277 million; in 1934, about 36 million acres were diverted at a cost of $637 million; and in 1935, about 30 million acres were diverted at a cost of $467 million. The total rental and benefit payments for this 3-year period amounted to $1.4 million, which was equivalent to slightly over 18 percent of the total farm income from the commodities for which the programs were in effect.

While, in the light of the experience with past programs, it would seem that the magnitude of rental payments required to balance present and indicated supplies of wheat, cotton, and other crops with market outlets tends to be underestimated, the costs to the taxpayer of carrying under Government ownership large surplus accumulations of these crops is also not generally appreciated. The alternative of withdrawing excess acreage from production to withholding excess production from the market appears to merit careful study, particularly since such a program could be depended upon to make flexible price supports more effective in adjusting production and consumption to each other.

The problem of diverted acreage is becoming one of the most important issues we must deal with promptly and effectively if we are to prevent extension of rigid acreage and marketing controls to the nonbasic commodities—a course of action which would be difficult to reconcile with our administration's endeavor to permit farmers greater freedom in their operations.

You may be assured that the development of programs designed to deal with this problem, the proposals to which you call our attention will be given most careful study and consideration.

Very truly yours,

MARVIN L. MCLAIN,
Director, Grain Division.

APRIL 7, 1955.

Mr. MARVIN L. MCLAIN,
Director, Grain Division, United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Stabilization Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCLAIN: I very much appreciate your letter of April 4 and I am particularly heartened to know that the Department of Agriculture is at this time giving considerable thought toward plans for diversion of land unneeded for production of crops to other uses which, in the main, I expect would be grass, pasture, or summer fallow.

Let me point out first that, in my opinion, the extreme drought in the Southwest is about the only thing that will save our price-support program on wheat this year. If, with the coming of summer, this drought area widens out, it might also rescue the programs on feed grains. But without this calamity, I am afraid we would have been faced with an impossible situation right now. The terrible misfortune of the farmers living in these stricken areas simply gives us a little time to work out a program.

In your letter you particularly comment on rental of diverted acres, such as was carried out in years of the thirties. I don't think we should neglect also consideration of the actual purchasing of surplus acres.

I am in the country grain elevator business. I am fairly well acquainted with the Government purchase of land in McKenzie County in North Dakota south of Williston

and in Prairie County near the town of Terry, Mont. We had elevators at both Terry and at Alexander, N. Dak., which was quite close to the project in McKenzie County. Because of the decrease in the land which would be under cultivation in those areas, we disposed of our elevators. As things turned out, we perhaps would have been better off to have kept our properties, but that is water over the dam.

However, we have other elevators in those areas that have actually benefited from these so-called big pastures. Grain farmers have been able to carry considerable herds of beef cattle. There is no doubt but what this combination has tended to stabilize and improve income.

I don't know how they have worked out from a dollars-and-cents point of view as far as the Government is concerned. I would be very much interested, if you do have the figures.

I believe it is particularly important to consider the purchase of land in the establishment of grazing districts, especially in the marginal territory where perhaps the land never should have been broken up.

Without the calamity in the drought area, I am afraid we would have been in for a very chaotic condition and one that very easily could have led to a sharp decline in our general economic condition. The terrible misfortune of the farmers in the stricken area simply gives us a little more time to attack this problem right at the roots where it must be met.

No time can be lost if we are going to have congressional hearings on legislation and get it passed in this session of Congress. I think it particularly important that such action be taken, not only because I believe it is needed so as to get production nearer in line with demand, but there is considerable evidence of a feeling of despair and helplessness spreading over farm areas. I think the active sponsoring by the administration of legislation to meet this very critical problem would go a long way in changing this farmer attitude.

I hope that the Secretary will use all his influence to prevail upon the administration to take prompt action to sponsor legislation along the lines outlined in my previous letter.

Thanks again for your prompt and enlightening reply.

Yours very truly,

BEN C. MCCABE.

LAND REFORM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a moment ago I requested unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article stressing the importance of individual farm ownership and operation, which was published in Harper's magazine for February of this year. Along with the article, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a communication I have received from the Department of State, concerning the United States Government's position on land-reform measures. The communication came to me at the time of the dismissal of Mr. Ladejinsky, and was sent to me as the result of an inquiry I made of the Department of State as to whether our Government had taken a position with reference to land reform in the underdeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world.

I am glad to report that we do have such a policy, although it has been somewhat of a well-kept secret, I may say. Instead, it might well have been expounded in very great detail.

Mr. President, for many weeks I have been concerned with failure of our Government to attach enough significance to the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, and to give advance thought to planning a constructive policy for following through with our friends at the Conference.

A week in advance of the Conference, I called public attention to the vital importance of land-reform issues among countries which would be participating in the Conference, and I urged our Government to stop hiding under a bushel basket its support for constructive land-reform efforts throughout the world. I urged our Government to speak out and to make known its interest in the aspirations of people in the countries participating in the Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my press statement on that subject may be published at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

GREATER EMPHASIS ON LAND REFORM URGED AS BID TO ASIA, AFRICA

MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1955.—On the eve of the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, the United States should reiterate and emphasize its interest in and support of land reform measures throughout the world, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, declared yesterday.

"We must move from a defensive to an offensive position in relation to this significant conference," Senator HUMPHREY warned.

"In most of the countries to be represented at this important conference, man's relation to the land represents one of the most pressing social and economic problems.

"Nearly half of the world's people will be represented by countries participating in this conference, from which we are excluded.

"If we expect to keep the great majority of these people on the side of freedom in the world as contrasted to domination by Soviet imperialism, it is imperative that we assure them that we recognize and concur in their own aspirations—that our interest lies in their progress, not in their exploitation.

"Let us not make the mistake of letting the Communists seize on the popular objective of land reform as a propaganda weapon at this conference, the weapon they used so effectively in conquering Red China by taking better advantage than we did of the aspirations of underprivileged people who toil on the soil but fail to share reasonably in the economic rewards from the land.

"Instead, let us stress the basic interest of the United States in support of land reform measures in their broadest concept, and take the offensive in turning the Communist's propaganda efforts against the Kremlin.

"If spokesmen for the Kremlin dare to offer the bait of more widespread opportunity for land ownership to the land-hungry peasants of Asia and Africa, let us oppenly challenge the Soviet to apply such land reform principles in their own country and extend to Russians the opportunity to own and farm their own land instead of being compelled to accept a collectivized state agricultural pattern," Senator HUMPHREY said.

"Senator HUMPHREY called attention to the fact that the State Department had recently reiterated its support for basic land reform policies of our government adopted in 1951, and outlined by the United States delegate to the FAO Conference in Rome as 'the United States concept of agrarian reform as a foundation for world peace.'

"Such policies offer a beacon light of hope to many areas of the world today," Senator HUMPHREY declared. "It is not enough to have such policies and pledges in our archives, however. It is time responsible foreign policy spokesmen of our administration gave new emphasis to these commitments, and brought them out publicly before the forum of world opinion as a vital weapon in the ideological battle for the mind of mankind all over the world."

Senator HUMPHREY urged that support for "realistic land reform measures" be made a major part of the United States "peace offensive," so that "we show we are attuned to the needs and desires of people in other lands now struggling for the very goals of our own Declaration of Independence."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Apparently, Mr. President, that statement did not create too much interest in the areas in this country where it should. However, I want the RECORD to show I was correct in my judgment as to the interest it would create among Asian people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a clipping from a New Delhi, India, newspaper, reporting my statement to the people of India.

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

[From the Delhi (India) Statesman of April 11, 1955]

U. S. A. URGED TO CLARIFY ATTITUDE TO LAND REFORM

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY said today that the U. S. A. must reemphasize its support of land reform programs throughout the world.

The Senator declared in a statement that the Eisenhower administration's policy should be made crystal clear as the Asian-African conference was opening in Indonesia soon, and the Communists could be expected to turn land reform into a major propaganda weapon there.

"We must move from a defensive to an offensive position in relation to this significant conference," he stated.

He added: "In most of the countries to be represented at this important conference, man's relation to land represents one of the most pressing social and economic problems.

"Nearly half of the world's people will be represented by countries participating in this conference, from which we are excluded.

"If we expect to keep the great majority of these people on the side of freedom in the world as contrasted to domination by Soviet imperialism, it is imperative that we assure them that we recognize and concur in their own aspirations—that our interest lies in their progress not in their exploitation.

PROPAGANDA WEAPON

"Let us not make the mistake of letting the Communists seize on the popular objective of land reform as a propaganda weapon at this conference, the weapon they used so effectively in conquering China by taking better advantage than we did of the aspirations of underprivileged people who toil on the soil but fail to share reasonably in the economic rewards from the land.

"Instead, let us stress the basic interest of the United States in support of land reform measures in their broadest concept, and take the offensive in turning the Communists' propaganda efforts against the Kremlin.

"If spokesmen for the Kremlin dare to offer the bait of more widespread opportunity for land ownership to the land hungry peasants of Asia and Africa, let us openly challenge Soviet Russia to apply such land reform principles in their own country and extend to Russians the opportunity to own

and farm their own land instead of being compelled to accept a collectivized State agricultural pattern."—Reuter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call attention to this only to emphasize the opportunities I feel our Government is overlooking to bolster the case for democracy by alining ourselves with the natural aspirations of other peoples for the same freedoms and blessings we enjoy.

Instead of taking advantage of such opportunities, however, I regret that our Government's attitude toward the Bandung Conference may be losing us friends, instead of winning friends. I refer to the failure of our Government to send official greetings to the Conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a United Press dispatch which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of Monday, April 18, under the heading "Negro United States Lawmaker Assails American Stupidity on Bandung."

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

NEGRO UNITED STATES LAWMAKER ASSAILS AMERICAN STUPIDITY ON BANDUNG—POWELL SAYS IKE SHOULD HAVE SENT PARLEY GREETINGS

BANDUNG, INDONESIA.—Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of New York, charged today that the United States administration was guilty of sheer stupidity in rejecting his suggestion that President Eisenhower send greetings to the Asian-African conference here.

The Negro congressman, here as an unofficial observer and newspaper reporter, said the American omission "was all the more obvious after Moscow radio broadcast greetings to the conference today."

He said, "I think this is a colossal error and sheer stupidity and further indicates that we have no Far Eastern policy and do not understand what is happening here at all."

He exhibited a cable he said he had just received through the United States Embassy from Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State.

The cable read:

"I have been asked to acknowledge your telegram of April 6 to President Eisenhower in which you suggested that he address a message of goodwill to the Asian-African conference.

"While most grateful for the suggestion, we do not believe the relationship of this Government to the Bandung conference would warrant such a message from the President."

POWELL said the State Department had opposed his attendance at the Bandung conference and "tried to buy me off." He said "the deal was that if I stayed away from Bandung they would send me on one or two pair red-carpet missions anywhere I wanted to go."

When he refused, POWELL said, Morton told him, "Very well, but do us a favor and stay away from the American Embassy."

"I finally managed to see American Ambassador Hugh Cummings this morning, and he told me: 'The State Department decided we should stay away from you so that nobody could say we were trying to influence the conference'."

The Congressman said that "this conference has put us right on the spot. Asia and Africa are riding on, whether we want to come along or not. If we abstain from voting on colonial questions in the United Nations any more, our entire relationship in Asia and Africa is in danger."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to concur in and associate myself with Representative POWELL's keen disappointment at our Government's attitude; and, as one Senator, I wish to assure the people of Asian and African countries who want freedom from either Communist imperialism or colonial domination that there is a large body of American citizens who have a sympathetic understanding of their problems and want to work with them toward social and economic progress and preservation of the individual dignity of all mankind.

Mr. President, while the administration seems reluctant to give much emphasis to land reform, I want the RECORD to show that our State Department has reaffirmed the official position on this subject taken by our Government in 1951.

In reply to my questions about whether these policies had been changed, in relation to the Wolf Ladejinsky case, the State Department informed me that the basic land-reform policy had been reviewed on several occasions, but such reviews had not led to any revisions, and today it remains the basic United States Government guidance for all of our agencies and diplomatic missions abroad. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the State Department appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 18, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Serious consideration has been given to your letter of December 23, 1954, expressing your concern about the implications of the Wolf Ladejinsky case as related to our foreign policy. A survey has been made of the significant policy documents relating to the problem of land reform and the summary set forth below, including the enclosed documents, accurately reflects the major policy developments in this field during the past few years.

In your letter you question whether we have * * * "reversed or otherwise backed down from our Government's statement of position in land reform previously sent to our diplomatic envoys throughout the world." * * * It is assumed in this connection that you refer to the land-reform policy developed during 1951 by the Interagency Committee on Land Reform under the chairmanship of the Department of Agriculture. This policy was fully set forth by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, United States Delegate to the Food and Agriculture Conference, in November 1951. A copy of this statement is enclosed.

This basic land-reform policy has been reviewed on several occasions as problems have arisen in connection with meetings of the Food and Agriculture Organization and sessions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. These subsequent considerations of the problem, however, have not led to any revisions of this policy, and it remains today the basic United States Government guidance for all agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the Foreign Operations Administration, and our diplomatic missions abroad. From time to time certain parts of the basic guidance have been questioned, particularly as to their applicability to certain issues or problems relating to a single country or area, since a policy of this type cannot necessarily be universally applied. However, there has been no change in the basic policy as stated by Representative HOPE, nor is any basic revision in that policy being undertaken.

During the past 2 years there have been several occasions on which United States policy on land reform has been clearly set forth. In November, 1953 the question was on the agenda of the Food and Agriculture Organization conference in Rome. Our instructions to the United States delegation to that meeting were based upon the 1951 policy statement. At that time, the United States delegation (1) reaffirmed the concept of "reform of agrarian structures" of the FAO sixth conference which in turn had reaffirmed the principles of the ECOSOC resolution of 1951, the comprehensive United Nations statement of principles on this subject; (2) urged the FAO to be less hesitant in its approach to specific program activities to implement this resolution; and (3) recommended that the FAO program should be modified by "stressing positive, practical expert help to countries" and mentioned in particular the importance of seminars, training, and direct technical assistance to specific countries.

The seventeenth session of the Economic and Social Council, beginning March 30, 1954, considered a report by the Secretary General on progress in land reform based on replies of governments to a questionnaire on this subject. The instructions for the United States delegation to that meeting were developed and agreed through the United Nations Economic Committee, and interdepartmental committee chaired by State and including the Department of Agriculture and the Foreign Operations Administration. The United States position again stressed the basic interest of the United States in support of land reform measures in their broad concept and reflected no basic revision or change from previous policy. This position was restated most recently at the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, where the resolution on land reform was supported by the United States. The General Assembly resolution and the statement by the Alternate United States Representatives, James P. Nash, are also enclosed.

While there has been no reversal of the basic United States policy on land reform over the past few years, it is only fair to state that less emphasis has been placed upon land reform relative to other policies designed to improve conditions in the underdeveloped countries and to combat subversive Communist influences. This has come about as a result of two developments. First, the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization some time ago completed elaboration of the fundamental principles recommended for guidance to countries undertaking land reform programs. The real work to be done in this field now consists largely of technical guidance through such organizations as the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization, rather than continued general discussions and resolutions. Second, other problems relating to assistance to underdeveloped countries across a broad political, military, and economic front have demanded greater current attention.

A full survey of what has been done to implement our land reform policy during the past few years would involve a considerable effort. I would, however, like to call your attention to several developments in this field aside from those actions taken at meetings of international organizations referred to above. No change in the basic land reform policy was made by Mr. Stassen at the time the Foreign Operations Administration was established and the policy developed in 1951 remains as guidance for the operating programs of that agency. The State Department has furthermore repeatedly expressed

its interest in land reforms as one of the means of countering Communist influence in southeast Asia and of furthering conditions conducive to greater economic stability in that area. We have particularly emphasized the importance of land reform in Free Viet-Nam and have supported steps for instituting such measures.

The United States Government has expressed a willingness to assist Latin American countries which undertake sound land reform programs, but it stops short of open advocacy of such programs because of the extreme political sensitivity of the subject. Most of the assistance which the United States can offer in that area is in the form of technical assistance, which is now under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Operations Administration.

A resolution on agrarian reform was adopted by the Tenth Inter-American Conference at Caracas last spring. In abstaining on the final vote on this resolution, a statement was made clearly indicating that, although the United States favored and supported agrarian reform in its broad and full sense, it could not support the resolution because it was based largely on the narrow concept of land distribution.

The Philippines have an aggressive land reform program under way as the result of legislation which was prepared with the assistance of United States technicians. This program involves the settling of State-owned lands as well as the acquisition of privately owned but underdeveloped lands, with proper compensation, and was a major influence in settling the "Huk" problem.

The Shah of Iran is attempting to start a land tenure adjustment program by the transfer of some of his own lands to the tenants on a longtime payment scheme.

In Italy help was extended during the past several years in passing proper legislation for the acquisition of land not effectively used and distribution by sale on acceptable terms to relatively small farmers who had not previously been able to acquire land.

In Formosa the second and third steps in a land tenure adjustment program are now in operation. The first step was legislation which controlled the share of the crop to be paid by the tenants to a maximum of 37½ percent. This step was in fact similar to legislation in some of the States in the United States. The second step was the distribution of State-owned lands, and the third step is the acquisition of large estates, with proper compensation, and distribution of the land to the land-hungry.

The activities sketched above clearly illustrate the continued interest of our Government in this problem and our efforts to assist other countries to improve their basic economic conditions through adequate land-reform measures. They demonstrate that land tenure adjustments can be carried out in a democratic fashion.

The Department shares your views that well-planned actions in this field are significant and effective methods of combating Communist infiltration and discrediting Communist methods. You may be assured that there is no intention to reverse our policy or to abandon our efforts to encourage sound land-reform programs in the interest of agricultural improvement and economic development. The fact that the Interdepartmental Land Reform Committee has been inactive since the summer of 1953 should in no way be construed as an abandonment of interest in that field. The basic purpose of this Committee was the development of land-reform policy and since no revision of that policy has been requested, there has been no need to reactivate the Committee. Other interdepartmental channels have been used to coordinate the interests of the various agencies on current land-reform problems

I hope this résumé of our policies and actions in the field of land reform, all of which have been developed and coordinated in close cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and other interested agencies, will dispel your concern that there has been any reversal or change in basic United States policy on land reform or the activities in support of that policy.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Repretatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, Mr. WOLVERTON, and Mr. HINSHAW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. PAYNE conferees on the part of the Senate.

POSTAL PAY BILL OF 1955

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955."

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS, COVERAGE, AND EXEMPTIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this act—

(1) "Department" means the Post Office Department established by section 388 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 361), and the postal field service of the Post Office Department;

(2) "postal field service" includes all operations and organization units of the Department, other than the departmental operations and organization units in the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government, and includes postal inspectors assigned to the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government;

(3) "employee," unless the context otherwise indicates, includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, and all other persons employed in the postal field service, regardless of title, other than persons who provide services for the Department on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

(4) "position" means the duties and responsibilities assigned to an employee, other than duties performed on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

(5) "key position" means an existing position, described in section 203 of this act;

(6) "salary level" means the numerical standing in the Postal Field Service Schedule assigned to a position in the postal field service;

(7) "basic salary" means the rate of annual or hourly compensation specified by law, exclusive of overtime, night differential, and longevity compensation;

(8) "basic compensation" means basic salary plus longevity compensation; and

(9) "persons" has the meaning prescribed for such word in section 1 of title 1 of the United States Code.

COVERAGE

SEC. 102. This act applies to all positions and employees in the postal field service.

TITLE II—RANKING OF POSITIONS

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. (a) The Postmaster General shall determine the personnel requirements of the postal field service, and fix the number of supervisors and other employees in such service, except that not more than one assistant postmaster may be employed at any post office. He shall define the various positions other than the key positions specified in section 203 of this act and the standard positions of postmaster in a fourth-class office and rural carrier. He shall assign each such position to its appropriate salary level in the Postal Field Service Schedule. He shall ascertain the appropriate salary level of a position (1) by comparing the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the position with the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of key positions described in section 203 of this act, and (2) by ranking the position in relation to the key position most closely comparable in terms of the level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements.

(b) In ranking positions, the Postmaster General shall apply the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and give effect to substantial differences in difficulty of the work to be performed, in the degree of responsibility to be exercised, in the scope and variety of tasks involved, and in the conditions of performance.

(c) The Postmaster General's determinations under this section shall be the basis for the payment of compensation and for personnel transactions.

APPEALS

SEC. 202. Any employee, either individually or together with one or more other employees with a similar grievance, may appeal at any time, in person or through his representative specifically designated for that purpose, to the United States Civil Service Commission to review (1) if such employee is in a position other than a key position described in section 203 of this act, any action taken by the Postmaster General under section 201 of this act, in order to determine whether his position has been placed in its appropriate salary level in accordance with such section, and (2) if such employee is in a key position described in section 203 of this act, any administrative action taken or determination made under this act, in connection with such employee, in order to determine whether such employee has been placed correctly in a key position on the basis of and in accordance with the descriptions of key positions and the assignments of such

positions to salary levels specified in section 203 of this act. The Commission shall act upon such appeal at the earliest practicable time, and its decision on such appeal shall be certified forthwith to the Postmaster General who shall take action in acordance with such certificate.

KEY POSITIONS

SEC. 203. Key positions in the postal field service consisting of standard, related tasks commonly performed in that service are described and assigned to salary levels in the Postal Field Service Schedule, as follows:

(1) Position: Janitor—Level 1.

Basic function: Cleans, sweeps, and removes trash from work areas, lobbies, and washrooms.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Sweeps and scrubs floors and stairs, dusts furniture and fixtures, cleans washrooms, and washes windows (except exterior glass in high buildings).

(B) Moves furniture and helps erect equipment and fixtures within offices of the building.

(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Cleans ice and snow from the sidewalks and driveways, and tends the lawn, shrubbery, and premises of the post office.

(ii) Washes walls and ceilings.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(2) Position: Elevator operator—level 2.

Basic function: Operates a freight or passenger elevator.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Operates elevator.

(B) Cleans cab of elevator and polishes metal fittings.

(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Pushes handcarts of mail on and off elevator or assists in loading or unloading material carried on elevator.

(ii) Tends the heating plant or performs cleaning duties in the vicinity of the elevator.

Organizational relationships: Reports to an elevator starter or other designated supervisor.

(3) Position: Order filler—level 2.

Basic function: Selects, assembles, and makes ready for shipment items requisitioned by postal field establishments.

Duties and responsibilities:

Is assigned any of the following duties:

(A) Separates sheets of the requisition form, fastens copies to clipboards and places on appropriate conveyor line.

(B) Clarifies writing on carbon copies of requisitions in order to minimize errors in filling requisitions.

(C) Sets up and prepares shipping containers.

(D) Places in cartons on conveyor lines the quantities of items requisitioned from an assigned station, indicating action taken opposite each item.

(E) Fills and labels bulk shipping orders and moves bulk material to dispatch area.

(F) Replenishes from stock items stored in individual stations and keeps stations neat and orderly to facilitate filling of requisitions.

(G) Transports bulk and individual shipments on hand trucks.

(H) Assembles materials for each requisition where conveyor lines converge.

(I) Places cartons on assembly table for coordination and packing.

(J) Checks requisition copies and items to assure that proper action has been taken.

(K) Directs items not requiring packing to dispatch area.

(L) Combines shipments to reduce packing.

(M) Transmits bulk slips and shipping labels to the appropriate person.

(N) Labels bulk and individual packages with printed labels to avoid hand labeling.

(O) Prepares labels by use of appropriate rubber stamps.

(P) Seals cartons with stapling machine or tape.

(Q) Packs supplies for shipment.

(R) Stacks and trucks completed orders.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(4) Position: Clerk. Third-class post office—level 2.

Basic function: Sorts incoming and dispatches outgoing mail for a small number of points of separation and destination; provides a limited number of services at public windows.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Sorts incoming mail for general delivery, lock boxes, and one or more delivery routes.

(B) Postmarks, and prepares mail for dispatch by train or other mail route; closes, locks, and affixes labels to pouches and mail sacks.

(C) Performs services at a public window, such as selling stamps, stamped envelopes, or other routine functions.

(D) As the needs of the service require, may perform other related duties incidental to the operation of the post office.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster.

(5) Position: Guard—Level 3.

Basic function: Makes rounds of the post-office building, and punches clocks at designated stations.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Patrols buildings, punching watchman's clock where furnished, checking door and window locks, noting and reporting fire hazards and other irregularities, such as running water and unclosed doors and windows.

(B) Sounds fire alarm.

(C) Preserves order in corridors and, when necessary, detains persons for interrogation by post-office inspectors or local police.

(D) In addition may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Gives directions to the public in building lobby.

(ii) Raises and lowers the flag.

(iii) Retrieves lost and found articles and delivers them to the appropriate place.

(iv) Obtains names of victims, doctors, police, and witnesses in the event of accident.

(v) Guards property entrances and prevents damage to property by the public.

(vi) Tends the heating plant of the building.

(vii) Operates elevators on a relief basis.

(viii) Does incidental cleaning and laboring work.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a lieutenant of the guard, a building superintendent, or other designated supervisor.

(6) Position: File clerk—Level 3.

Basic function: Sets up and maintains files on one or more subject matters.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Prepares new file folders and maintains existing folders in correct order as prescribed in the established filing system.

(B) Transmits folders or information contained therein to authorized personnel (for example, forwards personnel folders to requesting supervisors, or copies data from folders to satisfy requests).

(C) Opens, sorts, and searches file material, and maintains files in up-to-date condition.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Types from rough draft or plain copy.

(ii) Answers telephones.

(iii) Prepares requisitions for supplies.

(iv) Operates a mimeograph machine.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

(7) Position: Typist—Level 3.

Basic function: Types material such as forms, correspondence, and stencils from rough draft or plain copy; performs general office clerical work.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) In accordance with instructions and information furnished by supervisor, types forms, standard reports, and documents such as invitations to bid, orders, contracts, invoices, personnel actions, and related materials.

(B) Types correspondence and memoranda from rough drafts or general information.

(C) Cuts stencils for instructions, circulars, and other general uses.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Transcribes from a dictating machine.

(ii) Operates a mimeograph machine.

(iii) Files, checks, requisitions, prepares vouchers, and answers the telephone.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

(8) Position: Mail handler—Level 3.

Basic function: Loads, unloads, and moves bulk mail, and performs other duties incidental to the movement and processing of mail.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Unloads mail received by trucks. Separates all mail received by trucks and conveyors for subsequent dispatch to other conveying units, and separates and delivers working mails for delivery to distribution areas.

(B) Places empty sacks or pouches on racks, labels them where labels are prearranged or racks are plainly marked, dumps mail from sacks, cuts ties, faces letter mail, carries mail to distributors for processing, places processed mail into sacks, removes filled sacks and pouches from racks, closes and locks same. Picks up sacks, pouches, and outside pieces, separates outgoing bulk mails for dispatch and loads mail onto trucks.

(C) Handles and sacks empty equipment, inspects empty equipment for mail content, restrings sacks.

(D) Cancels stamps on parcel post, operates canceling machines, carries mail from machine to distribution cases.

(E) Assists in supply and slip rooms and operates addressograph mimeograph, and similar machines.

(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Acts as armed guard for valuable registry shipments and as watchman and guard around post office building.

(ii) Makes simple distribution of parcel post mail requiring no scheme knowledge.

(iii) Operates electric fork-lift trucks.

(iv) Rewraps soiled or broken parcels.

(v) Performs other miscellaneous duties, such as stamping tickets, weighing incoming sacks, cleaning and sweeping in workrooms, offices, and trucks where such work is not performed by regular cleaners.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(9) Position: Garageman—Level 3.

Basic function: Performs a variety of routine services incidental to the proper maintenance of motor vehicles.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Lubricates trucks in accordance with lubrication charts and type of truck.

(B) Changes crankcase oil and filter cleaners and cleans case in conformance with instructions and vehicle mileage.

(C) Changes tires and makes necessary repairs.

(D) Washes and steam-cleans trucks.

(E) Assists automotive mechanics.

(F) Fuels and oils trucks.

(G) Cleans garage, garage office, swing room, and washroom, as assigned.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

(10) Position: Special delivery messenger—Level 4.

Basic function: Is responsible for delivering, on foot or by vehicle, special delivery

letter mail and parcels to city patrons. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Receives special delivery mail for delivery and signs c. o. d. and registered items at post office before beginning route.

(B) Delivers on foot and by vehicle special deliery mail to patrons; obtains signatures when required; collects amounts and fees on c. o. d.'s; in case of absent patrons, exercises judgment in determining whether to leave mail or leave notice and return mail to post office.

(C) Returns receipts and moneys collected to authorized personnel at post office.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Faces and cancels mail and makes routine distribution of incoming and outgoing mail.

(ii) Delivers and collects mail other than that requiring special delivery handling.

(iii) Loads and unloads or carries bulk mail and parcels.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(11) Position: Motor vehicle operator—Lever 5.

Basic function: Operates a mail truck on a regularly scheduled route to pick up and transport mail in bulk.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Picks up and delivers bulk quantities of mail at stations, branch offices, and terminal points; as required, picks up mail from collection boxes and deposits mail in relay boxes.

(B) Operates truck in conformity with time schedules and rules of safety, and in accordance with instructions regarding the route for which responsible.

(C) Ascertains the condition of the truck prior to leaving and upon returning to the garage; reports all accidents, mechanical defects noted, and mechanical failures while on route.

(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Drives a tractor and semitrailer on occasion, unloading bagged mail and packages at post offices and picking up mail for delivery to a central point.

(ii) Prepares daily trip reports showing work performed.

(iii) Makes minor mechanical repairs to truck in emergencies while on route.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a superintendent of motor vehicles or other designated supervisor.

(12) Position: City carrier—Level 5.

Basic function: Is responsible for the prompt and efficient delivery and collection of mail on foot or by vehicle under varying conditions in a prescribed area within a city. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with route patrons and others, requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used, and with the geography of the city.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Routes or cases all classes of mail in sequence of delivery along an established route. Rearranges and relabels cases as required by route adjustments and changes in deliveries.

(B) Withdraws mail from the distribution case and prepares it in sequence for efficient delivery by himself or a substitute along an established route. Prepares and separates all classes of mail to be carried by truck to relay boxes along route for subsequent delivery.

(C) Enters change of address orders in change of address book and on appropriate form. Readdresses mail to be forwarded and marks for appropriate handling other mail addressed to route patrons who have moved. Sorts such mail into throw-back case for convenient handling by clerks.

(D) Delivers mail along a prescribed route, on a regular schedule, picking up additional mail from relay boxes. Collects mail from street letter boxes and accepts letters for mailing from patrons. Such service may be rendered on foot or by vehicle and in some instances may consist exclusively of parcel post delivery or collection of mail.

(E) Delivers and collects charges on customs, postage-due, and c. o. d. mail matter. Delivers and obtains receipts for registered and certain insured mail. Receipts for such matter, except insured mail, at the post office before beginning route and accounts for it upon return by payments of the amounts collected and delivery of receipts taken.

(F) Deposits mail collected in the post office upon return from route; faces such mail for stamp cancellation.

(G) Checks, and corrects if necessary, mailing cards presented by advertisers bearing names and addresses of patrons or former patrons of the route.

(H) Furnishes patrons with postal information when requested, and provides change of address cards and other postal forms as requested.

(I) Reports to supervisor all unusual incidents or conditions relating to mail delivery, including condition of street letter boxes and time cards.

(J) Regular city carriers assigned to foot delivery routes are required to become proficient in the casing of mail on at least one other foot delivery route.

(K) Substitute city carriers may be assigned to perform clerical duties and may be required to pass examinations on schemes of city primary distribution.

(L) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Checks hotels and other such establishments to insure that mail for residents undeliverable as addressed is not improperly held.

(ii) Delivers stamps or other paper supplies to contract or classified stations.

(iii) Serves at carriers' delivery window.

(iv) Receives and registers, where practical, all letters and packages of first-class matter properly offered for registration and gives receipt therefor.

(v) Makes delivery on other routes as assigned.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster or assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

(13) Position: Distribution clerk—Level 5.

Basic function: Separates mail in a post office, terminal, airmail field, or other postal facility in accordance with established schemes, including incoming or outgoing mail or both.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of incoming mail by delivery point (for example, classified or contract station or branch or other delivery unit, general delivery, lockboxes, rural or star route, or city carrier route) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme established for that office.

(B) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of outgoing mail for dispatch (for example, by city, State, region, train, highway or railway post office, or airmail flight) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme prescribed by the Postal Transportation Service.

(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Maintains records of mails.

(ii) Examines balances in advance deposit accounts.

(iii) Faces and cancels mail.

(iv) Ties mail and inserts facing slips.

(v) Opens and dumps pouches and sacks.

(vi) Operates cancelling machines.

(vii) Records and bills mail (for example, c. o. d., registered, and so forth) requiring special service.

(viii) Renders service at public windows.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(14) Position: Window clerk—Level 5.

Basic function: Performs a variety of services at a public window of a post office or post office branch or station. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons and others requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) As a regular assignment, performs any of the following duties:

(i) Sells postage stamps, stamped paper, cards, internal revenue stamps, migratory bird stamps, and postal savings stamps and certificates.

(ii) Accepts from and, after proper identification, delivers to patrons parcel post, insured, c. o. d., and registered mail; makes collection of required postage, issues necessary receipts, and issues general delivery mail to patrons.

(iii) Verifies second-, third-, and fourth-class mailings, computing and maintaining on a current basis mailers' credit balances.

(iv) Assigns special delivery and registered mail for delivery.

(v) Checks and sets post office stamp-vending machines, postage meters, and large mailers' stamp permit meters.

(vi) Receives, follows up, and recommends action on patrons' claims and complaints.

(vii) Issues and cashes foreign and domestic money orders and postal savings certificates.

(viii) Rents post office boxes, receives rental payments, conducts reference checks, and completes related forms.

(ix) Provides information to the public concerning postal regulations, mailing restrictions, rates, and other matters involving postal transactions.

(B) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Makes emergency calls on patrons to adjust service complaints.

(ii) Makes emergency carrier relays.

(iii) Assists in alien registration and census matters.

(iv) Separates and distributes mail.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

(15) Position: Automotive mechanic—Level 6.

Basic function: Repairs mail trucks, including the removal and installation of complete motors, clutches, transmissions, and other major component parts.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Diagnoses mechanical and operating difficulties of vehicles, repairing defects, replacing worn or broken parts.

(B) Adjusts and tunes up engines, cleaning fuel pumps, carburetors, and radiators; regulates timing, and makes other necessary adjustments to maintain in proper operating condition trucks that are in service.

(C) Repairs or replaces automotive electrical equipment such as generators, starters, ignition systems, distributors, and wiring; installs and sets new spark plugs.

(D) Conducts road tests of vehicles after repairs, noting performance of engine, clutch, transmission, brakes, and other parts.

(E) Operates standard types of modern garage testing equipment.

(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Removes, disassembles, reassembles, and installs entire engines.

(ii) Overhauls transmission, rear end assemblies, and braking systems.

(iii) Straightens frames and axles, welding broken parts where required.

(iv) Makes road calls to make emergency repairs.

(v) Makes required truck inspections.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

(16) Position: Transfer clerk—Level 6.

Basic function: Arranges for transfer of mail at junction points between trains and other mail units and observes the separation, loading, and unloading of mail by railroad employees to make certain that this is done properly.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Provides for the most expeditious transfer of mail from observations of the operation of trains, star route, or mail messenger vehicles, Government-owned vehicles, and platform vehicles.

(B) Examines outgoing and incoming cars to determine maximum utilization of space and proper adherence to railroad safety requirements; reports findings, when necessary, to the district superintendent.

(C) Decides whether outbound cars in full authorizations should be held beyond the first available dispatches in order to obtain fuller loading and maximum utilization of the space paid for, making certain that this will not unduly delay the arrival of the mail at destination.

(D) Studies the routing and loading of mail dispatched from his station in storage cars in order to recommend changes which would bring about economies in line haul and terminal charges and effect earlier arrival. Gives similar attention to incoming mail to assure that dispatching divisions are using best routing and loading methods; reports facts to the district superintendent.

(E) Maintains close liaison with foremen of appropriate incoming and outgoing trains and vehicles to assure prompt receipt and expeditious dispatch of mail.

(F) Keeps informed on local holding orders for each outgoing dispatch and requests that departure of unit within these limitations be withheld when scheduled connections are delayed.

(G) Prepares list of railroad cars (except railway post office cars) in which mail is loaded and maintains record of mail loaded and unloaded in outgoing and incoming trains. Serves notice on railroad company to cancel operation and purchases lesser storage unit in its place when necessary. Prepares official diagram and appropriately labels outgoing cars to indicate destination or next relay point.

(H) Inspects the loading and unloading of storage mail to secure individual piece count of lesser storage units (30 feet and less); estimates volume when more than 30 feet.

(I) Observes and reports to designated supervisor any failure of the railroad company to afford protection for the mail.

(J) Qualifies periodically through examination on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train connections.

(K) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Receipts for, transfers, and delivers registered mail between trains or between train and post office.

(ii) Distributes mail prescribed for distribution in transfer office.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

(17) Position: Distribution clerk, R. P. O. or H. P. O.—Level 6.

Basic function: Distributes mail in railway or highway post office prior to departure and while en route.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Determines the fastest or most expeditious dispatch of mail from the standpoint of assignment. In emergencies, such as floods, storms, wrecks, strikes, and missed connections, redistributes the mail so as to reach destination by the most expeditious alternative means, for example, by other railway post office or highway post office, airmail route, or star route.

(B) Distributes mail rapidly into letter case or pouches and sacks.

(C) Hangs pouches and sacks in racks and places labels in holders provided: labels letter cases in accordance with official diagram.

(D) Prepares mail for dispatch, involving labeling and tying of letter mail in packages for distribution in pouches, closing and locking sacks and pouches, and maintenance of proper separations for connections en route.

(E) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Receives and dispatches mail en route.

(ii) Unloads mail and equipment at terminal of run.

(iii) Examines car to ascertain that no mail is left.

(iv) Convoys registered mail to post office and connecting lines.

(F) Qualifies through examination periodically on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train schedules.

Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman in charge of the railway post office car or highway post office.

(18) Position: Claims clerk, paying office—Level 6.

Basic function: Examines claims for loss or damage of insured or c. o. d. mail matter and determines and approves for payment the amount found to be due under postal regulations.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Receives and reviews prescribed claim papers to ascertain whether:

(i) All necessary items of the appropriate claim form have been properly completed.

(ii) Proof of value has been properly determined.

(iii) Appropriate check has been made of applicable records.

(iv) Other necessary information has been supplied.

(B) Determines whether amount of claim exceeds amount of loss and the proper amount payable is within the limits of the indemnity.

(C) Conducts necessary correspondence in connection with the claim.

(D) Approves amount to be paid, and directs disposition of damaged articles.

(E) Maintains prescribed record of claims.

Organizational relationships: Reports to an assistant postmaster or other designated supervisor.

(19) Position: Postmaster, small third-class office—Level 6.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a small third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window service, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has no employees other than the postmaster and a replacement to serve during his leave; has annual receipts of approximately $1,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Conducts the activities of the office in such manner as to provide prompt and efficient postal service to the patrons of the office.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

(D) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

(E) Prepares and submits estimates of operating allowances as required.

(F) Makes deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills.

(G) Maintains required office records; prepares and submits necessary reports in accordance with instructions.

(H) Maintains files for the office.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(20) Position: Claims clerk, common and contract carriers—Level 7.

Basic function: Audits carriers' claims for the transportation of mail to insure their accuracy and correctness of form prior to certifying them for payment.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Checks original or draft of claims submitted by carriers using space procurement data, records of air carrier flights and weight allocations, reports of railroad space utilization, emergency space procured, and other pertinent reports and data submitted by the districts.

(B) Corrects errors in drafts of claims and returns them to the carrier for resubmission in final corrected form.

(C) Expedites the processing of claim by continuous coordination with the carriers to minimize the incidence of error on claims submitted.

(D) Rechecks resubmitted claim prior to certifying them for payment.

(E) Maintain records pertinent to carrier claims such as unscheduled air carrier flights, weight allocations for mail on flights of air carriers, and airline flight schedules.

(F) Accumulates data and prepares periodic and special reports on subjects related to the purchase and use of railroad space, and air carrier weight allocation.

Organizational relationships: Reports to the supervisor in charge of the fiscal section in a Postal Transportation Service division office or other designated supervisor.

(21) Position: Postmaster, third-class office—Level 7.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has one part-time clerical employee; has annual receipts of approximately $4,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Supervises and conducts the activities of the office in order to provide prompt and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations.

(D) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

(E) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

(F) Makes required deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills, and makes salary disbursements.

(G) Prepares and submits annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances as required.

(H) Maintains required office records; prepares and submit necessary reports in the accordance with instructions.

(I) Maintains files for the office.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(22) Position: Foreman, mails—Level 8.

Basic function: Supervises a group of employees engaged in carrying out assigned tasks connected with the processing of incoming or outgoing mail.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Lays out work for employees; insures attendance to duties and proper performance

of assignments; shifts employees from one assignment to another to meet fluctuations in workload; answers questions respecting work progress.

(B) Trains new employees and provides continuous on-the-job training for all employees under his supervision.

(C) Reports unusual difficulties to a general foreman and suggests solutions. Personally resolves problems of a routine nature.

(D) Keeps required records for such matters as time, mail on hand, and mail processed.

(E) Recommends personnel actions respecting subordinates; maintains morale among the employees in the group; adjusts complaints; supplies leadership necessary to secure maximum interest and effort from men and promotes cooperation and harmony.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a general foreman or other designated superior. Supervises approximately 20 or more employees.

(23) Position: Postmaster, third-class office—Level 8.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has two clerical employees and annual receipts of approximately $6,000, and rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Supervises the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees and is responsible for the administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window services; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mail; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local banks; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks of employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries and schedules of disbursement.

(I) Maintains all files for the office.

Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(24) General foreman: R. P. O.—Level 9.

Basic function.—Directs mail service operations in a railway post office train with two or more authorized cars. Supervises a crew foremen and clerks whose primary function is the distribution and exchange of mails en route.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Provides for the proper distribution, exchange, and dispatch of mails regularly assigned for handling in the railway post office cars. Makes decisions concerning the most expeditious dispatch, rerouting and utilization of alternative connections involving irregularly received mail and also in emergency situations.

(B) Directs mail service operations in the railway post office train including:

(i) Rapid distribution of all classes of mail in accordance with official diagrams and via most advantageous routing.

(ii) Handling, recording, and protection of registered mails.

(iii) Makeup and exchange of mail at intermediate and terminal offices.

(iv) Proper utilization of space in each railway post office car with relation to other storage space in train and, except as charged to transfer clerks, for proper handling of all storage mail in train.

(v) Loading and unloading of railway post office cars to assure maximum use of available storage space without additional cost.

(vi) Proper usage of mail equipment and supplies.

(vii) Maintenance of distrbution schemes and schedules of mail routes in corrected condition.

(C) Supervises the activities of foremen and clerks in the cars and reassigns them to various duties as may be required to complete maximum distribution. Instructs clerks on proper practices and procedures and reports failures to meet operating standards to the district superintendent.

(D) Inspects condition of railway post office cars and reports to the railroad company unsatisfactory situations.

(E) Completes trip reports form covering service operations, including particulars of train operation, roster of clerks on duty, mails received, worked and dispatched, and mails not worked; prepares a list of all cars on train in which mail is carried, a record of the mail, and a report of any irregularities in service. Observes and reports to district superintendent any failure of the railroad company to afford protection to the mail.

(F) May personally distribute letter mail for one or more States, and maintain record of pouches received and dispatched.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through one or more subordinate foremen, clerks assigned to the run.

(25) Position: Assistant postmaster, small first-class post office—level 9.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, providing general direction and supervision over mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 16 employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and 8 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate employees in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(26) Position: Postmaster, second-class office—level 9.

Basic functions: Is responsible for all operations of a second-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has approximately six employees, annual receipts of approximately $16,000, and has rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Supervises and coordinates the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; is responsible for the administration of the efficiency apprasial system.

(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window service; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mails; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local banks; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks for employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries, and schedules of disbursement.

(I) Maintains all files for the office.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(27) Position: General foreman, mails—Level 10.

Basic function: Directs foremen in the distribution of all or part of incoming mails, outgoing mails, or both, at a first-class post office.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Lays out work for foremen at the beginning of a tour and issues instructions.

(B) Oversees work in progress to prevent accumulation of mail.

(C) Insures that mail is distributed in accordance with established orders and instructions.

(D) Shifts men from one foreman to another to keep mails moving.

(E) Reports difficulties and suggests corrective measures to superior.

(F) Maintains required records.

(G) Assures that adequate on-the-job training is carried out to promote employee proficiency.

(H) Reviews and forwards recommendations of foremen respecting discipline, promotions, or changes in assignments; approves time and leave requests; submits manpower estimates.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent or assistant superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through approximately four foremen, employees as assigned.

(28) Position: Postmaster, small first-class office—Level 10.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 16 employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and city delivery service consisting of 8 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(29) Position: Building superintendent—Level 11.

Basic function: Directs the janitorial, maintenance, and operating services of a large post office building and branches and stations covering an aggregate area of approximately 700,000 square feet, including security, heating and ventilating, mechanical and electrical equipment, and elevator services.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Plans and prepares work schedules and supervises the custodial forces in cleaning, heating, guarding, operating, and repairing the post office building and equipment.

(B) Makes frequent inspections to determine maintenance needs of the building and equipment, and to determine the efficiency of the janitorial and maintenance force.

(C) Prepares and answers correspondence relating to custodial service.

(D) Plans and supervises maintenance or alteration work under contract.

(E) Supervises the office force in the preparation of vouchers, requisitions, and reports incidental to custodial service, and in the maintenance of required accounts and records.

(F) Recommends transfers, promotions, and disciplinary measures for custodial personnel.

(G) Inspects mechanical equipment to determine repair needs and adherence to standards of preventive maintenance.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster or other designated superior. Directs, through a general foreman of laborers and a chief engineer, approximately 100 employees, including electricians and other skilled trades.

(30) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 11.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 27 employees, annual receipts of $129,000, and 11 city delivery and rural carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; and is responsible for the proper administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(31) Position: Tour superintendent, incoming or outgoing mails—Level 12.

Basic function: Directs general foremen in the distribution of incoming mails or outgoing mails on a tour at a large first-class post office.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Provides for the prompt and complete operation of a tour activity, such as incoming mails, outgoing mails, or all first- and third-class outgoing mails.

(B) Reassigns employees as necessary to meet peak-load demands; provides direction to subordinate foremen, coordinating the portions of work assigned to them.

(C) Answers questions of subordinate foremen regarding operating problems; refers policy questions to his superior with appropriate recommendations.

(D) Reviews requests for personnel actions by subordinate foremen, recommending final action to superior.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower required, consolidating for recommendation to superior.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to an assistant superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through general foremen, employees assigned to the tour.

(32) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 12.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 53 employees, annual receipts of $314,000, 6 Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and 25 city and rural delivery routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the efficiency appraisal system.

(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

(G) Prepares numerous reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

(H) Advertises for bids for various services including contact stations, vehicular service, mail-messenger service, and vehicular-maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(33) Position: Postal inspector—Level 13.

Basic function: Is responsible in an assigned territory, usually including all classes of post offices, for inspection and investigative programs covering all phases of the postal service. In heavily populated areas may be assigned a majority of the time to selected types of work as determined by the inspector in charge.

Duties and responsibilities, assigned territory.

(A) Inspects post offices and related postal units to insure compliance with postal laws and regulations, protection and proper expenditure of postal revenues and appropriated funds, and evaluates and reports to administrative officials on operational efficiency.

(B) Maintains close working relationship with regional officials and submits to them

factual information and recommendations on conditions and needs of the postal service; acts as counselor to postmasters and other postal officials and employees in explaining instructions, regulations, applicable laws and decisions.

(C) Investigates violations of postal laws, including, but not limited to, armed robbery, mailing of bombs, burglary, theft of mail, embezzlements, obscene literature and pictures, and mail fraud.

(D) Determines the validity and seriousness of charges against postmasters and other officers and employees and makes pertinent recommendations.

(E) Investigates local and area operating problems and recommends corrective action, and within his prescribed jurisdiction, initiates necessary corrective action, including restoration of service immediately in disaster areas caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other catastrophes.

(F) Maintains liaison activities (i) with military installations to insure adequate postal service for the military forces; (ii) with Federal and State civil defense authorities at the area level; (iii) with branches of Federal and State law enforcement agencies.

(G) Ascertains postal needs for post offices and stations, rural and city delivery, changes in schedules, quarters, equipment, manpower, and procedures and reports findings and recommendations to appropriate officials.

Selected cases:

(H) Investigates the loss, theft, destruction, and damage to mail matter through technical analyses of complaints and other specialized procedures.

(I) Investigates money-order forgeries; investigates complaints of use of the mails to defraud and to operate lotteries.

(J) Investigates personal injuries, motor vehicle and other accidents; develops evidence for defense of suits under the so-called Federal Tort Claims Act; recommends out-of-court settlements.

(K) In any criminal investigation, develops evidence, locates witnesses and suspects, apprehends and effects arrests of postal offenders, presents facts to United States attorney, and collaborates as required with Federal and State prosecutors in presentation before United States commissioner, grand jury, and trial court.

(L) Surveys postal service on an area basis to ascertain and recommend ways of improving service and effecting economies.

(M) Makes investigations of a variety of other matters and performs related duties as assigned.

Organizational relationships: Responsible to the inspector-in-charge or the assistant inspector-in-charge of the division. Supervises trainees and other inspectors as assigned.

(34) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 13.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services. This office has approximately 72 employees, annual receipts of $797,000, 6 Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and 17 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(35) Position: Station superintendent, large classified station—Level 14.

Basic function: Directs the operations of a large classified station, including the distribution, delivery, and dispatch of mail and all required window services to the public.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Plans and supervises the distribution of incoming and outgoing mails, the delivery service, including special delivery, and the dispatch of outgoing mail.

(B) Supervises services to the public at windows, including sales of stamps and stamped paper, money orders, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, registry and insurance of mail; handling of c. o. d. items; general delivery and box mail.

(C) Supervises city and rural carriers and determines that delivery schedules are maintained; consults in the adjustment and establishment of routes to reflect changes in volume, patronage, or population; and recommends establishment or changes in location of collection boxes.

(D) Directs and maintains required records for personnel of station, verifies and approves timecards for payroll purposes; makes manpower estimates and reports; trains new supervisors and employees in various aspects of station operations.

(E) Requisitions supplies and equipment, stamps, stamped paper, and accountable forms from main post office, reissuing to subordinates as required. Is responsible for entire fixed credit of station and for operation within the allowance granted.

(F) Maintains effective relations with large matters and the public; simplifies handling of mail, and takes appropriate action to meet complaints.

(G) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

(i) Supervises the cleaning and custodial maintenance of the station building.

(ii) Makes necessary arrangements for special services such as alien registrations, special census reports, or handling of special purpose mailing.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through subordinate supervisors, approximately one thousand or more employees.

(36) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. The office has approximately 450 employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, fifty Government-owned vehicle units, one classified station or branch, and 130 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(37) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including the direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 180 employees, annual receipts of $1 million, 21 Government-owned vehicle units, 3 classified stations, and 65 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by the departmental and civil service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

(38) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on

internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 1,200 employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, 117 Government-owned vehicle units, 16 classified stations and branches, and 290 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationship with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(39) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 450 employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, 50 Government-owned vehicle units, 1 classified station or branch, and 130 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil-service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(40) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 3,200 employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, 200 Government-owned vehicle units, 34 classified stations and branches, and 1,000 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous-audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assigiments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(41) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 700 employees, annual receipts of $4,470,000, 77 Government-owned vehicle units, 8 classified stations and branches, and 200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(42) Position: General superintendent, PTS Division—Level 17.

Basic function: Directs all activities of a division of the Postal Transportation Service of average size and complexity in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, or in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail-handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the Division.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail handling and transportation, schedules, security of mail in transit, and rates.

(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units, such as transfer offices, airmail fields, terminals, railway post office lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers, such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, trucklines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, up to 3,300 employees.

(43) Position: Assistant postmaster, large first-class office—Level 17.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 8,000 employees, annual receipts of $48 million, 400 Government-owned vehicle units, 50 classified stations and branches, and 1,400 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally overseas the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(e) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(44) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 17.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 1,200 employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, 117 Government-owned vehicle units, 16 classified stations and branches, and 290 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(45) Position: General superintendent, largest PTS division: Level 18.

Basic function: Directs all activities of one of the largest divisions of the Postal Transportation Service in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, as well as in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the division.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail-handling and transportation schedules, security of mails in transit, and rates.

(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units such as transfer offices, air mail fields, terminals, railway post office lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, truck lines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, approximately 3,300 or more employees.

(46) Position: Assistant postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 18.

Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 20,000 employees, annual receipts of $140 million, 1,100 Government-owned motor-vehicle units, 66 classified stations and branches, and 3,200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

(47) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 18.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately 3,200 employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, 200 Government-owned vehicle units, 34 classified stations and branches, and 1,000 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency-appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(48) Position: Postmaster, large first-class office—Level 19.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a large first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately 8,000 employees, annual receipts of $48 million, 400 Government-owned vehicle units, 50 classified stations and branches, and 1,400 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency-appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

(49) Position: Postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 20.

Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of one of the largest first-class post offices, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations and branches. This office has approximately 20,000 employees, annual receipts of $140 million, 1,100 Government-owned vehicle units, 66 classified stations and branches, and 3,200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

(D) Supervises the administration of the efficiency-appraisal system and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director.

(50) Position: Regional director—Level 21.

Basic function: Directs the management of all postal activities within the jurisdiction of an assigned region in accordance with basic departmental policies and with functional direction and guidance from Assistant Postmasters General.

Duties and responsibilities:

(A) Develops and formulates policies and practices for the region within basic policies and instructions of the Postmaster General.

(B) Manages post office operations.

(C) Administers routing, distribution, and transportation of mail within and in transit through the region.

(D) Arranges for the provision of adequate facilities and equipment for all postal functions in the region.

(E) Administers the personnel program of the region, including employment, placement, training, evaluation of positions, employee relations, and other personnel functions.

(F) Authorizes and issues allowances for all expenditures and exercises budgetary controls.

(G) Administers cost reduction programs and provides industrial engineering services to operating segments of the region.

(H) Maintains effective public relations with the general public, large mail users, and with Federal, State, and municipal authorities.

Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the Deputy Postmaster General. Directs, through subordinate officials, approximately 30,000 to 35,000 employees in some 3,000 offices within the region.

SEC. 204. (a) An employee may be appointed to more than one position and shall be paid compensation at the rate provided by law for each position, without regard to the provisions of sections 1763, 1764, and 1765 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 58, 69, and 70).

(b) As the needs of the service require, an employee may be assigned from time to time to perform, without change in compensation, duties and responsibilities other than the duties and responsibilities specifically set forth in his position description; however, if any employee is assigned for more than 30 days in any calendar year to duties and responsibilities of a salary level which is higher than the salary level to which his position is assigned, except to perform service in a relief capacity for a supervisor granted compensatory time pursuant to section 603, he shall be paid for the period of his assignment in excess of 30 days a basic salary computed in accordance with the provisions of section 502.

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 assigned, 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. The report shall be printed as a House document.

TITLE III—BASIC SALARY SCHEDULES

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

SEC. 301. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "PFS." Except as provided in sections 302 and 303 of this act, basic salary shall be paid to all employees in accordance with this schedule.

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	------	------	------	------	------	------

(b) The basic salary for hourly rate employees shall be computed by dividing the per annum rates prescribed in the Postal Field Service Schedule (1) by 2,080 in the case of hourly rate employees other than substitutes, and (2) by 2,016 in the case of substitute employees.

RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

SEC. 302. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "RCS," for carriers in the rural delivery service, which is based in part on fixed compensation per annum and in part on specified rates per mile per annum. Basic salary shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

Rural carrier schedule

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,538	$1,578	$1,618	$1,658	$1,698	$1,738	$1,778
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63	65	67	69	71	73	75
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,538	------	------	------	------	------	------
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63	------	------	------	------	------	------
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

(b) A rural carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the length of the route served by him. A rural carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the combined length of the two routes.

(c) The Postmaster General may pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes not exceeding 61 miles in length. He may not pay additional compensation to a carrier serving such a route in an amount which would exceed $4,700, when added to the basic salary for the maximum step in the rural carrier schedule for his route. In case any such heavily patronized route is extended in length, the rural carrier assigned to such route at the time of such extension shall not be reduced in pay.

(d) The Postmaster General may pay additional compensation to rural carriers who are required to carry pouch mail to intermediate post offices, or for intersecting loop routes, in all cases where it appears that the carriage of such pouches increases the expense of the equipment required by the carrier or materially increases the amount of labor performed by him. Such compensation shall not exceed the sum of $12 per annum for each mile such carrier is required to carry such pouches.

(e) In addition to the other compensation, rural carriers shall be paid the authorized fee for making special delivery of mail. Such fee shall not be paid when (1) no special delivery service is rendered, (2) delivery is made into a rural mail box, or (3) delivery is made to the addressee or his representative on the rural carrier's route.

FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

SEC. 303. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "FOS," for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the gross postal receipts as contained in returns of the post office for the calendar year immediately preceding. Basic salary shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

Fourth-class office schedule

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,514	$2,598	$2,682	$2,766	$2,850	$2,934	$3,018
$900 to $1,299.99	2,304	2,381	2,458	2,535	2,612	2,689	2,766
$600 to $899.99	1,886	1,949	2,012	2,075	2,138	2,201	2,264
$350 to $599.99	1,467	1,516	1,565	1,614	1,663	1,712	1,761
$250 to $349.99	1,048	1,083	1,118	1,153	1,188	1,223	1,258
$200 to $249.99	838	866	894	922	950	978	1,006
$100 to $199.99	629	650	671	692	713	734	755
Under $100	419	433	447	461	475	489	503

(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in gross receipts at the start of the first pay period after the beginning of each fiscal year. In adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step, the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted gross receipts of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of changes in gross receipts shall be deemed the equivalent of a step-increase under section 401 of this act and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category or class indicated by the receipts of the preceding quarter. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category or class pursuant to this subsection shall remain in such category or class until the start of the first pay period after July 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category or class indicated by the receipts for the preceding calendar year.

(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as such postmaster.

(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods such office is open for business during the fiscal year.

(g) Where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the third class for each of the two consecutive calendar years are less than $1,500, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $1,400, such post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

CONVERSION

SEC. 304. (a) Each employee whose basic salary is paid under the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, or under the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended, and who on or prior to the effective date of this section has earned but has not been credited with a higher automatic salary grade increase under the act of July 6, 1945, or a higher within-grade step-increase under the Classification Act of 1949 for his position shall be given credit for such increase before his basic salary is adjusted under this act.

(b) The basic salary of each employee in effect immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, and the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, shall be adjusted to the basic salary in the schedules in the following manner:

(1) If the basic salary of the employee is equal to any step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

(2) If the basic salary of the employee is less than the entrance step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such entrance step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

(3) If the basic salary of the employee falls between any two steps established for his position in the appropriate schedule, the higher step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

(4) If the basic salary of the employee is greater than the highest step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such basic salary shall be established as the new basic salary of the employee.

ADDITION OF LONGEVITY STEP-INCREASES

SEC. 305. (a) When the basic salary of an employee, except an employee whose basic salary immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, is established under section 304 of this act, each longevity step-increase which such employee has earned prior to the effective date of his schedule shall become a part of his basic compensation and shall constitute a longevity step-increase under section 404 of this act.

(b) In the case of an employee whose compensation immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, all creditable service under section 404 shall be counted in order to determine such employee's eligibility for longevity step-increases under such section.

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.

TITLE IV—STEP-INCREASES

AUTOMATIC ADVANCEMENT BY STEP-INCREASES

SEC. 401. (a) Except as to a substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–6 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, each employee whose position is allocated to the Rural Carrier Schedule, the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, or salary level PFS–10 or a lower salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, who has not reached the highest step for his position, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step for his position at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of each 52 calendar weeks of satisfactory service, if no equivalent increase in basic salary from any cause was received during such period of 52 calendar weeks. The

benefit of successive step-increases shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the Armed Forces.

(b) Each employee whose position is allocated to salary level PFS-11 or a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be advanced to and including step four of his salary level in the manner provided in subsection (a) of this section. Advancement of such employee to steps higher than step four, exclusive of longevity step-increases, shall be granted by the Postmaster General on the basis of superior performance under regulations issued by him, but no such employee is eligible for more than one step-increase within the time period specified in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Each substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service, whose position is allocated to salary level PFS-6 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, shall be advanced in the manner prescribed for other employees under subsection (a) of this section, but such substitute shall not be advanced beyond step four of salary level PFS-6.

CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR ADVANCEMENT

SEC. 402. Each employee in the postal field service is eligible to earn step-increases in accordance with this act. Except for temporary rural carriers serving in the absence of regular rural carriers on leave without pay or on military leave, credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for 1 year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

ADJUSTMENT OF SERVICE CREDIT

SEC. 403. (a) Subject to subsection (b) of this section and for the purpose of establishing eligibility for step-increases under the provisions of section 401 of this act, each employee whose basic salary is adjusted on the effective date of the schedules in sections 301, 302, and 303 of this act shall begin his waiting period of 52 weeks on the date of such adjustment.

(b) Each employee in the automatic grades immediately prior to such adjustment who had not reached the maximum grade for his position may retain his anniversary date established under the Act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress), as amended, for purposes of advancement to the next step for his position, if the amount of the increase which he received by reason of such adjustment to his salary schedule under this Act is less than that part (allocable to the service performed by him since his last automatic increase under such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended) of the amount representing the grade increase which would have been credited to him at the beginning of the quarter following his next anniversary date under such Act of July 6, 1945, as amended.

LONGEVITY STEP-INCREASES

SEC. 404. (a) There are established for each employee longevity steps A, B, and C. For each promotion to a longevity step—

(1) each postmaster at a post office of the fourth class shall receive an amount equal to 5 per centum of his basic salary, or $100 per annum, whichever is the lesser, and

(2) each employee (other than a postmaster at a post office of the fourth class) shall receive $100 per annum.

In computing the percentage increase under this subsection the amount of the increase shall be rounded to the nearest dollar. A half dollar or one-half cent shall be rounded to the next highest dollar or cent, respectively.

(b) Each employee shall be assigned to—

(1) longevity step A at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 13 years of service;

(2) longevity step B at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 18 years of service; and

(3) longevity step C at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 25 years of service.

(c) (1) There shall be credited, for the purposes of subsection (b)—

(A) all time on the rolls, except time on the rolls as a substitute rural carrier, in the postal field service or in the Post Office Department;

(B) all time on the rolls in the custodial service of the Department of the Treasury continuous to the date of the transfer of the employee to the custodial service of the Post Office Department in accordance with Executive Order Numbered 6166, dated June 10, 1933;

(C) all time on the rolls as a special-delivery messenger at a first-class post office; and

(D) all time on the rolls as a clerk in a third-class post office for which payment is made from authorized allowances.

(2) In determining longevity credit for the purposes of subsection (b) in the case of an employee whose continuous service in the postal field service or in the departmental service of the Post Office Department shall have been interrupted by service with the Armed Forces or to comply with a transfer during war or national emergency as defined by the United States Civil Service Commission, all time engaged in such service with the Armed Forces or on such transfer shall be credited pro rata for each week of such service. All service specified in this subsection, whether continuous or intermittent, shall be credited on the basis of 1 week for each whole week the employee has been on the rolls, except that credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for 1 year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

(d) Employees on the rolls on the effective date of this section who are entitled to promotion credit for longevity purposes under section 2 of the Act approved May 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 102; 39 U. S. C. 839), shall retain all rights and benefits established or continued under such section to the same extent as though such section had remained in effect.

(e) Increases under this section shall not be deemed equivalent increases within the meaning of section 401.

TITLE V—GENERAL COMPENSATION RULES

APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 501. The Postmaster General may appoint any person who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the Government to any position in a regional or district office or to any professional or scientific position and may place such person in any step in the salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest basic salary which such person received from the United States.

PROMOTION

SEC. 502. (a) Any employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid basic salary at the lowest step of such higher salary level which exceeds his existing basic salary by not less than the amount of difference between the entrance step of the salary level from which promoted and the entrance step of the salary level immediately above the salary level from which promoted. If there is no step in the salary level to which the employee is promoted which exceeds his existing basic salary by at least the amount of such difference, such employee shall be paid (1) the maximum step of the salary level to which promoted, or (2) his existing basic salary, whichever is higher.

(b) Regular clerks and carriers in first- and second-class post offices are not eligible for promotion to positions of higher salary levels in their respective offices unless they are in the maximum steps of their respective salary levels. If for any reason such clerks and carriers in such maximum steps are not available those clerks and carriers in the lower steps in such offices shall be eligible for such promotion.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

SEC. 503. Each temporary employee who is hired for a continuous period of 1 year or less for a position under the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid a basic salary at the entrance step for the salary level of the position to which he is appointed.

PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION OF FORMER COMPENSATION

SEC. 504. (a) 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.

(b) For the purposes of this section, "basic compensation" includes basic compensation under the Classification Act of 1949.

TITLE VI—PAY ADMINISTRATION

PAY PERIODS AND COMPUTATION OF RATES

SEC. 601. (a) Employees in the postal field service shall be paid compensation in 26 installments. Each such installment shall be the compensation for a pay period of 2 weeks.

(b) As basic compensation for a full pay period, an employee, other than an hourly rate employee, shall be paid an amount equal to one twenty-sixth of his annual basic compensation. As basic compensation for a portion of a pay period, such employee shall be paid basic compensation computed in accordance with subsection (d) of this section for the number of days and hours of service for which he has credit.

(c) As basic compensation for the pay period, an hourly rate employee shall be paid an amount equal to the product of his hourly rate of basic compensation and the number of hours of service for which he has credit.

(d) For purposes of computing rates of compensation other than annual rates the following rules shall govern:

(1) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for employees other than substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,080.

(2) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,016.

(3) To compute the daily rate of compensation for postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 312.

(4) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for annual rate employees other than postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the hourly rate of basic compensation shall be multiplied by the number of daily hours of service required.

(e) Except for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave upon the termination of employment, an annual rate employee shall not be paid more than one twenty-sixth of his basic compensation as basic compensation for a pay period.

(f) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(g) When a pay period for employees to whom this act applies begins in one fiscal year and ends in another, the gross amount of the earnings of such employees for such pay period may be regarded as a charge

against the appropriation or allotment current at the end of such pay period.

HOURS OF WORK

SEC. 602. Except as otherwise provided in this act, employees shall not be required to work more than 8 hours a day. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours.

COMPENSATORY TIME, OVERTIME, AND HOLIDAYS

SEC. 603. In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to work more than 8 hours in 1 day, or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays. For such service he shall grant employees in the "PFS" schedule compensatory time or pay such employees overtime compensation under the following rules:

(1) Each employee in or below salary level PFS-8 shall be paid for all work in excess of 8 hours in 1 day at the rate of 150 percent of his hourly basic compensation.

(2) (A) Each employee in or below salary level PFS-8 who performs work on Saturdays or Sundays shall, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the excess time worked within 5 working days, except that, in lieu of such compensatory time, the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize such employee to be paid, for work performed on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December, at the rate of 150 percent of his hourly basic compensation.

(B) If the work performed by such employees on Saturdays and Sundays is less than 8 hours, such service, in the discretion of the Postmaster General may be carried forward and combined with similar service performed on other Saturdays and Sundays. The employees may be allowed compensatory time for such combined service or any part thereof at any time, except that, whenever at least 8 hours of such service has been accumulated, the employees shall be allowed 8 hours, compensatory time on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday on which the total accumulated service was at least 8 hours.

(3) For time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the act of December 26, 1941 (5 U. S. C., sec. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees generally, each employee in or below salary level PFS-8, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall either be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such time worked within 30 working days, or be paid premium compensation at a rate equal to his hourly basic compensation for the time so worked. For work performed on Christmas Day, premium compensation shall be paid at a rate equal to 150 percent of the employee's hourly basic compensation.

(4) Each employee in or above salary level PFS-9 who performs overtime or holiday work as described in this section, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such overtime or holiday work.

NIGHT WORK

SEC. 604. Employees who perform work between the hours of 6 o'clock p. m. and 6 o'clock a. m. standard or daylight-saving time, depending upon which time is observed where such work is performed, shall be paid extra compensation for each hour of such work at the rate of 10 percent of their hourly basic compensation. The differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which such employees may be entitled.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO PAY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 605. (a) Sections 602, 603, and 604 of this act do not apply to the heads of regional or district offices and such other employees of the headquarters staff of regional and district offices as the Postmaster General designates, or to postmasters, rural carriers, post-office inspectors, traveling mechanicians, and traveling examiners of equipment and supplies.

(b) Sections 602 and 603 of this act do not apply to substitute employees and to employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty.

(c) Section 602 of this act does not apply to employees in post offices of the third class.

(d) The provisions of section 603 of this act relating to compensatory time and overtime compensation for work on Saturdays and Sundays do not apply to hourly rate regular employees.

SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 606. (a) Subject to subsection (c) of this section, the Postmaster General shall prescribe the conditions under which substitute positions may be established.

(b) Each substitute employee who reports for duty in compliance with an official order shall be employed for not less than 2 hours following the hour at which such employee is ordered to report.

(c) In the case of positions which are the same as or equivalent to the positions enumerated in the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1936, as amended (39 U. S. C., sec. 834), the ratio of classified substitute employees to regular employees shall not be more than 1 classified substitute to 5 regular employees or fraction thereof with respect to each such position, except that in offices having fewer than 5 regular employees there may be 1 substitute clerk and 1 substitute carrier, and 1 substitute in the motor-vehicle service.

EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

SEC. 607. (a) The Postmaster General shall organize the work of employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty into regularly scheduled tours of duty. Such tours of duty shall aggregate an average of not more than 8 hours a day for 252 days a year, including an allowance of 1 hour and 35 minutes for work to be performed on layoff periods. He shall not grant allowances of time for work performed on layoff periods to employees other than employees engaged in the distribution of mail.

(b) Employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty, except substitute employees, who are required to perform work in excess of the scheduled time of their regular tours of duty as established by the Postmaster General shall be paid at the rate of 150 percent of their hourly basic compensation for such overtime work. In arriving at the amount of overtime to be paid at any time during the calendar year, any deficiencies accrued up to that time during the same calendar year shall be offset against any overtime work by the employee.

(c) Substitute employees in the postal transportation service assigned to road duty shall be paid on an hourly basis for actual work performed according to the time value of each trip of such road duty, including an allowance of time for all work required on layoff periods.

(d) In addition to compensation provided under this act, the Postmaster General, under regulations prescribed by him, may pay not more than $9 per day as travel allowances in lieu of actual expenses, at fixed rates per annum or by such other method as he deems equitable to regular and substitute employees in the postal transportation service who are assigned to road duty, after the expiration of 10 hours from the time the initial run begins.

(e) Substitute employees in the postal transportation service shall be credited with full time while traveling under orders of the Post Office Department to and from their designated headquarters to take up assignments.

EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR SPECIAL DELIVERY MESSENGERS

SEC. 608. (a) In addition to the compensation provided under this act regular and substitute special delivery messengers at first-class post offices shall be paid an automotive equipment maintenance allowance at the rate of 7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof for miles traveled under the direction of the Department in making delivery of special-delivery mail or at the option of the Postmaster General at the rate of 90 cents per hour spent in making delivery of special-delivery mail. Payments for equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

(b) The Postmaster General may provide or hire vehicles under an allowance basis for use in the delivery of special-delivery mail whenever the needs of the postal field service so require.

EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

SEC. 609. (a) In addition to the compensation provided in the rural carrier schedule, each rural carrier shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 9 cents per mile for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled. The Postmaster General may pay such additional equipment maintenance allowance as he determines to be fair and reasonable, not in excess of $3 per day when combined with the equipment maintenance allowance provided by the preceding sentence, to rural carriers entitled to additional compensation under section 302 (c) of this act for serving heavily patronized routes. Payments for such equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

(b) Any employee in the postal field service who is assigned to serve any rural route, and who furnishes the vehicle used in the performance of such service, shall be paid the equipment maintenance allowance provided for the route so served, in addition to his compensation.

ALLOWANCES FOR POSTMASTERS IN FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES

SEC. 610. Postmasters of fourth-class post offices shall be paid as allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment an amount equal to 15 percent of the compensation earned in each pay period, at the same time and in the same manner as their regular compensation.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

CLASSES OF POST OFFICES

SEC. 701. The Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of gross annual postal receipts. He shall place in the first class those post offices at which such receipts are $40,000 or more. He shall place in the second class those post offices at which such receipts are $8,000 or more, but less than $40,000. He shall place in the third class those post offices at which such receipts are $1,500 or more, but less than $8,000. He shall place in the fourth class those offices at which such receipts are less than $1,500.

ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 702. With the consent of the employee, the Postmaster General is authorized to detail any employee, including any employee of the departmental service, between the postal field service and the departmental service to such extent as may be necessary to

develop a more efficient working force and more effectively to perform the work of the Department. Each such detail shall be made for a period of not more than 1 year and may be made without change in compensation of the employee so detailed.

INCREASES IN BASIC COMPENSATION NOT "EQUIVALENT INCREASES"

SEC. 703. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of enactment of this act shall not be considered as an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 701 (a) (A) of the Classification Act of 1949, in the case of employees who transfer or are transferred to a position coming within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

SEC. 704. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to adopt applicable provisions of this act for postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, as of the respective effective dates of such applicable provisions.

REFERENCES IN OTHER LAWS WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC LAW 134, 79TH CONGRESS

SEC. 705. (a) Whenever reference is made in any other law to the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, such reference shall be held and considered to mean this act. Whenever reference is made in any other law to a "grade" of such act of July 6, 1945, such reference shall be held and considered to mean the corresponding basic salary step in any schedule contained in this act.

(b) The application of this act to any position or employee shall not be affected by reason of the enactment of subsection (a).

APPLICABILITY OF ACT TO GUAM

SEC. 706. This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

REGULATIONS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

SEC. 707. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND RULES, VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

SEC. 708. This act shall not be construed to modify the application of the Civil Service Act and Rules or the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the postal field service.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 709. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 710. (a) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(b) Section 601 of this act shall take effect on any Sunday following the date of enactment of this act designated by the Postmaster General but not later than the first Sunday of the first calendar month which begins more than 60 days after such date of enactment.

(c) The remainder of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

(d) (1) The adjustment of the basic salary of each employee to the basic salary established for the position he was occupying on the effective date of this act shall be completed within 180 days after the effective date of section 304 (b).

(2) The applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, shall continue in effect with respect to each such employee until the date on which his basic salary is adjusted under such section 304 (b).

(3) Such adjustment of basic salary of each such employee shall be made effective as of the effective date of section 304 (b) and payments of basic salary on the basis of such adjustment shall be decreased by the amounts of basic salary received by such employee during such period under the applicable provisions of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. LANGER conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the controversy concerning the failure of the refugee-relief program has been spread over the front pages of the press of the Nation during the past 2 weeks. The dismissal of Mr. Edward Corsi as special assistant to the Secretary of State in charge of immigration problems—a most unfortunate and regrettable development, for which the Secretary of State must yet fully account—has focused national attention on the Refugee Relief Act, and on the administration of that act, as never before since the enactment of the legislation in the summer of 1953.

The Refugee Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee is now investigating the Corsi matter and all its implications. The subcommittee is investigating and reviewing the administration of the refugee relief program. In the course of the subcommittee hearings, there has been frequent reference to the inadequacies of the Refugee Relief Act. There seems to be a debate as to which factor has been chiefly responsible for the paralysis of the refugee program—the unfortunate terms of the law itself, or the unfortunate manner in which the law has been administered. Mr. President, I am willing to give full and equal credit to both factors. The law is very faulty. The administration of the law has been most inadequate.

Today, Mr. President, I shall address myself largely to the shortcomings of the law. Today I am introducing, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a comprehensive set of amendments to the Refugee Relief Act. These amendments are badly needed. I send this bill of amendments to the desk for appropriate reference. I hope the Judiciary Subcommittee, which is looking into the operations of the refugee program, will give full and sympathetic consideration to these amendments. I hope that legislative hearings will be held upon them. I hope the amendments will be reported out, submitted for a vote, passed by the Senate, and sent to the House.

Some changes in administrative attitude are indeed necessary on the part of the Secretary of State, on the part of the consular officers abroad, and on the part of all those who are dealing with this program, if this program is to be snatched from the jaws of failure and converted into a success. The way this program has gone up to now has cast a pall of shame on the prestige of the United States abroad. It has disappointed hundreds of thousands of people, both here and abroad. What was intended by Congress to be a great undertaking in humanitarianism, has instead become a bureaucratic nightmare, full of hair-splitting interpretations of law, frustrations, disappointments, and heartbreak for refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain and for their friends and relatives in the United States.

Let us recall, Mr. President, that this act was entitled the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The message from President Eisenhower recommending this program described at great length the plight of those who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain—of those who had been driven from their homes by war and disaster. That was the keynote of this program.

In that message, the President said:

> We are all aware of the tragic developments of the past several years which have left countless thousands of individuals homeless refugees in the heart of Europe. In recent months, the number of refugees has been increased by the steady flow of escapees who have braved death to escape from behind the Iron Curtain * * * these refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world.

When this bill was acted on in the Senate, and when it was signed by the President, noble sentiments were expressed regarding the concern which America felt for the brave men and women who, seeking freedom, had escaped into the free world from slave-labor camps and from the oppressions of tyranny behind the Iron Curtain.

The Congress passed the Refugee Relief Act. On the surface, it was a generous act. But technical amendments adopted in committee—boobytraps—robbed the act of its truly humanitarian aspects, and made it, instead, a prescription for delay, frustration, and heartbreak.

When that bill came up for vote on the floor of the Senate, I cast my vote in favor of it; but at the time I warned that those who held forth high hopes for the effectuation of this program were overly optimistic, and that there would be a rude awakening. I predicted, at the time, that only a small percentage of the refugees and escapees whom we undertook to assist by means of that legislation would ever actually be assisted.

I regret to say that my predictions of July 28, 1953, have sadly come true. In almost 2 years of operation—and there is only a year and one-half left—considerably less than 1,000 actual refugees and escapees have been admitted into the United States. Numerous contradictory figures have been cited; but the volun-

tary agencies representing the various religious faiths, who have been working strenuously to translate this program into reality, insist that according to their records, the number of refugees and escapees who have been admitted to the United States number well under 1,000.

Some thousands of relatives of American citizens and of aliens permanently resident in this country have been admitted under the terms of this refugee program. Almost all of them would have been eligible to enter the United States under the quota provisions of permanent immigration law, although their entry would thereby have been delayed. As it has worked out, this program has not been a refugee relief act, but a relatives' relief act.

Of course, I have no objection whatever to the admission of relatives into this country. I am in favor of that, but I do object to the frustration of the hopes, dreams, and legitimate aspirations of refugees and escapees who have no relatives in the United States. This was one of the main objects of the passage of this legislation. Tragically, that objective has been frustrated.

Mr. President, the amendments I am introducing today would slightly increase the allowable number of aliens who would be admitted into the United States under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act from the present limit of 209,000 to 224,000. The difference of 15,000 is accounted for by a proposed authorization to admit refugees now residing in Spain and North Africa, in addition to those already eligible under paragraph 3 of section 4a of the act, namely, the NATO countries, Turkey, Sweden, Iran, and the Free Territory of Trieste.

Moreover, Mr. President, it is the general purpose of my amendments to make clear the 224,000 figure is a goal which it is desired to achieve. In other words, a target. It has been the very mistaken impression of those administering the act that Congress, in setting the previous ceiling of 209,000 was merely setting an inflexible upper limit and did not really intend that this number of persons should be admitted into the United States.

Those in charge of the program have taken the position that the fewer admitted the better. My amendments would provide that if any of the authorized numbers to be admitted in the various categories are not, in fact, admitted by December 31, 1956, an equivalent number of visas are to be made available in the categories where applications for admission are in excess of the number authorized to be admitted in those categories.

Another of the provisions in my bill would take the administration of the Refugee Relief Act away from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, where it does not belong, and vest it in a full-time administrator who would operate in the Department of State and who would not be subject to the bureaucratic control of any division chief.

Another of the major changes my bill would accomplish would be authorization of the use of so-called agency assurances, in addition to individual assurances, so that our great voluntary organizations, both religious and nondenominational organizations, may assume responsibility for providing housing and employment for the refugees desiring to come to the United States under the act.

My amendments would eliminate the distinction between so-called refugees and so-called escapees, and establish only one category, to include those who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and those who are refugees from the aftermath of World War II.

My amendments would liberalize the provisions permitting aliens who are now in the United States, in a nonresident status, to apply for adjustment of status to that of permanent residents.

My bill would also eliminate the unworkable requirement for a 2-year security history prior to admission. The present provision is self-defeating, making it almost impossible for escapees from behind the Iron Curtain to enter the United States until they have been for at least 2 years in free territory.

All would-be immigrants, in any category, must pass the security requirement of the McCarran-Walter Act—very severe requirements, indeed. Yet the present refugee law, which is designed to facilitate the admission of refugees and escapees into the United States, establishes additional security barriers which make it almost impossible for recent escapees and refugees to enter the United States under any circumstances.

Finally, Mr. President, I would make the final cut-off date for this program December 31, 1960, instead of the present cut-off date of December 31, 1956.

As I said previously, I firmly believe and I think the American people feel that the authorization to admit 209,000 or 224,000 refugees should be used. Time should certainly be allowed for the completion of the processing of applications and the straightening out of difficulties in individual cases to the full extent of the authorized ceiling of admissions. The cut-off date I have provided in this bill of amendments would permit such a procedure.

Our amendment would also provide, as I have said, that further applications could be received in categories where the authorized number of visas had not been issued by the preliminary termination date for visa issuance, namely, December 31, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that a detailed analysis of my bill, along with a copy of the bill, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The bill (S. 1794) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, to redefine the term "refugee," to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN on behalf of himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KEFAUVER was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 2 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 400; 50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) 'Refugee' means any person in a country or area which is neither Communist nor Communist dominated, who because of persecution, fear of persecution, natural calamity, military operations, or events subsequent to September 1, 1939, is out of his usual place of abode and is unable to return thereto."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 2 of such act is hereby repealed.

(c) Subsection (d) of section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971a), is amended by striking out "two hundred five thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof "two hundred twenty thousand."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971b), is amended by—

(1) striking out in paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (13), wherever it appears in such paragraphs, the word "ethnic";

(2) striking out in paragraph (2) the word "escapees" and inserting in lieu thereof: "refugees"; and

(3) striking out all of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Not to exceed 25,000 visas to refugees residing within the European continental limits of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or in Turkey, North Africa, Spain, Sweden, Iran, or the Free Territory of Trieste and who are not nationals of the area in which they reside. Such visas shall be issued only in the area in which they reside."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out the word "ethnic."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971c (a)), is amended by striking out "ten years of age" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "fourteen years of age."

SEC. 5. Section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971d), is amended by—

(1) striking out in the first sentence "Any alien who establishes that prior to July 1, 1953, he lawfully entered the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any alien entering the United States prior to July 1, 1953, who establishes"; and

(2) striking out in the second sentence that portion which reads "except that the quota to which he is chargeable is oversubscribed."

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971e), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Except as provided in section 5 of this act with regard to eligible orphans, no visa shall be issued to any alien under this act unless an assurance, in accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to this act, shall first have been given by a citizen or citizens of the United States or by an organization recognized by the Administrator for the purpose of submitting such assurances, that such alien will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such alien and the members of such alien's family who shall accompany such alien and who propose to live with such alien will not become public charges and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent sons and daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons and stepdaughters and sons or daughters adopted prior to July 1,

1953, of such alien shall not be required to have such assurances made in their behalf. The assurances shall be submitted to the Administrator and it shall be the duty of the Administrator to verify the authenticity and bona fides of such assurances. This subsection shall have no applicability to an alien eligible under paragraph (6), (8), or (10) of section 4 (a) of this act, if such alien provides satisfactory evidence that he will not become a public charge."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 7 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) No alien shall be issued a visa under this act or be admitted into the United States unless he shall present to the consular officer at the time of application for a visa or to the immigration officer at the time of application for admission a valid unexpired passport, or other suitable travel document, or document of identity and nationality, if any such document is required under the regulations issued by the Administrator."

SEC. 7. Subsection (d) of section 11 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971i), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 8. Section 12 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971j), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. Section 20 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971q), is amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 20. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), no immigrant visa shall be issued under this act after December 31, 1956.

"(b) If any of the special nonquota immigrant visas authorized to be issued under section 3 of this act remain unissued on December 31, 1956, such unissued visas shall be redistributed among those categories in section 4 (a) of this act that have (1) unfilled applications for visas, and (2) no visas remaining available for issue on December 31, 1956. Each such category shall be allotted a percentage of such unissued visas (to the extent necessary to fill applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956) equal to the percentage of the visas authorized under section 3 which is allotted to such category under section 4 (a). Any unissued visas remaining unallotted after the allotment provided by the preceding sentence shall be allotted among those categories which are not allotted sufficient visas under the preceding sentence to fill the applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956, until (1) all such unissued visas have been allotted or (2) all categories have been allotted a number of such unissued visas equal to the number of its applications remaining unfilled on December 31, 1956. No immigrant visa made available to the categories under section 4 (a) of this act by virtue of this subsection shall be issued after December 31, 1960."

SEC. 10. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1971), is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof as follows.

"ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 21. There is hereby established in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall serve under the direction of, and shall be solely responsible to, the Secretary of State and shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $17,000 per annum."

The analysis submitted by Mr. LEHMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT AMENDMENTS

1. The term "refugee" is broadened to include persons who are displaced from their country of birth or nationality as a result of events prior, during, or subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and as a result of present political conditions, fear of persecution, military operations, etc., are unable to return to their natural place of abode. The term "refugee" is made to include escapees from behind the Iron Curtain obviating the necessity for two separate categories which in the present law have contributed to administrative delay and confusion.

2. The responsibility for the administration of the act is vested in an Administrator within the Department of State, but not, as in the present law, in the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. The present Administrator, Mr. Scott McLeod, would have this responsibility taken from him. The new Administrator would be appointed by the President, subject to Senate confirmation. He would serve under the direction of the Secretary of State.

3. The overall number of visas available for issuance is increased from 209,000 to 224,000. The 15,000 increase is added to the present 10,000 allotment of visas (sec. 4 (a) (3)) for refugees residing in the NATO countries. New areas included within the purview of the act would be Spain and North Africa.

4. The restrictive and opprobrious term—"ethnic"—is struck from the act.

5. The maximum age for orphans eligible to be admitted under section 5 of the act is increased from 10 to 14.

6. The provision for adjustment of status of aliens presently residing in the United States is broadened and liberalized.

7. The requirement for employment and housing assurances for qualified refugees has been modified to provide that these assurances may be given by individuals or by voluntary agencies recognized by the Department of State for the purpose of giving such assurances. One of the major problems arising under the present assurance requirements is that a specific job and housing facility must be underwritten by a specific individual prior to the time a refugee can be declared eligible for immigration. Authorizing the acceptance of such assurances from duly recognized voluntary agencies would greatly simplify the entire program.

8. The requirement of section 7 (d) of the present act that an alien, before being admitted into the United States must obtain a certificate of readmission into the country from which he departs for the United States is eliminated. It is felt that the requirements of the basic immigration law covering necessary travel documents and clearances are more than sufficient to protect the interests of the United States.

9. The requirement of subsection (d) of section 11, that a completely documented 2-year history of the alien be submitted as a condition of eligibility is repealed. This provision has resulted in interminable delays in the admission of escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. The security requirements of the basic immigration law, as well as the additional requirements of this act, are deemed more than adequate to protect the security interests of the United States.

10. The final termination date of the act is extended from December 31, 1956, to December 31, 1960. Provision is made that after December 31, 1956, those visas which have not been issued in the various categories established in the act shall be reallocated to those categories which have exhausted their visa allocations and in which there is still a demand for visas.

11. Section 12 of the act which establishes a system of priorities for the issuance of visas is repealed. These provisions have proven to be largely unworkable and meaningless in actual practice.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN TROOPS AT THE ELBE RIVER, GERMANY

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, today has a special meaning for all people everywhere. Ten years ago today, almost at this very time, soldiers of the American and Soviet Armies met on the Elbe River in Eastern Germany.

For myself and for 59 other Members of this distinguished body, for 256 Members of the House of Representatives, and for millions of other veterans throughout the country, this anniversary has a very personal meaning.

Mr. President, 10 years ago those of us who had not been knocked out were still participating actively in the bloodiest struggle in history. Our eyes had become accustomed to seeing fellow humans being killed and maimed. The smell of death was with us constantly, and we had seen privation and destruction in the areas where so short a time before had been peaceful farms and villages of those whose land had become the arena for this slaughter.

Is it any wonder that the great event that took place on April 25, 1945, stirs in us a strong emotion? The meeting of American and Soviet GI's that day meant that the war in Europe was about to end—which it did, as we all know, 2 weeks later. And the end of war in Europe meant the end of Nazi tyranny—with its concentration camps, its secret police, its slave-labor factories, its intellectual inquisition, and its contempt for the rights, liberties, and dignity of the individual.

It is well to remember all this when we consider how tragically the hopes of 10 years ago have been betrayed. Let us not forget that the destruction of Nazi tyranny did restore freedom and a better life to half of western Europe and liberate the majority of German people from totalitarian rule. But unfortunately it brought no such benefits to the peoples of the Soviet Union or of eastern and central Europe. Nor did it bring true peace. Instead, the hopes of Elbe Day gave way to the Iron Curtain, the cold war, and the threat of a new world war of unimagined destructiveness.

The end of a war that left the Soviet regime immensely strong but the Soviet peoples still enslaved by totalitarian rule could not bring real peace to the world. For, as General Bradley said the other night in a message broadcast to the Soviet veterans over Radio Liberation, "the only threat to peace is tyranny."

This is the crux of the world problem we face today. With its hollow propaganda about coexistence, the Soviet tyranny would like to cause the world to ignore the fact of tyranny itself, and the fact that Soviet despotism is the source of the threat which hangs over all of us today. How can peace be secure as long as one-third of the human race lives under totalitarian despotism, as long as millions of human beings are tormented in concentration camps, as long as people from the Elbe River to the China Sea are denied the human rights to which all men are entitled?

Until the Soviet peoples themselves—the first victims of Communist tyranny—are free, neither the life nor the liberty of anyone on this earth is really secure.

For this reason, if for no other, we look forward to the day when our Soviet comrades-in-arms in the war against Nazi tyranny, together with all other peoples now living under the Communist yoke, have achieved liberty.

We are heartened by the knowledge that the struggle for liberty has never ended in the Soviet Union. I am convinced that the Soviet veteran yearns for a world of peace and freedom just as earnestly as does the American veteran.

Indeed, here in our own Capital today are emissaries of those unknown millions in the Soviet Union who, each in his own way and in his own heart, struggle toward a world without barriers, and in which the individual is master and the state is the obedient servant. They are Soviet soldiers who, together with thousands of others, have escaped through the Iron Curtain since 1945.

Mr. President, some of us have just returned from the Presidential Room where we participated in a special ceremony to be broadcast to the Soviet peoples by Radio Liberation. It is heartening to know that the citizens of the Soviet Union who yearn for freedom have a voice that speaks to them of a better future. It is the voice of Radio Liberation, which is manned by men and women—technicians, scholars, writers, and artists—who have escaped from Soviet tyranny. With the help of American citizens who believe that a secure peace depends upon liberty, they are now operating nine powerful transmitters and beam the message of hope to their still-enslaved compatriots. We Americans who are proud of our revolutionary tradition in the cause of human liberty can take pride in the fact that Americans are giving their support to such a program.

In recent days, Mr. President, the official organ of the Soviet Government—Izvestia—delivered a violent attack against Radio Liberation and against those Americans who are helping their Soviet friends who dream of freedom. This proves that after nearly 40 years of thought control the Soviet masters have been unable to kill the dream of freedom, and that they still fear it. This proves that after nearly 40 years of iron control by secret police, the masters of the Kremlin have not been able to stifle the urge for personal liberty. This proves that after nearly 40 years of totalitarian rule, the despots of the Soviet Union know that their despotism is still vulnerable to the most powerful ideas in the world—the ideas of freedom, of liberty, of justice, of the brotherhood of man.

Mr. President, I think it is agreed by all Americans that we must do everything humanly possible to avoid an open clash with the Soviet Union, since the consequences of such a war are beyond contemplation. At the same time, we must be strong and firm, and prevent any further Communist aggression, whether by direct conquest or by subversion.

But for the long run, I submit, Mr. President, the world's hope for enduring peace lies in the possibility of freedom for the enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union. For when the Soviet peoples are free, and I think not before, the promise of peace which shone so brightly when American and Soviet soldiers met 10 years ago, will be fulfilled.

When that day comes, Mr. President, the sacrifices that were made in World War II—and this has deep meaning for me—will have been fully justified.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] expressed sentiments which are shared, I believe, by the leading veterans' organizations of the country—the Disabled War Veterans, the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the AMVETS, and the American Legion. So I think we can be sure that the ex-GI's who did the fighting against Hitler's tyranny are well aware that until the tyranny in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain is lifted from the unhappy peoples of those lands neither peace nor liberty can be finally secure—either in this country or anywhere else.

We have learned through bitter experience that a regime which maintains itself in power by terrorizing its own people cannot live in real peace with anyone else. Such is the substance of Bolshevik despotism—as it was the substance, 10 years ago, of the Nazi-Fascist tyranny which millions of Soviet soldiers and citizens died to help destroy.

Therefore, on this day, 10 years after Soviet and American soldiers met on the Elbe River, let us remember all who perished in that struggle—whether on the battlefield, or beneath the stones of crumbling cities, or in the incinerators of Nazi concentration camps. And, above all, let us remember this central truth: Whatever form of government may be imposed on them, the plain people of the world yearn for peace and for personal freedom.

The tyranny of the Soviet Communist leaders does not represent the peoples of the Soviet Union any more than the tyranny of Hitler represented the German people. If we have anything for which to reproach ourselves in the long struggle against Hitlerism, it is only this: That we did not seek out, in good time, the decent elements in the German trade unions, the German army, the church and elsewhere, who regarded Hitlerism as a hideous libel on the German spirit and culture. We might have saved countless lives, had we done so.

But there is still time, now, to learn from bitter experience. There is still time to achieve lasting peace—without war. Today, on Elbe Day, let us make it known that we do distinguish clearly between the plain people of the Soviet Union and the reactionary dictatorship.

Let us make no mistake about it: The present Soviet regime is not merely despotic, but—like all despotisms before it—it is thoroughly reactionary. What else can we call a regime which permits no free trade unions, reduces farmers to serfdom on state-controlled farms, employs slave labor on a gigantic scale, allows no freedom of speech, no freedom of the press and no freedom of assembly. What else can we call a regime which has built radio jamming stations extending from East Germany to the Ural Mountains in a desperate effort to prevent the independent words of Soviet soldiers and citizens abroad from reaching the Soviet people over radio liberation? What else can we call a regime which has inflated one man's indictment and analysis of the economic evils of a century ago into a state religion from which there must be no dissent, no heresy?

Clearly the present Soviet Government is both despotic and reactionary. Our Soviet brothers-in-arms in the war against Nazi-Fascism deserve a far better future than such a regime can ever give them. The Russian people are heirs of a great revolutionary tradition—of a century-and-a-half-old struggle for liberty and social justice. They will surely win the human rights for which they have so bravely and so often fought against the cruelest odds.

Let the Soviet armed forces and the citizens know on this Elbe Day that our feelings of fellowship and sympathy for them have not changed at all since the meeting on the Elbe, 10 years ago.

The American people today, as always, remain the friends and allies of every man in every land who fights for the liberties and dignity of the individual. We know that every fighter for liberty, wherever he may be, fights the battle of all mankind. And we know that when the world is rid of tyranny, the peoples of the world—Russians, Americans and all others—will join together in the common war against poverty, ignorance, prejudice, and disease.

SHIPMENT OF SCRAP IRON TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a condition which I think deserves consideration and which has disturbed a good number of the people in my State.

I am informed that large stockpiles of scrap iron are being assembled in various port cities throughout the United States for shipment to foreign countries. It is suspected that this scrap iron is then being transshipped to Red countries behind the Iron Curtain.

I cannot help remembering the days when scrap iron was shipped to Japan, and we Americans had it thrown back at us at Pearl Harbor. Anyone can make a mistake once, but only a fool makes the same mistake twice.

If this scrap iron is going to countries behind the Iron Curtain, then I think the American people should know about it, and I think its shipment should be stopped. We should not tolerate business by a few people who are making a momentary profit with no thought of the future. I am sure our scrap dealers would not want to do business of this sort behind the Iron Curtain. We should investigate this matter thoroughly.

I have discussed this with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and he has agreed with me that if scrap iron is being shipped to foreign countries and then transshipped to Red countries, it should be stopped immediately. He has agreed to take the matter up for investigation by the Armed Services Committee. I believe we should look closely into this matter and protect our people and our servicemen from ever again being fired upon with scrap-iron bullets and scrap-iron guns.

Mr. President, I call this to the attention of the Senate because I feel sure that the Members on both sides of this honorable body never again want to see our people the victims of attack with our own scrap iron as they were in World War II.

THE SO-CALLED BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. HENNINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that we are now undertaking to get in touch with the distinguished majority leader in an effort to get further information on the matter the Senator from Delaware has spoken to me about, and in connection with which I believe he now desires to have me yield to him. I shall take only 5 minutes, or less, to speak on another matter. I assure the Senator there will be no delay on the subject he had reference to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on Friday last I wrote a letter to the President of the United States urging that he declare in clear, precise, and unequivocal terms the position of the administration on the so-called Bricker amendment, which was reintroduced early in this session of Congress. I ask the indulgence of the Senate that I may read to the Senate the text of the letter I wrote to the President of the United States. It is as follows:

On April 27 the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, a revival of the so-called Bricker amendment.

As you know, Mr. President, the Senate concerned itself with this proposal for many weeks during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. During extensive committee hearings, your Secretary of State, speaking presumably for the administration, clearly expressed his opposition. Subsequently, you declared yourself on more than one occasion as opposed to any constitutional amendment which would throw out of balance, in any way, the historic separation of powers as between the three branches of our Government and as between the several States and the Federal Government. In a letter to you dated February 5, 1954, and on many occasions in public and on the floor of the Senate, I expressed my wholehearted support for your defense of the Constitution and my emphatic opposition to any weakening of the constitutional powers of the President.

Since our victory last year, events have occurred which have focused attention again upon the powers of the President in the field of foreign relations as Commander in Chief. I refer specifically to the resolution on the defense of Formosa and the adjacent areas which, in response to your request, the Congress adopted last January. At that time, Mr. President, I indicated my deep concern lest the procedure followed on that occasion be misconstrued as a tacit acceptance of the principle you opposed at the time of the debate on the Bricker amendment. Although you made quite clear your position that as President you already had, under the Constitution, the authority you requested in the resolution, the resolution itself failed to recognize that you hold such powers and reflected in this respect a grave misunderstanding of the true nature and extent of the constitutional powers of the Presidency.

Mr. President, the forces who fear and mistrust the Presidency as an institution are again at work. It would appear that the Nation is again about to be subjected to the same shopworn arguments, the same fallacious, ill-considered and, in fact, dangerous propaganda which last year poured forth in such copious quantities from people bent on destroying our basic constitutional structure. Considering the many grave international and domestic issues which demand our immediate attention, the Senate and the Nation can ill afford to become engaged again in weeks upon weeks of debate and controversy over a proposal which was roundly defeated and discredited at the last session of Congress.

I fear, Mr. President, that those who wish to weaken or restrict the historic powers of the Presidency are prepared now to seize upon the Formosa resolution as an indication of your support or acceptance of their position. In short, the adoption of the Formosa resolution has created serious doubt and uncertainty as to your present position with respect to the Bricker amendment.

In this context of events, Mr. President, as one who has fought the battle long and hard for the preservation of the historic constitutional powers of the Presidency, I feel compelled to urge you to declare now in clear, precise and unequivocal terms your unwavering and uncompromising opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1 and to any and all substitutes or alternative proposals tending to dilute, distort, or destroy the powers of the Executive.

In this matter, Mr. President, partisan considerations play no part. Members of your own party and of mine have firmly stood their ground against the persistent forces of reaction and fear. We shall continue to do so. At the same time it is imperative that the full authority and prestige of your office and your person be brought to bear against these forces and in unqualified support of those who have struggled and will continue to struggle to preserve intact and unimpaired the historic powers of the Presidency.

I believe, Mr. President, that the national interest will be served at this time by a statement of your position on this issue, and your declaration will be of inestimable value to those of us who propose to continue to fight to preserve the great constitutional powers of the Presidency, to preserve, in fact, the Presidency itself for yourself and your successors, as strong and as vigorous as the founding fathers intended that it be.

The Nation, Mr. President, awaits a clear statement of your position.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read in the newspaper the Senator's letter, and I have listened this morning to his reading of it. Does he draw a distinction between the powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and the President's authority as Chief Executive in connection with diplomatic and political questions? The Formosa situation, as I see it, is a problem of the Commander in Chief rather than one within the President's diplomatic or political powers.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, there is a distinction, as the Senator has indicated. I issued a rather lengthy statement. In terms of the problem we are going to be called upon to solve, I think it is unfortunate, that there is apparently a resubmission of the so-called Bricker amendment on the heels of its defeat at the last session of the Congress. I, of course, voted in favor of the Formosa resolution, I may say to my good and distinguished friend from Massachusetts, and I did so for reasons which I think were not related to my personal feelings in the matter.

This morning I learned from the clerk of the Judiciary Committee that Secretary Dulles, who was scheduled to testify before the subcommittee on constitutional amendments in behalf of the Eisenhower administration, has canceled his appearance. I am also told that Secretary Dulles has not indicated to the subcommittee when he will be ready to testify on this resolution.

In view of the failure of Secretary Dulles to present testimony on behalf of the administration at the initial and crucial stages of the hearings on the so-called Bricker amendment, I am requesting the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to cancel the hearings scheduled for Wednesday, and not to schedule any further hearings on the resolution until Secretary Dulles is in a position to present the administration's attitude concerning the proposed constitutional amendment, which so vitally, and in some instances so fatally, would affect the Presidential powers and our country's foreign policy.

As Senators know, the original and, may we say, unadulterated, pristine Bricker amendment was soundly defeated during the last session, but proposed substitutes in lieu of it were, in the last instance, defeated by only 1 vote. The distinguished newspaper columnist, Robert C. Albright, writing in Sunday's Washington Post and Times Herald, indicated that the Bricker amendment and its closely related fellows have apparently less chance this session than during the last session; but only, cautions Mr. Albright, if President Eisenhower makes clear, in forceful terms, a determined opposition.

That the protection of the historic powers of the Presidential office must find most support from the opposition party is a sad commentary on the state of public affairs in this country. It is my prayer that President Eisenhower will become aware of the importance which his views in this matter must of necessity be, and that he will direct his Secretary of State to come forward with adequate testimony in opposition to the amendment, which would subvert the historic doctrine of separation of powers of our Government and, in many respects, seriously weaken and whittle down the great office of the Presidency itself.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN PRIVATE BUSINESS TO BECOME MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the strength of a Nation is measured in terms of its gross national product which consists of combined resources of production and services rendered by its total manpower.

The ability to repel any attempt to destroy us would be determined by the maximum output of our total manpower. This manpower must be shared by the civilian economy with the military forces because each one requires more personnel of high qualifications than is available from supply. Consequently, any philosophy or policy which rejects the principle of sharing the available manpower between civilian and military needs is fallacious. Such a philosophy or policy is apt to lead to serious disagreements among our people.

Civilians should not be barred from participation in Military Reserve forces simply because it is inconvenient to employers. Neither should the reservist be penalized in his efforts to attain greater economic security and advancement because of the fact that part of his time must be given to drills and study.

The very existence of the employers of this Nation depends upon the maintenance of military strength necessary to protect against the seizure of our businesses and our entire country by an outside enemy.

Consequently, I am deeply concerned over the statement in Babson's Washington Forecast of April 18, 1955, which reads as follows:

> Businessmen should expect some complications under the new reserve setup. For example, if a reservist doesn't meet his obligation, penalties imposed upon him could also hurt your business.
>
> Right now, you could avoid difficulties by not hiring reservists. Later, however, all young employees will have military obligations * * * and you'll have to learn how to live with the problem.

The Reserve Officers Association, as well as the United States Chamber of Commerce, has been attempting to educate the business firms of this country that it is not only a patriotic duty but also a case of self preservation to encourage employees to become members of the Reserve Forces.

We are living in an era of uncertainty. We pray constantly that we will not be engaged in another armed conflict. But, should it come, the Communist world will attempt to strike from the air at the great industrial centers of this country. Their hope would be to deal such a blow the United States would be unable to produce the materials of defense necessary for victory.

It is impossible to maintain sufficient forces on active duty to provide maximum security for our Nation. However, if we develop our Reserves as envisioned in the National Reserve Plan to augment the active duty force, we will have sufficient strength to combat the effect of sudden attack.

To achieve our objective, the young men of America must be assured that their service in the Reserve Forces will not hamper or retard advancement in the business world.

The Reserve Officers' Association has been attempting to educate the American public that every young man has an obligation of citizenship to his country. Part of this obligation is to serve in the military either with the active duty force or the Reserve or a combination of the two for a specified number of years. Under present law each individual reaching age 18½ has an 8-year obligation in the Reserves.

We believe business and industry of this Nation must encourage individuals to execute their military obligation by serving in the Reserve Forces. Within a few years these employees will have discharged their obligations except that a certain number will be needed to remain voluntarily in the program.

Consequently, business and industry must take the initiative in encouraging employee participation in the nation's defense forces. Fathers and mothers must encourage their sons to carry out their obligation rather than attempt to seek reasons for deferment.

The American public must be fully educated that every man, woman, and child has a personal and specific obligation of citizenship to the United States and sufficient numbers of people must accept their responsibilities. When this is accomplished, our fears of Communist powers need not be as great. With God's help and guidance our kind of government and our way of life will continue as the hope of mankind.

THE FORMOSAN SITUATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, within the past few weeks the situation in which the United States found itself in respect to threats in the area of the Formosan strife appears to be hardening to such an extent that open warfare seems almost unavoidable. The American people can take note of happenings over the past few days which indicate that the apparent inflexibility of the situation has now given way to an atmosphere in which conciliation and adjustment seem possible. Today it appears not unlikely that the United States can reach a political rather than a military solution to the problems in this area.

Above and beyond all the talk of warlike action on both sides is the fact that the people of this Nation want peace, and honorable peace. The actions of many of the leaders of the Asian and African nations demonstrate that they too want peace. I cannot believe that the people of China, despite the previous position taken by Chou En-lai and other leaders of the Communist government, want war.

I was glad to read the advice of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], that we prepare ourselves to sit down with our adversaries and attempt to work out a practical solution. Selfish interests on both sides require that this be done.

I also hope that the administration will carefully consider the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia that we now begin active consultation with all our friends and allies as to their positions and wishes regarding a just settlement.

It seems to me that there lies before us the opportunity to adjust differences in the particular matter of Formosa, and as well to open the way to such general settlements as may be necessary for peace in the whole Far Eastern area. This will be a long step toward peace in the world.

THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Time magazine, in its issue of April 18, devotes approximately a column and a half to a discussion of a recent decision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on the basis of an amendment to the Walsh-Healey Act which I sponsored in 1952.

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

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

LABOR: ON THE SOUTH SIDE

Few Members of the United States Congress walk both sides of the street as successfully as Arkansas's Senator JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. Often described as a passionate Democrat and a liberal, he is also good at conforming to his constituents, many of whom are far from being liberals. For instance, FULBRIGHT knows how to tip his hat to southern industrialists, who capitalize on cheap labor. Last week, Dr. Full was in eclipse and Mr. Bright had the spotlight.

In 1952 FULBRIGHT pushed through Congress a bill under which the courts could review United States Department of Labor prevailing minimum-wage orders. His purpose was plain. Under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, the Department of Labor had set nationwide minimum wages for manufacturers and suppliers holding $10,000 or more in Government contracts. Since the Labor Department's minimums were affecting the wage scale throughout the textile industry, southern textile men wanted to attack the order in court. After FULBRIGHT put through the amendment, the Southern manufacturers sued to wipe out the national minimum of $1 an hour in cotton, silk, and synthetic textile plants.

Last deek Washington's Federal Judge Alexander Holtzoff (who upheld Harry Truman's seizure of the steel industry in 1952, and was reversed by the United States Supreme Court) ruled on the case. Judge Holtzoff pointed out that the Walsh-Healey Act permits the Department of Labor to set minimum wages by "locality," but said that blanketing the whole United States under that term is a "tortured interpretation."[1] His conclusion: the Labor Department cannot set nationwide minimum wage rates under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Senator FULBRIGHT's good friends the southern industrialists were overjoyed, but his good friends in the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, were not. Said TWU

[1] Commenting on this interpretation, Judge Holtzoff quoted a passage from Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking-Glass: " 'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less.'

" 'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things.'

" 'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be the master—that's all.' "

Executive Vice President William Pollock, in an appeal for repeal of the Fulbright amendment: "What the court said, in effect, is that it is quite proper for employers in one section of the country to pay less for the same work as long as they can get away with it. Under this kind of reasoning we should also abolish the Federal minimum wage law (under which the minimum is 75 cents an hour). If Judge Holtzoff's philosophy prevails, we shall have taken a long step backward toward the sweatshop and the slums."

Naturally, New England textile manufacturers were lined up with the TWU in this case. Continued lower wages in the South help to hold them under a serious disadvantage. Management and labor outside the textile industry were deeply interested, too. If the Holtzoff ruling is finally upheld by the United States Supreme Court, it can affect pay scales in nearly 50 other industries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Time magazine seems also to have some difficulty in placing me in one of the convenient slots into which editors are wont to divide us all. I regret very much that I have so complicated the lives of the editors of Time. I know it makes the life of an editor extremely difficult if a public official cannot be categorized as a liberal, conservative, radical, or reactionary.

In my own case, Time accuses me of walking both sides of the street successfully, of conforming to my constituents, and of knowing how to tip my hat to southern industrialists.

These Time-style characterizations, as well as their resort to a play on my name, seem to imply that I am a political Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde—Dr. Full and Mr. Bright. Time says Mr. Bright took over in this case.

Mr. President, I do not think one needs to be very bright, liberal, conforming, et cetera, to come to the conclusion I, as well as the Congress, arrived at in 1952, when Congress decided that the Secretary of Labor should follow the law, or that his decisions should be subject to judicial review. This is a principle of government, it seems to me, which the editors of Time should be able to understand, if they would devote their attention to it.

Of course, this decision of mine—namely, that the Secretary of Labor should be required to follow the law—was based upon an opinion that he was not, in fact, doing so. The decision of the United States District Court, of which Time takes note, confirms my opinion that, for one thing, locality, a term used in the act, does not mean the entire United States. In other words, the requirement of law that wages of laborers engaged on Government contracts be determined on the basis of those prevailing in the locality in which the materials are to be manufactured, does not mean those prevailing in the whole United States. Or to put it more simply, locality does not mean the whole United States of America.

This most recent decision is the third by a Federal court since my amendment was enacted. In every case, the Federal courts—which I do not suppose Time would care to label as "liberal," "conforming," "bright," or "full," or to characterize as tipping their hats to southern industrialists—have upheld the view I took in sponsoring the amendment.

"Naturally," Time says, "New England textile manufacturers were lined up with the Textile Workers Union in this case," in opposition to the Court's decision. This, I presume, is supposed to put the clincher on my own paradoxical character. How could a "liberal" support such legislation?

Mr. President, I suggest to Time, Inc., and to anyone else, that a "liberal" or a "conservative," or anyone concerned with the proper role of government in the economic development of our Nation, could support this proposition on the same grounds as those on which he might oppose some of the same groups in their efforts to maintain the South and West as colonial areas, for the exploitation of the northeast. This was their practice for many decades, through their control of government and finance, by the use of discriminatory tariffs, interest rates on money, and freight rates. They now seek to maintain it through their control of certain agencies of the Government; and they seem to be extremely aggravated because the courts have held that, in so doing, they must follow the law of the land—that is, that the 48 States of the United States do not constitute a "locality."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Friday, April 15.

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

MR. FULBRIGHT AND THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT

One of the most thoroughgoing journalistic hatchet jobs we have seen lately was performed this week by Time magazine on Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.

The technique used here, of which we ourselves often have been the victim, is to attribute to the Senator convictions he doesn't have and then accuse him of hypocrisy for not following them. Says Time of Mr. FULBRIGHT:

"Often described as a 'passionate Democrat' and a liberal, he is also good at conforming to his constituents, many of whom are far from liberal. FULBRIGHT knows how to tip his cap to southern industrialists who capitalize on cheap labor. Last week Dr. Full was in eclipse, and Mr. Bright had the spotlight."

Well, the Senator is a Democrat all right, and we think he has earned the title "liberal"—in the old-fashioned sense; that is, as opposed to the doctrinaire usage that Time imputes here. But if anybody has ever described the slow-speaking, professorial Arkansan as "passionate" it must be someone who has never met him or examined his record in the House and Senate. The prime characteristic of Mr. FULBRIGHT's public career has been a sort of intellectual detachment rare in politics, and it has often led him into collision with his party's leaders, as in the notable case of his spectacular feud with Harry S. Truman over the RFC investigations.

The industrialists Time charges the Senator with running errands for in this instance are the southern textile manufacturers, who have recently brought suit to knockout a national dollar-an-hour minimum wage imposed on Government contractors under the Walsh-Healey Act. The action was brought under an amendment to the act sponsored by Senator FULBRIGHT in 1952, and Time implies that all this was carefully rigged on behalf of the Senator's good friends, the southern industrialists.

The great irony in all this is that the textile industry in Arkansas consists of four small mills with a combined political influence roughly equal to that of the Little Rock Audubon Society. The Senator's interest in the Walsh-Healey Act stemmed from the fact that under its arbitrary interpretation by the Labor Department scores of small industries in this underindustrialized State were being frozen out of Federal contracts. His amendment, which was actually a compromise against a drive to repeal the act entirely, simply provided that decisions of the Labor Department, which had been final, could be challenged in the Federal courts.

The Walsh-Healey Act was passed after the old NRA was knocked out by the Supreme Court, and was intended as a stop-gap wage-fixing device to be used until Federal wages and hours legislation could be enacted, as it subsequently was. But during the Korean war the Labor Department began to employ it as a device to raise wages paid by Government contractors well above the minimum level required by law. Moreover, the Department began to interpret the requirement that wages should be determined by "locality" to mean that it could establish standards based on nationwide averages.

The obvious result of this was to squeeze out many small Arkansas fabricators, particularly in the wood products field. To qualify for a Government contract of more than $10,000 they had to raise their wages not to the level their competitors were paying under private contracts, but to the level paid in the wealthy States of great industrial concentration. Senator FULBRIGHT contended that this was an absurd interpretation of the act, and the courts have now agreed in the first test case. "Tortured" was the term used by Judge Alexander Holtzoff in characterizing the Labor Department's practice of interpreting "locality" to mean the whole United States.

It is also worthy of note that the Labor Department was clearly acting in the interests of New England manufacturers who have been trying to use the full leverage of Federal labor laws to fight off the effort of Arkansas and other underdeveloped States to attract industry. There is a tipoff as to what the shouting is really about in the fact, as Time notes, that in the present instance the New England textile industry has joined with the Textile Workers Union in denouncing Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment as "sweatshop legislation."

One consistent pattern in Mr. FULBRIGHT's public career has been the effort to stimulate small business in general, and to protect it against undue pressures from the great national concentrations of industry. The Walsh-Healey amendment was in that pattern. So, in part, was his recent investigation of Wall Street, in the course of which he also earned Time's wrath. It would, it seems to us, require still another "tortured interpretation" to brand this course as either illiberal or un-Democratic.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE HONORABLE KEN ANDERSON, MEMBER OF THE AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in years gone by, many of us have had the privilege of visiting our sister Republic, the Commonwealth of Australia. Under the rules of her Parliament, a member of a legislative body of equal standing has the right to the floor.

I was privileged to be present at a meeting with the Australian Cabinet last fall. I enjoyed very much the hos-

pitality of that great country and the opportunity to visit its legislative assembly halls. I was inspired by the fine work Australia is doing and by her system of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. President, today I am delighted to have the privilege of presenting to the Senate a member of the Australian Parliament, the Honorable Ken Anderson, from Sydney, New South Wales.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes the distinguished Member of the Parliament of Australia. All of us are very glad to have the opportunity to greet him and to have him visit the Senate and our country.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In view of the great importance of the speech which will be made by my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee, a speech which I hope as many Senators as possible will hear, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER. 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. GORE. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is now nearing the conclusion of its consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to extend and modify the reciprocal trade agreements program. It is expected that the bill will reach the floor of the Senate within a few days.

In terms of our own economic prosperity and progress, and in terms of the units of nations in the grand alliance of free nations of the world, its importance can not be overemphasized. Our foreign trade policy serves as the cornerstone of all our foreign policy, and its success or failure can mean the difference between prosperity or adversity in our domestic economy, the difference between a prosperous export trade, or falling domestic prices and unmanageable surplus. It can mean the difference between a high level of employment, or unemployment for American workers. It can mean the difference between profit and loss for thousands of American businesses.

It can mean the difference between allied economic solidarity, or stagnation of trade and economic division in the free world.

We can not for a moment afford to underestimate the importance of the decision we make on H. R. 1.

For 2 years now our foreign economic policy has been sick. On two successive Junes, just as it was about to draw its last breath, it has been revived temporarily by 1-year extension of life. Nothing has been done to get at the root of the illness, nothing has been done to breathe into it new life and vitality.

Two years ago when the Eisenhower administration came into office it was faced with the problem of what to do to bolster our sagging world trade and to secure the economic solidarity among nations of the free world which had been achieved at such great cost. Since there was a new team in control of both the administration and the Congress, it was argued—and with some justification—that time was needed to study the situation. The Randall committee, composed of notable cast, was appointed to study and report.

But no positive action on a world trade program was taken. Instead, we marked time for a year by enacting a simple and practically meaningless 1-year extension. During that year we did nothing to enhance our trade position—not one single new trade agreement was made.

But while we marked time the Communist world went into action, making trade overtures to many of our customers in the free world. Those overtures met with considerable success. While we made no new trade agreements, the Russians concluded agreements with 15 of our allies, and the Red Chinese with 13.

Last year, with the Randall Committee study completed, the President sent to the Congress on March 30, recommendations for a trade program. He asked for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act along with some cautious liberalization which he called the "minimum" he considered "essential." I was disappointed that the President did not go further in his recommendations for trade liberalization, but I thought the program he did submit was good as far as it went.

The President's program last year met a storm of opposition from members of his own party in Congress. Eventually he chose to back down on his request rather than face the hostility of members of his party. He said he would settle for another 1-year extension, and despite efforts of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle to save the 3-year program for him, a meaningless—for him and for the country—1-year extension is all that passed. So, for still another year we have marked time without concluding one single trade agreement. For a second year the President was deprived of the minimum weapons he needed to meet and counter the Communist trade offensive. But the Reds continued to move ahead. Since January 1, 1954, nations dominated by the Kremlin have made 30 new trade agreements with nations of the free world, while we, the great United States, have made none.

The faltering of the past intensifies the challenge today.

I think there is none among us who will not agree that the national economy would be enhanced by an increase in our export markets, though not all will agree upon the method to be employed. I am convinced that passage of H. R. 1 is the very minimum step we should take to rejuvenate our declining foreign commerce. H. R. 1 is the least disquieting procedure we can use to maintain the unity among free nations of the world that has been achieved at such great cost. Failure to take this minimum step would signal a return to the protectionist policies which played a significant part in wrecking our economy and the economy of the whole world in the early 1930's. More than that, failure in this small task would seriously damage the grand alliance of free nations that stands with us as a bulwark against the spread of communism.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. What my distinguished friend from Tennessee says is true. But is it not a fact that the group who desire to contract the commerce of the United States and to take us back to the days which the distinguished Senator describes is the Republican Party of the United States?

Mr. GORE. I think there are certain Members affiliated with the Republican Party who do hold to that philosophy. However, in view of the vote in the House of Representatives, I cannot deny that some Members of the Democratic Party also seem to embrace that philosophy, at least in part.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator. Let me state that I share the same views on tariffs and foreign trade the Senator from Tennessee entertains. Perhaps I would go even further in removing trade barriers. But, after all, the center of opposition to the reciprocal trade program has been and is the Republican Party.

Mr. GORE. I think the record will speak to that effect rather loudly, if not eloquently. When this question was before the United States Senate last year, nearly all Senators on this side of the aisle voted for the 3-year extension program which the President had requested. Every Member of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle opposed it. I do not know how Members of either party will vote on the question this year. I hope there will be some improvement in that regard.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The act contains a peril-point provision does it not?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator agree that it is a bad provision?

Mr. GORE. I do not know that I would agree that it is bad. Perhaps it has many inadvisable features. Perhaps there is something that may be said in its favor, too.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who placed that provision in the bill?

Mr. GORE. I do not recall the author.

Mr. EASTLAND. It was placed there by the Republicans, was it not?

Mr. GORE. I am sorry, but I do not recall the vote. I believe it was largely

supported by Members of the Republican Party.

Mr. EASTLAND. In fact, the Republican Party has given only lip service to the program, and that is one of the reasons why the program is in trouble now. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I am having difficulty disagreeing with the able Senator from Mississippi. I am hoping, however, that with the leadership of the President in this field there will be some conversions effected of Members of the Republican Party. I say that because our foreign policy should be bipartisan, and our foreign trade must be the keystone of economic foreign policy. I am very hopeful that with the leadership of the President we can pass in a bipartisan fashion a forward-looking, self-interest-promoting, and free-world-interest-promoting foreign trade program.

Mr. EASTLAND. Am I to understand the Senator to state that if the President really leads and really makes a fight for this program, a good bill will be passed by Congress?

Mr. GORE. I did not say I thought that would happen; I said I hoped it would. The trouble with the President's leadership on this subject is that there is some uncertainty about where he will stand. It is possible that when we arrive at his position he may have changed it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I say that regretfully. I do not mean to be critical in that regard. I appreciate the contribution of the able Senator from Mississippi, and I am grateful for his support of a program that is very vital to the welfare, not only of the United States, but to the grand alliance of free nations, which has been built at such great cost.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In connection with the colloquy which my colleague has had with the Senator from Mississippi, while we all hope that this program may have strong bipartisan support in the Senate, so that it may be enacted this year, I believe the RECORD ought to be clear, particularly since the necessity has been shown of the President's taking a very strong position in support of this measure at this session, that in the last session, while no support came from the Republican side of the aisle for the extension which the Senator from Tennessee sought to provide by amendment, only four votes in favor of the extension were lost on the Democratic side of the aisle. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I do not remember the exact vote. I believe the Senator has stated the vote approximately.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not also a fact that a substantially larger number of Democrats voted for the measure in the House of Representatives this year than did members of the Republican Party?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. The number was considerably larger.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the junior Senator from Tennessee feel that, although the President supports the measure, if this great program is to be rescued, it will take more vigorous support and backing from the administration than has thus far been evidenced?

Mr. GORE. I do indeed. I may say, also, that in such matters as international trade the role of the President is the dramatization of the national interest. When there is no effective leadership from the President, Senators and Representatives become prey to the special interests of their own constituencies. Each Senator has at least two constituencies which he must consider. The first is the constituency he is honored to represent directly. The second is the national interest, which every Senator must also keep in mind.

Conversely, the President has but one constituency, and that is all the people. Therefore, in such matters, it is the function and, I believe, the duty of the President of the United States to hold ever in the forefront, by effective leadership—not by lip service—the national interest, and thereby encourage and lead Members of Congress to take a broad position, rather than permit them to yield to the demands of interests within their constituencies who may believe or fancy or imagine that they will be damaged by such a program.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will my colleague further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the Senator has made a very telling point in the statement he has just uttered. I have had the pleasure of reading a part of the Senator's outstanding address. I cannot escape the feeling that if the President of the United States were to take the measure to the people of the United States and present it to them in the same vein the Senator from Tennessee is presenting it to the Senate today, there would be no doubt that this great program, which is so necessary for trade and peace, would be saved. That is the kind of support the Senator is suggesting should be accorded. I hope it will be forthcoming.

Mr. GORE. I have in mind the kind of fight that Woodrow Wilson made for a liberal trade program when he denounced the tariff lobby and called the attention of the American people to the threat that such activities posed to the national interest. I am not talking about lipservice. I am talking about the kind of effective political leadership which should be able to get at least one vote on the other side of the aisle from the President's own political party.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee mentioned the tariff lobby. Does the Senator know that there will be a number of very powerful tariff lobbies at work in opposition to the bill?

Mr. GORE. I do indeed. In the course of my remarks I expect to pay particular attention to the tariff lobby.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Mississippi knows something about such lobbies. Every one of the lobbies is allied with the Republican Party. If the Republican Party really wanted to pass the proposed legislation, it could pass it without change. It is solely a question, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee says, of whether we will serve the national interest, the interest of all Americans, or whether we will listen to the siren song or special privilege. The Republican Party has always listened to the siren song of special privilege and high tariff. We see again those forces at work under the banner of Republicanism.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his contribution. I should like to call attention to the contrast between the fight which the administration made on the tax bill and the lip service which it has given to the reciprocal trade agreement program. I should like to read what former President Woodrow Wilson said about the tariff lobby of his day. That lobby was essentially the same then as it is today.

Behind the clamor against the reciprocal-trade program is one of the best organized, most insidious lobbies Washington has ever had to contend with. It is the high-tariff lobby, and it has been around a long time. It is the same lobby which descends upon Washington every time a trade question comes up for discussion. During President Woodrow Wilson's first term the activities of this lobby became so notorious that President Wilson felt compelled to issue a statement of warning to the country. Because that warning would be applicable today I want to read the Senate what President Wilson had to say:

> I think the public ought to know the extraordinary exertions being made by the lobby in Washington to gain recognition for certain alterations in the tariff bill. Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, and so insidious a lobby. The newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to mislead not only the judgment of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby, and to create an appearance of a pressure of opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill.
>
> It is of serious interest to the country that the people at large should have no lobby and be voiceless in these matters, while great bodies of astute men seek to create an artificial opinion and overcome the interests of the public for their private profit. It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of this matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it.

It is unfortunate that President Eisenhower has not emulated President Wilson's warning that the tariff lobby threatens the national interest, for everything President Wilson said about that lobby in his day applies to its activities today. The maximization of the national interest is the proper role of the Presidency. Only by strong, effective Presidential leadership can the tariff lobby now be overcome.

Mr. President, I have read the speech which President Eisenhower made in New York within the hour. In that speech the attention of the American people is in nowise called to the tariff lobby. There is no denunciation of the unfair and misleading tactics employed. Nowhere in the speech do I find that it is calculated to give effective leadership to-

ward the enactment of the program by the Senate. Indeed, Mr. President, the word in the cloakroom is that the administration has agreed to the first breach in the line by accepting the amendments which have already been adopted by the Senate Finance Committee. Not once, before either the House committee or the Senate committee, was there an explanation of the importance and meaning of a provision which would permit tariff reductions to 50 percent of the 1945 rate on items which are not imported into this country at all because of prohibitively and unrealistically high import duties. Not once before either committee was there an explanation of the importance of the provision which would permit such reductions of tariffs on some 617 items which are not imported into this country in more than negligible quantities because of prohibitive tariffs.

Mr. President, is that a fight by the administration for the program presented by the President? Was the speech in New York a fight for that program? I did not so interpret it. It is a fine general statement of policy, but what of the trade agreements?

Mr. President, I should like to read an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on April 22, entitled "Trade Bill in Danger":

> The first serious inroads on the administration's reciprocal trade extension bill (H. R. 1) have now been made by the Senate Finance Committee, and there may be more to come before the measure is reported to the floor. What will happen when the Senate as a whole starts to debate this bill is anybody's guess.
>
> All of this means that President Eisenhower must exercise every ounce of his vast influence if the bill is to be approved in satisfactory form. Thus far, pressure from the White House has been reported so light as to be unnoticeable.

Mr. President, last fall I went to Geneva as a United States delegate to an international conference on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. While there I had an opportunity to talk to officials of dozens of countries. From these talks I got the impression that the whole free world was waiting to see what direction our international trade policy would take. I am convinced that a return to protectionism by the United States would cause a stampede among other nations to raise their own tariffs and erect any other protectionist barriers they could devise. For that reason alone, though there are many others, it is imperative that the President be given the new authority he asks under H. R. 1, without crippling amendments.

Although the Senate Finance Committee has already adopted crippling amendments, with effective executive leadership further crippling amendments may be defeated and the disturbing features of the amendments already adopted may be mitigated and modified. Some say these amendments are not seriously damaging to the program and that their adoption was necessary in order to save the bill. Others say this is but the first breach in the line. I hope the first interpretation will prove to be correct, but I am apprehensive that the latter will be more than justified.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that the press generally interpreted those amendments to affect principally if not entirely the textile industry. Their effect is more far reaching than that, Mr. President. I consider the more serious aspect of the amendments the one which has been referred to but little in the press, namely, that which denies to the President the power to negotiate reductions to the level provided by existing law in the tariffs on goods which are not imported into this country at all, of which there are 484 items, and commodities which are imported into this country only in negligible quantities, which are 617 in number.

It is in this field, Mr. President, that there might be great opportunity to effectuate two-way trade without the infliction of injury upon industry in the United States. Yes, in this field there is vast opportunity to effectuate two-way trade which would build markets in this country, not only for imports, but for the development of industry within the United States, to meet new market demands.

It is particularly disturbing that this first yielding to a special interest comprises concessions to an industry which enjoys not only more than 99 percent of the American market, but also a thriving export trade, since it sold more than 6 percent of its production abroad in 1954. I am, of course, referring to the textile industry.

I shall treat with this phase of the question in more detail later; but at this point let me express my deep concern about maintaining our export markets. My concern is both national and local in character.

An estimated 200,000 Americans have jobs manufacturing and processing this thriving textile export business, to say nothing of the number of farmers helped by this big outlet for their cotton. In the State of Tennessee alone, if I may be permitted to make direct reference to my own constituency, the jobs of an estimated 5,000 textile workers depended upon this export trade in 1952.

How are we to continue to sell abroad, Mr. President, unless we are willing to buy from abroad? The tariff lobby provides no answer to this crucial question.

To be specific, Mr. President, I wonder what segment of our people is expected to bear the burden of maintaining this big exportation of textile products. The textile lobby has shown its unwillingness to accept any imports whatsoever. So whom, I ask, does the textile lobby expect to bear this burden? What other industry does it expect to accept the requisite amount of import competition to balance our $622 million of textile exports? To this question the textile lobby is as silent as it is loud about some very minor textile imports.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that ever since 1860, the textile industry, has demanded that the United States should maintain a high tariff on textiles, and that the original claim was, "If you will only give us protection for a few years and allow the infant industry to develop, it will become so strong that it will be able to stand on its own feet and will not need a tariff"?

Was not the great Henry Clay, who came from the Senator's adjoining State of Kentucky, the man who first advanced that argument?

Mr. GORE. To the last question, the answer is "Yes." To the first question, the answer is that the statement is true of the textile industry, in the history of protectionism for that industry. But it is also true and typical of many other industries as well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true of the iron and steel industry, is it not?

Mr. GORE. Indeed, it is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Tennessee think that in 139 years the baby ought to have been able to grow up and stand on its own feet?

Mr. GORE. Not only ought it to have become able to do so, but I shall show in the course of my remarks that it is able to stand on its own feet, and that it is able, successfully, to meet competition not only in the United States, but also abroad.

Why is it that the American textile industry can export $622 million of products in the markets of the world? It is not because the foreign customers like the way we part our hair. It is not because they want to spend their scarce dollars. It is because they like the American product, made with the efficiency and ingenuity of American industry, by American workers, and because the great American textile industry can furnish such products competitively in both price and quality.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to be saying, in effect, that the infant has long since grown up, but has refused to be weaned?

Mr. GORE. Since so many of my constituents are involved in this industry, and since they feel so strongly that their interests would be endangered by the passage of H. R. 1, I rather hesitate to speak in terms of weaning. I must say, however, in all candor, that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, characteristically, has a picturesque and eloquent manner of putting the question.

I recur to the question, What segment of our industry do we expect to bear the burden of maintaining the thriving export trade for the textile industry? Is it the farmers? Is it the chemical industry? Is it the automotive industry? What segment of our industry is it? Again, there is silence.

Can it be that the taxpayers of the United States are to be saddled with this requirement or burden? We cannot continue to export except in 1 of 2 ways: Either by accepting more two-way trade or by continuing to dole out American dollars abroad in subsidy to foreign nations, in order that they may have the money with which to buy American products.

Does the tariff lobby expect our Government to continue to dole out United

States money to foreign countries in order that the foreign customers may have the dollars with which to buy? That, Mr. President, would be aid, not trade. I thought our policy for many months past had been to develop trade, not aid.

We must choose between some method of balancing these exports between trade or aid, on the one hand, or suffer a loss of the markets abroad with consequent loss of jobs, on the other hand. Some may seek to avoid coming to grips with reality by advocating the expansion of our export trade, but opposing the development of import trade. That, however, is but an attempt to escape reality, and is to be compared with the philosophy of the classic demagog who votes for all appropriation bills but against all tax bills.

I realize that it is sometimes difficult for Congress to resolve what appear to be conflicts of interest between local and national welfare. When the people of our respective States think they will be injured by a program, it is difficult to support that program even though the national interest may require it. But the conflict may be more apparent than real. In fact, it may not be real at all. In the long run the sectional interest will, I believe, coincide with the national interest.

As I have said, all the clamor against this program is raised by one of the best organized and most effective lobbies I have ever seen. The lobby is conducting a vicious campaign and thereby producing unwarranted fear among the people of the country, in order to pressure and mislead the judgment of the Congress. It seeks to convince businessmen—and it is succeeding in convincing many businessmen—that if H. R. 1 should pass, they are likely to be bankrupt by competition from imports. It seeks to frighten laboring men and women, and it is succeeding in frightening hundreds of thousands of such workers with the spectre of unemployment caused by the failure of businesses which, it is contended, are unable to meet import competition. The goal of the lobby is to cause the people of each State to become so frightened that they will write to their Senators and urge them to vote against H. R. 1.

My own mail in opposition to H. R. 1 has been heavy. I am confident that the sentiment in Tennessee strongly favors the reciprocal trade program, which was fathered by the great Cordell Hull; and yet, because of the activities of the lobby which has been successful in implanting fear where there is no cause for fear, my mail against this program has been heavy. Most of the letters I have received from constituents are no doubt a genuine reflection of their fear. I do not criticize them for writing; I welcome their letters. But their letters show the results of an unconscionable campaign of misrepresentation that has resulted in generating fear. I resent this kind of campaign of misrepresentation, which has aroused fear unnecessarily, and caused doubt where there is no room for doubt.

In one of the slickest propaganda campaigns I have ever seen a group of willful, selfish men has spread the word that passage of H. R. 1 will bring on widespread business failure and unemployment. To many they have a plausible sounding story about competition from low-wage workers from abroad. For the most part, neither worker nor small-business man can do the research necessary to uncover the misrepresentation in this lobbying campaign. So many have been misled, and they are gripped with fear.

But United States Senators do have facilities to do research. We can determine which of the tariff lobby's claims are true, which are only half true, and which are completely false. We can discover what the whole picture is on any given industry. We do not have to take as gospel only that colored and slanted information which the tariff lobby offers.

Yes, Mr. President, many of the letters we have received reflect genuine fears of our constituents. But those fears are founded for the most part on half-truths and untruths planted by the high-tariff lobby which would betray the national interest for its own selfish ends.

I should like to speak about my own section of the country. Until this year the people of the South have not been as vulnerable to the tariff lobby's propaganda as have residents of other areas. The economy of the South until a few years ago was predominantly agricultural, and we in the South had a great net stake in the export of agricultural commodities. We still have such a stake, as does the whole country, but this year many people and several of our Congressmen have fallen victim to the tariff lobby.

The textile industry, which now employs a great many people in the South, has been one of the chosen instruments of the tariff lobby. It is, of course, a national industry and an important one. It is particularly important in New England and the South. I decided to find out just what the lobby was doing to influence that industry, and to determine what the textile import-export situation is.

I have before me a copy of the tariff lobby's plan for its propaganda campaign to be directed at the textile industry, at its workers, at its management, at businessmen, and at local civic leaders who are directly interested in and dependent upon the prosperity of that industry. After reading that plan I am not at all surprised that my mail from textile workers opposing H. R. 1 is heavy.

Mr. President, this tariff lobby textile campaign plan is a Madison Avenue type of production. It does not miss a single bet. The main theme is that if H. R. 1 passes, the country will be flooded by textiles made by cheap foreign labor, and that as a result our textile mills will fail and our textile workers will be thrown out of jobs. The plan is to persuade each mill manager to write a letter to his employees conveying this idea to them. The lobby even encloses a pattern text of the letter which it suggests be rephrased in the mill manager's own words. It is further suggested that the mill manager send the letter, along with a personal covering note, to leading citizens of his community.

Furthermore, the plan seeks also to persuade mill managers and mill personnel to write letters to the newspapers and try to secure newspaper stories and editorials. Very conveniently, it offers materials from which those letters, editorials, and news stories are to be made up.

I read now from verbatim directions found in the lobby's December 8 campaign bulletin:

> Make special effort during December to furnish your local newspaper with your own statement of the facts of the tariff issue.

Mr. President, I digress from the quotation to say that the lobby conveniently furnishes what it alleges to be facts, but which are in reality not facts. I resume reading from the campaign bulletin:

> Material for such statements can be easily adapted from any one or more of the encosed TIS (Textile Information Service) news stories recently published. This is especially important while your Congressmen are at home.

The lobby even prepared posters for posting on bulletin boards all over the country and has put on a campaign to secure public service radio and television time to exploit its propaganda.

Here, simply stated in the December 8 bulletin, is the purpose of the campaign:

> The objective of this entire campaign will be to work toward a climax reached in a flood of letters and other communications to Members of Congress as the showdown vote on the tariff issue approaches.

To achieve this objective, the lobby is missing no bets. According to its own plan, it has sent out portfolios of speech materials to be used before Rotary clubs, Lion clubs, and so forth. It has prepared special resolutions, which it sends out to the country in the hope of persuading American Legion clubs and Veterans of Foreign Wars clubs to pass them. It has distributed made-up advertising materials for use in newspapers. It has sent out the names of all Senators and Representatives, along with their hometown addresses. The lobby's order of battle even notes special plans for exploitation of letters to some of the most distinguished Members of the Senate, and "similar letters from executives in areas where there is important representation in Congress."

All this is coordinated through a special clearing house set up here in Washington, where all types of plans, reports, actions, and reactions on the campaign are set up in a special file with a general direction. As President Wilson warned, years ago, an untold quantity of money is being spent in order to mislead the people and to affect erroneously the judgment of the United States Congress. In the words of the lobby's bulletin, this clearinghouse is "set up to provide a quick idea of geographic coverage; to show specifically which Members of Congress are being approached and which ones are reacting; which areas may need greater attention or specially planned action."

Since, in the view of the lobby, I have not been reacting properly, I seem to have been made a subject of their specially planned action. Others, too, have been favored with specially planned action, especially those who represent, such as I do, constituencies in which

many people are employed in the textile industry. To textile employees, to small textile-mill owners, to people who are civic leaders in communities having textile industries, as well as to the general public, the lobby has painted the outlook for the textile industry in somber tones indeed.

Some people, as I have said, have been both misled and frightened by the scare-them-to-death tactics of the lobby. I wish to read a portion of a letter I received a few days ago from a good personal and political friend who is now president of the chamber of commerce of one of Tennessee's principal communities:

When you support legislation to lower the prices of foreign-made garments produced with unconscionably low-paid labor, an even greater injury than you may realize may be inflicted upon both working people and business here.

As to the patriotic aspects of free trade in the interest of world peace, we applaud your zeal in supporting these principles, but we feel certain you cannot afford to shut your eyes to the injury that must result to business in this country from the importing of foreign-made goods which sell at such low prices on the retail counter, unbelievably lower than the cost to produce the same clothing in this country.

About a thousand garment workers will be out of work in this county alone and many more thousands here will be adversely affected, if the garment industries of our county are compelled to go out of business because of foreign competition.

And I submit for the record, my reply to this letter which, as I say was addressed to me by a friend:

I have read very carefully your letter of April 12.

First of all, I should like to say that I am aware of the problems faced by the textile industry. I am aware, too, of the fears that have been expressed by representatives of that industry that enactment of a more liberal trade program would imperil the industry and the jobs of people who work in it. It is my considered opinion that these fears are exaggerated. It is true that any action which would permit increased imports would, to some extent, create more intense domestic competition for the industries engaged in producing the particular products affected.

But there is another side of the picture. As you may know, our textile industry exports a large percentage of its production. I have looked into the import-export situation with reference to the various classifications of textile products. I find that in almost all instances the volume of imports constitutes only a small fraction of the volume of exports. So, the textile industry has a large stake in export trade.

I believe sincerely that it will not be possible for us to maintain the existing level of exports, much less increase them, unless we adopt a program which will facilitate the flow of international trade. We cannot expect our foreign purchasers to continue to buy from us in increasing quantity unless we permit them to sell to us. Accordingly, I believe adoption of a liberalized trade program will result in more rather than fewer jobs for American people.

The program envisioned in H. R. 1 is moderate. The existing safeguards for American industry (particularly the so-called peril-point and escape-clause provisions of existing law) are retained intact by the bill. Furthermore, the President has stated that, in administering the program, he will keep fully in mind the problems of particular domestic industries.

I believe this is a question upon which the American people must take the lead. If we falter now, our friends abroad will begin immediately to raise their own tariffs and to erect other barriers to international trade which will make it exceedingly difficult for us to sell.

For these reasons, I believe it is manifestly in the national interest to enact a more liberalized trade program. I intend to support it with all the vigor I possess. I do so with full knowledge of the fears that have been expressed by some but with a sincere conviction that enactment of the program will provide greater security and greater prosperity for all of us.

Mr. President, I respect this friend. He went on to add some personal political advice as a friend. I appreciate that, too; and I have no doubt that his letter represents the real apprehensions of business leaders, as well as of many employees, of that community. But, Mr. President, that apprehension is erroneously based.

I looked up the facts. Far more jobs of employees in that community depend upon exports of this commodity than upon the very meager imports which might perchance compete. Again I express my concern for the jobs of the 200,000 American citizens who are employed in the export trade in textiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the jobs of those who are employed in manufacturing textiles are not the only ones which would be adversely affected? Is not the prosperity of a large section of the South dependent upon the exports of cotton; and if we refuse to admit imports, will not the foreign markets for our raw cotton be largely shut off?

Mr. GORE. There can be but one answer: The foreign markets would then be shut off, not only for our exports of cotton, but for all our other exports.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Including tobacco, does the Senator from Tennessee not agree?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so—and also automobiles and many other commodities which are produced in this country. Like water, the international flow of goods seeks its level, seeks a balance. There must be a balance. How are we to achieve it? The textile lobby seems unwilling to have any imports come into the United States. Yet the industry is exporting $622 million worth of goods a year.

Mr. President, I ask: By what process are we to maintain not only the export trade in textiles, but also the export trade in farm commodities and in manufactured commodities? How are we to maintain the jobs of 4 million Americans whose employment is dependent upon the export trade of our Nation? I know that everyone is strongly in favor of exports, but who is willing to accept any imports? Let us find them. Oh, yes; the friends of mine from the South who for the first time have cast protectionist votes are strongly in favor of export trade. They want to open up foreign markets. That seems to be the solution for all our ills. But how meek are they when they are asked to accept a few imports.

Mr. President, let me point out to the senior Senator from Illinois that I have before me a list of 487 commodities which are not imported at all into the United States, because of virtual prohibition, or, at least, effective prohibition, created by tariff rates. I also have before me a list of 617 commodities which are imported into the United States in only negligible quantities. Why is that so? It is because of unrealistic, prohibitive tariff rates. Yet there is an amendment, already approved by the Senate Finance Committee, which denies the President the authority to reduce the tariff rates on those commodities through negotiated agreements.

Mr. President, who are those who are strongly in favor of developing foreign markets? By what process do they propose to develop foreign markets? Do they propose to develop foreign markets by having the United States dole out the money of American taxpayers? Is that the only answer? It is the only answer in the absence of acceptance of two-way trade.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Unless we are willing to take more imports, is it not true that it will be more and more difficult for the countries of Europe and for Japan to take cotton and tobacco in return?

Mr. GORE. Not only will it be more difficult, but it will become impossible unless we lend or give them the money with which to buy those commodities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What will that do to the cotton-producing areas of western Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia?

Mr. GORE. It would be ruinous to them, just as it would be ruinous to the 4 million Americans whose jobs depend upon America's export trade. In my opinion it would be ruinous also to the grand alliance of free nations which has been built up at such great cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What effect would a restrictive trade policy have on the export of tobacco from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina?

Mr. GORE. Soon the producers of burley tobacco are to vote, in a referendum, upon the acceptance of a further reduction in acreage allotments. Our tobacco farmers are about to vote upon a program which would reduce hundreds of thousands of tobacco farmers to an acreage of one-half of an acre.

In Geneva last year, in an effort to help build up a foreign market for tobacco which is so important to the hill farmers of Tennessee, I undertook to talk with some leaders of the tobacco industry in Europe. They want to buy more, but they have not the money with which to do it. How do we make the money available to them? Either through gift or through trade. There is no other way. Yet, because of unrealistically high tariffs, more than a thousand commodities are imported to no extent at all or in very negligible quantities. The distinguished Finance Committee would deny the President the power to make

any reduction in the tariff rates on those items. Yes; we want to build up foreign trade, but apparently not many are willing to do it in any manner except by saddling the burden upon the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have talked with quite a number of representatives of various lobbies. Of course, there are lobbies in many industries, and there is also the overall lobby.

The other day a certain lobbyist came to see me. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Tennessee a question relative to his approach. He said that while the foreign-trade program was all right for the tobacco growers, and was a fine thing for the automobile industry in Michigan, he did not think much of it for the textile industry. He refused to relate the importance of the automobile industry and the tobacco growers' business, the farm machinery industry, and many other things, to the textile industry. He did not say what those industries mean to the textile industry. I tried to argue with him. I did not have the statistics. I hope the junior Senator from Tennessee will have some. In the first place, a great many textiles go into automobiles. In the second place, if we could not export some automobiles, I wonder what would happen to the textile products purchased by the constituents of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and by the constituents of the junior Senator from Tennessee and myself who grow tobacco. So I think the lobby, in its great effort to prove its point, has been completely overlooking the fact that we must give the people of this Nation employment if they are to be able to buy the textiles manufactured in our mills all over the country.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I wish to compliment him upon the answer he gave to his caller. He could have gone one step further and said that the textile industry itself has a great stake in foreign trade, because last year, when, the lobby says, the United States was literally "flooded" with textile imports, this country exported eight times as much textiles as it imported.

That is why I say I am concerned with the method by which we maintain our export trade. I hope we can find some means of expanding it. I am not willing merely to accept a condition of status quo with respect to American foreign trade. As President Eisenhower said in New York today—and I do not undertake to quote him exactly—the expansion of a healthy, two-way trade means prosperity for this country.

Let me quote from the President's speech:

> Two-way trade, I believe, is a broad avenue by which all men and nations of good will can travel toward a golden era of peace and plenty. Your administration is committed to building it. I personally believe it is for the greater good of all 164 million of our people, and I shall not relax my personal effort toward its achievement.

Mr. President, fine as are these words, we need, and the country needs, a kind of leadership which will persuade at least one member of the President's party in the United States Senate to vote for the program. I applaud the President's words, but I remind him of the leadership which Woodrow Wilson provided for this program, and I contrast the lipservice to this program with the all-out fight of the President against a tax bill which would have given some relief to the hard-pressed many in this country.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the President today used the words which the Senator from Tennessee has quoted. Referring to the enactment of this program, he said that, "I shall not relax my personal effort toward its achievement." Does the Senator think that is good enough to secure the passage of the bill? Is it enough not to relax? The efforts have been approaching close to zero. Is it enough to continue with this low rate of encouragement? Will it not have to be increased very materially.

Mr. GORE. I am wondering if the President relaxed when he agreed to the amendment which would deny him the power he had requested, to reduce to 50 percent of the 1945 rate the tariffs on more than 1,000 items the importation of which is now virtually prohibited. If that is the kind of relaxation we are to have, then I say that the President's leadership is difficult to follow, because we are not sure that he will not turn aside, when we arrive at a crucial point, as he did last year, when, immediately preceding the vote, there was read to the United States Senate a letter from the President backing down on his request for this program.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee remembers the line of Gilbert and Sullivan in their The Gondoliers, in which the Duke of Plaza-Toro sings:

> He led his regiment from behind—
> He found it less exciting.

Would the Senator from Tennessee say that that is the attitude of the administration so far as the tariff fight is concerned?

Mr. GORE. I believe in the Army it is called a retrograde movement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While the Senator from Tennessee is fighting on the floor of the Senate for the President's program, what are the members of the President's own party doing?

Mr. GORE. They are voting against it in committee.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has referred to the 4 million people who are affected by our export business. That is the approximate number of employees so affected. As a member of the Committee on Finance and also as a Member of the Senate—as well as from my long experience in the Senate—one of the troubles I find is the fact that no one dramatizes the 4 million people who are affected by our export business, but everyone dramatizes the 100, 150, or 300 people who are involved in our imports.

How can we dramatize, for the benefit of the American people, the effect on the 4 million workers to whom the Senator has referred, instead of merely dramatizing the effect on the few who may be involved in some particular industry or some particular plant? Where does that duty to do that lie? Does it lie here or with the Executive Department, including the President of the United States?

Mr. GORE. I do not believe it lies exclusively with the Executive Department. As I said earlier, Members of the Senate have their direct constituency and also the national welfare to consider. Conversely, the President has but one constituency, the national interest. I believe it is the proper role of the Presidency not only to dramatize but to maximize the national interest.

I would not, however, excuse Members of the Senate from undertaking to dramatize—to use the word the able junior Senator from Kentucky has used—the effect on the welfare of the 4 million people whose livelihood depends upon the export trade, merely because the President has not done so.

The junior Senator from Tennessee is undertaking this afternoon on the floor of the Senate to dramatize the welfare of one segment of our industry, the textile industry, in which the jobs of approximately 200,000 persons depend upon export trade. I am trying to bring that point home by pointing out that approximately 5,000 persons in the State of Tennessee have jobs dependent upon textile exports.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to an amendment regarding textiles, which has been agreed to by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GORE. And many other commodities.

Mr. BARKLEY. That amendment calms the fears of those engaged in that industry about what may happen to it in the future because of imports from Japan, although at this moment only one-half of one percent of our domestic consumption of textiles is imported. The committee, with the assent of the State Department, which represents the administration, has agreed to an amendment which calms all their fears, so that they are no longer worried. However, there are a great many other commodities with regard to which the State Department and the administration have not agreed so far as an amendment of that character is concerned.

Would the Senator from Tennessee be able to discuss the relative importance of the textile industry, which has been calmed by the amendment already agreed to, with the sanction of the State Department and presumably the President of the United States himself, with other industries, which have equal fears, not only for the future but for the present?

Is the Senator from Tennessee able to discuss the comparative importance of

those industries? I refer particularly to employment and the relative importance to our national defense and our security of the commodities produced by such industries.

Mr. GORE. There is some question about how ably the junior Senator from Tennessee may be able to discuss that subject, but he will try to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator discuss that point.

Mr. GORE. Before doing so, I wish to call attention to the fact that the junior Senator from Kentucky has confirmed the cloakroom rumor to the effect that the administration has agreed to one amendment. I would not wish to catechize the Senator about proceedings within an executive session of his committee, but it is rumored in the cloakroom that the administration has agreed to this damaging amendment, which not only affects textiles but more than a thousand other commodities, and which denies the President the authority to make a 50-percent reduction in the tariff rates on items on which the tariff is now prohibitive.

Mr. BARKLEY. All that was accomplished. There is no need to limit it to cloakroom rumors, because the press has published the fact that the committee has agreed to an amendment, which it did on the recommendation of the State Department, changing the date from July 1 to January 1, 1955, because negotiations are now in progress between this country and Japan, which may be consummated before the 1st of July 1955. The amendment provides that, notwithstanding any agreement by way of a trade proposal between the United States and Japan which might be consummated between now and July 1, the tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1955, shall be the basis upon which any reduction of rates will be accomplished.

That amendment adopted by the committee calms particularly the fears of the textile industry. Therefore, no matter what may happen between now and July 1 the tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1955, must be the basis of any reductions. That amendment was agreed to by the State Department and by the administration.

Mr. GORE. Again I call attention to the contrast between the President's speech in New York and the action of the Eisenhower administration in agreeing to this first serious breach in the line, which favors a few special interests.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield, but I shall wish to come back later and answer the interrogation of the able junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the administration makes this concession on textiles, how can it logically refuse or prevent similar concessions to the oil industry, or to zinc, to lead, to fluorspar, and to a whole variety of other products?

Mr. GORE. The answer to that question involves a part of my answer to the able junior Senator from Kentucky. I do not know. Such amendments are essentially commodity amendments. If it is fair to calm the fears, so to speak, of one industry, why is it not equally fair to calm the fears of the coal industry, of the chemical industry, of marbles, and of clothespins, and all other segments of our economy?

I may say in all candor that I would not seriously quarrel with the junior Senator from Kentucky about that feature of the amendment which eliminates the possibility of placing one industry in double jeopardy, but I do quarrel with the part of the amendment which denies the President the authority, which he has requested, to negotiate tariff reductions to a rate 50 percent of that obtaining in 1945 on more than a thousand other commodities. I shall seek to eliminate it from the bill when it reaches the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not seen the President's speech or heard what was said, but in view of the Senator's remarks, I am wondering whether the speech delivered today in New York perpetuates the idea and the conviction that in this administration the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing and is seeking perpetually to conceal what the left hand is doing. I am speaking in a blind alley, because I have not read the President's speech and I do not know what he talked about.

Mr. GORE. I have read the speech. I think the result can be accurately described as the Senator has described it. To put it in my own language, it is a repetition of the President's habit of never coming to grips with the practicalities of the issues before the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know that many noble sentiments have been expressed in speeches and messages, but those who have been brought here by the administration seek immediately to nullify them, and I am wondering whether this latest emanation from the White House is in consonance with the almost universal practice of the top level that noble sentiments are uttered in messages and in speeches, but, forthwith, those who were brought here by the President seek to nullify every noble sentiment he expresses.

Mr. GORE. Insofar as I see it, it follows the pattern of the President preaching one thing and his administration practicing something else.

Mr. BARKLEY. In my long experience here I cannot remember any time when at any top level the right hand has never known what the left hand was doing. There is only one comparison I can make, and that is the occasion when the hand of Esau got tangled up with the voice of Jacob.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his contribution. I find myself in agreement with him.

Further to answer the Senator, and trying to put the textile industry into proper focus, it has been estimated that the jobs of 200,000 persons are dependent upon the export of textile products. It is estimated that some 4 million Americans are employed in the export trade generally. So it is apparent that the textile industry accounts for approximately one-twentieth of the entire employment in the export trade of the United States. But while the industry is confronted with meager import competition, amounting to less than one-half of 1 percent of the domestic production, the tariff lobby succeeds, I regret to say, in arousing fears and apprehensions in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of our people.

I say, Mr. President, that we must seek not only to maintain, but to expand, our export trade. This is important not only to the one-twentieth of our export workers in the textile industry, but also to the prosperity of all America.

Mr. President, it is because I have examined the facts in some considerable detail that I have not been frightened by the propaganda of the tariff lobby which, as I say, has used the textile industry as its chosen instrument.

I take this occasion to lay before the Senate and the American people some of the facts as I have found them after careful study.

I refer to the textile industry in particular, first, because of my concern in maintaining our export trade in textiles; second, because it has been the chosen instrument of the tariff lobby, and through that instrument the lobby has been most successful in arousing, without foundation, the fears and apprehensions of the people; and, third, because it represents the first yielding by both the administration and the distinguished and able Senate Finance Committee to special interests.

I fear that this example may be followed by further concessions to this group and that group, as was indicated by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. This group, that group, and all the groups make up America.

I do not believe the President of the United States would so use the power he requests as seriously to harm any major segment of our society. I think he would use it advisedly.

I wish we would face some of the real facts which refute the propaganda of the tariff lobby.

Let us first face up to one obvious fact, and that is that in recent months the cotton textile industry has gone through a period of adjustment. Production of cotton cloth reached a peak of 10,184,000,000 square yards in 1953 after a moderate dip in 1952. There was a moderate decline in production in 1954. Total production over the past few years has been fairly static. There is no denying that there is increased competition in the cotton-textile industry and that this increased competition has imposed adjustment problems on many mills, particularly on the less efficient and marginal producers.

But if we are to understand the problem adequately and evaluate the implications of H. R. 1 for the cotton textile industry, the question that must be answered is: have imports of competitive cotton textile products caused the difficulties the domestic industry has encountered in recent years? We must also ask ourselves, what is the real stake of the cotton textile industry in foreign trade? Does it have more to gain from

exports than it has to fear from imports? What about H. R. 1? Will enactment of H. R. 1 really imperil the cotton textile industry?

If we examine these questions and look for the answers calmly, factually, and dispassionately, I believe we will arrive at the conclusion that the industry's difficulties are not due to imports; that it has an overwhelming stake in exports as opposed to the danger of imports; and that passage of H. R. 1, with the contribution it can make to the liberalization and expansion of world trade, can bring important net returns to the cotton textile industry.

The industry's difficulties have been primarily domestic in origin. Regional shifts in the producton of cotton textiles have brought with them adjustment problems for the areas from which industry has moved.

Increased competition—domestic, that is—has created adjustment problems for the less efficient producers in all the producing regions. Curtailment in military procurement of textiles has necessitated adjustment to production for civilian requirements. Then, technological changes in the industry have created both increased economies of production and a curtailment of employment. The development of new fibers and their admixture into new types of cloth have created still more problems. Aside from the technical problem that this involves, there are also marketing problems. Perhaps the most important development has been the change in demand for textiles, and the acute competition among the different fibers resulting from the development of synthetic fibers.

From 1950 to 1953 there was a 17 percent decline in the per capita consumption of textiles by the people of the United States. In the case of cotton, this decline was 14 percent. In the case of wool it was 42 percent. A 42 percent decline in the per capita consumption of woolen textiles is, of course, a very formidable and difficult problem. Much of the decline in wool demand is due to a shift in preference on the part of the American consumer to lighter weight fabrics. As a result, from 1947 to 1953, there was a decline in consumption of men's wool suits of 7,000,000 units in the United States. This was not caused by imports. Imports of woolen and worsted cloth have never been more than 6 percent of domestic production, and in 1953 were only 4.5 percent of production.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Tennessee is presenting some interesting figures. I am delighted to have the information.

As I understand, the fibers to which the Senator is referring are fibers such as nylon, orlon, and others—new fibers which have been developed and which have displaced some of the market for cotton and wool.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and also rayon and dacron. Numerous synthetic fibers are now vigorously competing with cotton and wool. I shall cite in a few moments the exact magnitude of the choice of the American people for the various fibers.

Let us look closely at the changing pattern of mill consumption in the United States of the different fibers—cotton, wool, rayon, acetate, and other synthetic fibers. A Department of Agriculture publication entitled "The Cotton Situation," No. CS 157, dated March 1955, has a table on page 20 showing the historical changes in total and per capita mill consumption in the United States in different fibers. Per capita consumption of cotton in 1946 was about 34 pounds. In 1954 it was down to 25 pounds. Despite an increase in population, total mill consumption declined from 4.8 billion pounds in 1946, to 4.1 billion pounds in 1954.

I call the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to the fact that this decline has occurred within the United States as a result of the preferences of the American consumers, without any relationship whatsoever to imports. Yet the tariff lobby will cite the reduction in employment in the cotton-textile industry as evidence that the United States has been flooded with foreign imports.

It is insinuated that such reduction in employment is the result of foreign imports. That is not so. The textile lobby has deliberately sought to mislead the American people.

Cotton lost in its relative position with respect to the consumption of all fibers. In 1946, consumption of cotton amounted to 74 percent of the consumption of all fibers, but had dropped to 68.5 percent in 1954.

The change in wool was even greater. Per capita consumption declined from 5.2 pounds in 1946 to 2.4 pounds in 1954 and wool's percentage share in the total market fell from 11.3 percent in 1946 to 6.4 percent in 1954, more than 50 percent drop in 8 years.

I now come to a discussion of the question asked by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Correspondingly, the use of synthetic fibers has increased. I neither applaud nor deplore this. I am simply laying before the Senate the facts relating to the textile industry which have been used by the tariff lobby to plant fear in the hearts of millions of our people, and in an effort to misguide, mislead, distort, and thwart the judgment of Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator state the percentage of the cotton textile production represented by imports at this time, and the percentage of American production which is exported? Does the Senator have such figures available?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I shall come to them very quickly. Six percent of our production is exported; less than one-half of 1 percent of our production is imported.

Last year, as I have said earlier, the textile industry exported eight times the amount that was imported. But that is not all of the picture with respect to that particular fact, because the imports were largely of specialty items which, in the main, are not competitive in the American market.

Later I shall cite examples of the imports and show that the bulk of the American textile production is not only able to compete successfully in the United States but is also able to compete successfully in the world markets, where our products face the same import restrictions as do the products of other countries.

Rayon and acetate fibers showed a per capita consumption in 1946 of 6.3 pounds and in 1954 of 7.1 pounds. Its percentage share of total consumption rose from 13.5 percent in 1946 to 19.2 percent in 1954. Most dramatic of all were the changes in such synthetic fibers as nylon, orlon, and dacron, and so forth. In 1946 per capita consumption was 0.4 pounds; in 1954 it was 2.1 pounds. It increased by a multiple of 5 or more in that 8-year period.

Total consumption increased from 54.2 million pounds in 1946 to 342.1 million pounds in 1954. Its percentage share of the total market rose from 0.8 percent in 1946 to 5.7 percent in 1954.

This was not because of imports; it was because of the technological development within the United States—improvements and developments in the production of fibers—and to the preferences shown by a substantial number of American citizens.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. According to the Senator's argument, the textile industry is picking on the wrong culprit. It is not the importers who are responsible for any decline in the textile industry in this country; it is the producers of other lighter materials, of the sorts which the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. GORE. The conclusion of the able Senator is inescapable when the facts are read and considered. However, I wish to point out that the cotton textile industry has a great stake in international trade. As I pointed out, the cotton textile industry last year exported eight times as much as was imported. As I have cited several times this afternoon, that situation involves jobs in that industry. I shall cite that fact again, because I am undertaking to dramatize the interests of American workers and American industry in export trade. I point this fact out to the Senator again to illustrate that the cotton textile industry, instead of being harmed by international trade, has a great net stake in that trade, and it should be interested in expanding rather than contracting it. Where is the representative of a textile industry, or a Member of the House or a Senator representing respectively, a district, or a State, as I do, in part, in which there is substantial employment in the textile industry, who would advocate destroying our foreign markets, which would result in reduced employment in that industry?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. What the Senator is saying about the troubles of the textile industry being so much at variance with the facts as related before the committee reminds me of the story of a prizefighter who had an optimistic manager. The manager would try to encourage the boy by telling him that he was doing fine. The fighter was engaged in a match in which he was doing poorly. At the end of one of the rounds he asked his manager, "How am I doing?" The manager replied, "Fine. He hasn't laid a glove on you." The fighter said, "When I go back for the next round, I want you to watch the referee, because someone has been punching the daylights out of me."

Obviously it is competition from other materials which is causing difficulty for the textile processors and industry. I believe the Senator from Tennessee has made a case that imports are not causing the trouble.

Mr. GORE. The figures on decreasing employment and the decline in the cotton-textile industry which were presented to the committee are disturbing, indeed; but I point out to the Senator that throughout American industry there is a tendency for greater production per man-hour. What is the word that I see used so much? It is automation. Workers are fearful of that in the automobile industry, in the appliance industry, and in all manufacturing industries. It is my hope that eventually this trend toward more productivity per man-hour will result in benefit to the American people. I would not attempt to stop automation, but I do regret to see persons temporarily lose their jobs because of it. But there has been increased employment for textile workers as a result of the export trade in textiles to a far greater extent than there has been a decrease in jobs as a result of import competition.

Mr. LONG. So actually, the textile people are about 12 to 1 ahead, if one compares the ratio of exports to imports. If I understood the Senator correctly, the figures he cited show that this Nation exports about 12 times as much, in dollar value, as it imports. I believe the Senator stated that 6 percent of our textile production went into exports, and one-half of 1 percent of textiles used in this country came in as imports.

Mr. GORE. The only reason why I hesitate to confirm what the Senator from Louisiana has stated is that he has translated the percentage into dollar value. I am not sure that when translated into dollar value the same percentage would be arrived at, because of the difference in retail markups and manufacturers' costs. I am not sure how the figure would come out, but it is a substantial sum. I am advised that the percentages refer to square yards of products.

Mr. LONG. A 12 to 1 ratio would be a good offhand guess of the favorable balance of trade in cotton textiles, would it not?

Mr. GORE. I wish to give the figures exactly. Cotton manufactures and semimanufactures accounted for $83.1 million in imports, but the value of comparable exports was $317.3 million.

Imports of synthetic fibers and goods were worth $32 million, but exports of those commodities were worth $217 million.

If in my own business I were to have a customer to whom I sold eight times as much as I bought from him, I would consider him to be a good customer, and I would try to seek ways to keep his patronage, rather than to try to cut him off and refuse to buy the small amount of his own product which would enable him to continue buying from me.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not present on the floor throughout the Senator's very interesting and informative speech. I listened to the figures he has given with regard to the relative position of exports and imports of fiber-made goods. I wonder whether the Senator included in those figures the carpet and rug industry of this country, or whether the figures included mainly wearing apparel.

Mr. GORE. The figures I gave were overall figures. I think I shall be able to find the figures with respect to the specific product about which the Senator has inquired. There are certain specialty items as to which there are significant imports.

The overall figures I gave indicate that imports of textiles as a whole are small and relatively negligible. I do not have the exact figures with respect to the particular commodity about which the Senator has inquired, but I shall undertake to obtain that information and have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. Steele Winterer, president of the Carpet Institute, Inc., reported to the House Ways and Means Committee that imports of machine-made rugs in 1954 amounted to about 5 percent of production. Imports were worth from $15 million to $20 million, and domestic production was worth about $400 million.

The Census Bureau reported late in 1954 that production of tufted textile products, and woven and knitted cotton rugs reached a new alltime high record in the first half of 1954.

The per capita consumption of all fibers fell from 46 pounds in 1946 to 37.1 pounds in 1954, and total consumption fell from 6.5 billion pounds to 6 billion pounds in the same period. There was thus a decline from 1946 to 1954 in the total mill consumption of fibers of just under half a billion pounds.

These changes in the consumption of fibers by United States mills, and in the composition of fiber consumption, have been domestic changes exclusively. They are not related to imports. They are the major influences which have affected the production of cotton cloth in the United States during the postwar period.

Although production levels have not changed very much, employment has. This is a very interesting phenomenon. For example, between 1951 and 1953, employment in cotton textile mills fell by about 20 percent while production between 1951 and 1953 increased by 200 million square yards. I read recently in Mr. J. A. Livingston's syndicated column, The Business Outlook, of March 6, 1955, that production of textile products as a whole—which included cotton textile products—increased 13 percent from December 1953 to December 1954, but employment declined by 3 percent. Of course, this development has no more been confined to textile industry than it can be blamed on imports. It has occurred in other industries where production techniques have been improved. For example, in the case of oil and petroleum products, production increased 9 percent while employment declined 5 percent. Production of transportation equipment increased 9 percent and employment decreased by 6 percent. As a matter of fact, national industrial production was up 5 percent and employment was down 4 percent during this same period.

Unmistakably, the trend in our economy is toward greater productivity and efficiency in production. It is to be hoped that this trend will create new jobs and that the decline in employment will be of short duration.

Fortunately, there is evidence that the depressed conditions of textiles in 1954 may have been reversed. The cotton situation report of last month points out that "the cotton textile industry was depressed during most of 1954 but rose to higher levels of operation late in 1954 and early in 1955."

One thing is sure: No good can come from falsely attributing this decline in employment to import competition. Over the same period which Mr. Livingston's statistics cover, our total merchandise imports decreased while our merchandise exports increased. Under that set of circumstances could the lobby blame the loss of employment on imports, when during this period imports decreased and exports increased? If anything, the effect of foreign trade on the domestic production and employment situation in 1954 was such that it supported production and employment. In the absence of this net gain in our foreign trade position, the decline in employment would have been greater.

As I said a moment ago, as the trend toward automation grows, we shall perhaps need fewer and fewer workers to produce all our domestic market can consume. If we are to maintain a high level of employment in this country, it is imperative, as the President said in his speech in New York, that we begin to move now to develop markets abroad where we can sell the greater surplus we shall soon be producing. Otherwise, we may have to cope with a most distressing problem of unemployment.

Mr. President, having established, at least in a prima facie fashion, that the influences at work on the cotton textile industry have been primarily, if not exclusively, domestic in nature, let us examine more closely our net stake in foreign trade in cotton textiles. Have imports of cotton textiles exceeded exports, so as to cause a net loss to domestic producers and, by so doing, contributed to the distress of the industry? Or do exports exceed imports, and thereby constitute an important outlet for our domestic production of cotton textiles? What of foreign trade in textiles made

of synthetic fibers? Is that a source of competition or an important market for the domestic industry?

I have already answered those questions, I believe; at least the record speaks quite loudly.

Let me state first, in summary fashion, the overall picture of exports and imports of textile manufactures for 1954.

The bulk of our exports were made up of cotton and synthetic textiles and textiles manufactures. It is to this area of the trade that much of the lobby's propaganda is directed. Imports of cotton and synthetic textiles and textile manufactures totaled only $115.1 million, while comparable exports were valued at $534.8 million, or 460 percent greater.

Cotton semimanufactures and cotton manufactures accounted for $83.1 million in imports, but the value of comparable exports was $317.3 million. Imports of synthetic fibers and manufactures were worth $32 million, but exports of these commodities were worth $217.5 million.

The particular product upon which the textile lobby centers its fire is cotton cloth, sometimes called cotton piecegoods. This category includes the whole wide variety of cotton textiles that are the major products of American textile mills. Here is the situation on cotton cloth. In 1954, we exported 605 million square yards, while our imports were only 73 million square yards. Thus, out of a total domestic production of almost 10 billion square yards of cloth, we exported over 6 percent of our production, whereas imports were the equivalent of less than 1 percent of our production. This is a statistical fact which deserves more attention than it has received. Surely on cotton cloth alone—and let me repeat once more that it is in the area of cotton cloth that so much fear has been excited over imports—our square yard exports are something of the order of 8 times our imports. In fact, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute itself has pointed out that this export business supports some 45 thousand jobs in the cotton textile industry.

The story on foreign trade is even more favorable with respect to cloth made of synthetic fibers. There, fully 7 percent of total production finds its way into export markets, and both production and exports have been growing over time, while imports have been on the decline.

But it is sometimes argued that total figures conceal as much as they reveal. I think that in this case what they may conceal is the fact that imports are even less important competitively than the textile lobby would have us believe, for to a large extent only selected items of cotton textiles come into this country. I have previously called that to the attention of the Senator from New York. They are for the most part either low-grade, low-cost gray goods on the one hand, or the fine cotton products like damask which require a lot of handwork, on the other. The bulk of American production of cotton textiles enjoys no significant import competition.

The fears we hear so much about are fears of competition of imports from Japan. So let us take a close look at the imports of cotton manufactures from Japan. I call this to your attention, Mr. President, because in this effort, this afternoon, I am undertaking to face all the facts, and not to dodge any.

In 1953 these imports totaled $18.7 million in value. This total was made up of four major categories:

First, cotton cloth, of which we imported from Japan 31 million square yards, or 5.2 million dollars' worth;

Second, table damask of which imports were valued in 1953 at $3.8 million;

Third, cotton wearing apparel in the value of $1.4 million; and

Fourth, cotton floor coverings worth $4.7 million, of which we imported about 3½ million square yards.

In 1954, these imports increased. I think we should acknowledge that, but we should also examine it. Total imports of cotton manufacturers from Japan were worth $23.1 million, an increase of $4.3 million over the 1953 levels. In the case of cotton cloth, 1954 imports were $9 million, or 48 million square yards, an increase of 17 million square yards over 1953. Imports of table damask in 1954 were the same as in 1953. Wearing apparel imports increased from $1.7 million to $3.1 million, while imports of floor coverings fell in value to $4 million.

I believe that is a partial answer to the questions asked by the able Senator from New York. The facts show that imports of floor coverings from Japan were less in 1954 than in 1953; and I believe Japan is the principal source of import competition in the case of this particular item. It is important for us to recognize that 1954 was labeled by the cotton textile lobby as a year in which the American market was swamped by a devastating inundation of Japanese cotton textile imports. Frankly, I fail to see by what test it is appropriate to call the increase in imports in 1954 a flood. It amounted to less than one-half of 1 percent of our production, let me again remind the Senate.

But let us look behind these figures and see what we can find. As I have said, Mr. President, there was an increase in imports from Japan of cotton textiles in the last quarter of 1954. Most of that increase was in the last quarter.

In fact, almost half of the imports of cotton cloth from Japan came in the last quarter of 1954. Does this show, as the textile lobby would have us believe, a new trend in imports of cotton goods from Japan? I think not. But that is what the lobbyists sought to lead the Senate Finance Committee to think. However, I do not believe that is the case. I am advised that the Japanese economy suffered serious inflation last year. The Japanese Government undertook a policy of deflation by restricting bank credit in order to get Japanese prices back into line. Japanese cotton textile manufacturers, short of cash, sought to liquidate their inventories of finished goods, in order to finance the purchase of the raw cotton which was necessary to keep their production going. The result was the sale of textiles at which might be called distressed prices. At times, it appears that the prices at which these products were sold to United States importers were below the cost of production in Japan. This practice I frown upon. I am advised by responsible persons in the State Department that the practice has now been stopped, and I understand that efforts have been made to insure that it will not recur.

There are two lessons to be learned from this situation. One is that there is need for stability and growth in the Japanese economy. Since that economy is so dependent upon foreign trade, it must follow that a most important avenue of stability and growth for Japan is an expansion of her foreign trade throughout the markets of the free world.

I wish to point out that the negotiations now underway in Geneva involve not only the United States and Japan, but 15 or 18 other nations. What is needed by Japan and by the United States is not two-way trade, but multilateral trade. We furnish Japan a large amount of the raw materials necessary for her industry. In fact, we sell to Japan three times as much as we import from her. What is needed is a reciprocal trade agreement arrangement by which the United States cannot only continue to sell what it now sells, but can sell more raw products to Japan, so that Japan, in turn, may process such products into manufactured items and sell them in Southeast Asia. Then we, in turn, need and can take strategic materials — rubber, tin, manganese, chrome, mica, and other products—from Japan's customers in Southeast Asia.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the thesis of the Senator from Tennessee. I think the answer is, as was brought out in the colloquy a few moments ago with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], to build up customers for Japan. But how are we to build up, within any reasonable measurable time, the purchasing power of the Southeast Asiatic countries which can, and should be, customers of Japan?

Mr. GORE. We can build it up if the United States buys, if South America buys, and if Western Europe buys more of the very important products which are indigenous to that area. That is an area with vast resources which we need, and which the people of many other nations need. If they are purchased there, the people of that area will have an enhanced income and purchasing power which they, in turn, can use to purchase from Japan, and which Japan, in turn, can use to purchase more from the United States. That is one way to do it. There are other ways—education, economic development, and so forth. The dynamic process of growth, development, enlightenment, and education will provide increased purchasing power in that important area.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have always felt that Japan—and perhaps India—probably represented the key to what is to happen in the Far East. If we can keep them on the democratic side, we have a chance for our way of life eventually to survive and make progress in the Far East. The ironical thing is that some of those who talk about a strong Japan and the necessity of strengthening Japan, in an effort to see that Japan survives the economic storms and the efforts the Communists are making to infiltrate, are mainly also the ones who are strongly opposed to increasing trade with Japan, without which she cannot possibly survive. Is not that the experience the Senator is finding?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is indeed correct. When we talk of trade with Japan, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, we are discussing a question which is vital to the security of the United States and the free world.

Saturday night I listened to a magnificent address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. In that address he paid eloquent tribute to the Japanese people and predicted for them a return to the responsible and powerful part they have played in the past in world society. I want that part to be played on the side of freedom, on the side of democracy, on the side with which the survival of the United States of America is inexorably involved.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator see how we can logically advocate preventing Japan from trading extensively with Communist China and with other Communist nations, and at the same time take positions, as apparently so many members of the Finance Committee have taken, which would still further reduce our trade with that nation?

Mr. GORE. As the Senator knows, Japan is a country of very limited natural resources, great density of population, and consequently stringent economic conditions. For her the choice is rather stark. It is either trade or starve. I agree fully with my senior colleague.

From our import experience in the last quarter of 1954, there is another lesson we must learn, and that is that we really have little to fear from Japan in the way of huge inflows of cotton textiles into the American market. It required depressed prices on sales of cotton cloth to increase Japanese penetration of our market by 17 million square yards in 1954. This 17 million square yards is to be compared with a total domestic production of 10 billion square yards. It represents seventeen one hundredths of 1 percent. Under normal price conditions it is doubtful that Japan could have expanded her sales appreciably in competition with domestic production.

But she could, I believe—and I think she should—be able to increase the export and sale of her commodities among the free nations of the world, to her profit, to their profit, and to the benefit of the United States if the negotiations envisioned by H. R. 1 are successful.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Tennessee has referred to a speech which the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] delivered last Saturday night, I believe, before the National Press Club. I did not have the privilege of listening to that speech. However, among my colleagues in the Senate I have very great regard and respect for the senior Senator from Georgia. The impression which I received from reading the press reports was that he was not wholly satisfied with the provisions of House bill 1 regarding our trade with Japan. As I say, that was the impression which I gained. I may have been mistaken. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee can advise me authoritatively. I received the impression that the Senator from Georgia believed that the authority given to the President to deal with Japan on tariff matters was too broad, and should be limited. As I say, I may be mistaken.

Mr. GORE. I would prefer to have the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia speak for himself in that regard. I am not sure that my understanding of what he said and meant would exactly comport with his own meaning and understanding. If the Senator from New York will pardon me, I should prefer to have the senior Senator from Georgia answer that question himself.

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully understand the Senator's position. I suggested that he might hesitate to speak for the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. It is perfectly true that there are individual specialty items where imports have been a significant proportion of domestic production. But the total domestic production of these products is a small part of our entire production of cotton goods. One of these specialty items is velveteens. Total United States production of velveteens was about 3 million square yards in 1954, as compared to the total production of 10 billion square yards of cotton cloth. There were 1,190 looms in the United States producing velveteens and less than 1,000 workers engaged in their production.

Ginghams are another item where imports are supposed to be sizable. There are no separate import data from ginghams but it is understood that these imports increased substantially in 1953–54 from the United Kingdom and Austria. But again, ginghams constitute only a small part of our total national textile production. Last year the production is estimated at only about 57,250,000 yards, less than 1 percent of our 10-billion-yard total cotton textile production.

The lobby tells us there is a critical situation in damasks. Even if there is stiff competition in this speciality line, it does not necessarily follow that the textile industry will be irreparably damaged, for our damask production is only about 15 million square yards a year. Shall the whole foreign economic program of the United States be jeopardized because of a few specialty items?

Would the textile industry refuse to accept the importation of any textile product whatever? If so, I come back to the question I asked earlier in my speech: What other segment of American society shall we expect to bear the burden of accepting import competition to balance our exports of $622 million worth of textiles?

I wish to refer to one other item, namely, the manufacture of shirts. Actually, in the shirt-manufacturing field there is very little competition from imports. Nevertheless, the tariff lobby has succeeded in arousing fear among the employees of shirt factories until they have been writing me by the hundreds. Merchants who depend upon shirt factory employees for trade have likewise been writing me, as have chamber of commerce representatives, shirt factory owners, and plant superintendents.

I have in my hand typical letters from shirt factory employees in my State, and I should like to read a letter that comes from Milan, Tenn.:

> DEAR SIR: Will you please come to our rescue by voting against low tariff laws. People are out of work, many with children to support, because we can't sell our products made here at home. Foreign trade is putting many families on starvation.

I think it is reprehensible for a lobby in Washington, financed with huge self-interest funds, to seek to mislead and to succeed in misleading people, and to throw fear into their hearts. The writer of this letter concludes her appeal with these words:

> Please won't you help us by helping our country get rid of low-tariff laws. Thank you.

The facts show that there is no reason for this lady to be alarmed about her job because of the importation of shirts. Quite to the contrary, her job might well depend upon the exportation of shirts, as is the case with the jobs of many of those who work with her.

What are the facts?

In 1954, United States imports of men's shirts amounted to less than 0.8 of 1 percent of United States production. Imports in 1953 were even less. United States production of men's shirts in 1954 exceeded 19 million dozen. Imports amounted to $915,836, but we exported more than 6 times this amount, $5,881,300 worth.

Compared with total production, however, the imports appear even less consequential—less, as I have said, than 1 percent. Yet the propaganda of the tariff lobby has succeeded in this case, as in others, in arousing fear where there is no cause for fear.

From this one plant I received 143 letters, all written according to the pattern suggested by the tariff lobby.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Tennessee visited Louisiana some years ago, and I was very much honored to have him as my guest for a few hours. I am sure he recalls that during his visit he spoke at a parish fair in southwestern Louisiana, where he addressed a large gathering, and that at that gathering he observed rice growing as far as the eye could see in every direction.

Mr. GORE. And there was a very large gathering of people, too.

Mr. LONG. The people the Senator spoke to on that day were rice farmers. They must sell at least half of their rice to overseas customers. They depend on people overseas who have dollars with which to purchase the rice. I am sure the Senator has visited other areas of our country, such as in the State of Tennessee, where cotton grows as far as the eye can see.

The Senator himself has pointed out in debate on the floor of the Senate that in good years 50 percent of that cotton must be exported to people who need the cotton, so that they may process it into clothing and other products.

The millions of American cotton farmers need cotton customers. They can get them only if the customers are able to earn dollars with which to buy the cotton. Is that not about the situation?

Mr. GORE. That is precisely the situation. Not ony are cotton farmers, rice farmers, tobacco farmers, and wheat farmers interested in export trade, but so are 200,000 textile workers. The same thing is true of 4 million other Americans engaged in industry. A loss of our export trade will result in a contraction of our economy, a lessening of our industrial employment, and a shrinking of markets for our farm products. No one advocates that, of course. However, where are those who are willing to do the things necessary not only to maintain our present export trade but to expand it, which I believe would be healthy, not only for this country, but for the free world as a whole?

I appreciate the contribution of the able junior Senator from Louisiana. I recall with pleasure being in his company upon the occasion to which he has referred. I enjoyed my visit to the great State of Louisiana. My heart was warmed by the esteem and genuine affection in which I found he was held by his fellow citizens.

But I wish to point out to him that the welfare of those people, as is true of the welfare of the United States as a whole and of the free world, is involved in maintaining economic solidarity in the great and grand alliance of free nations which we have built up at such a great cost, and upon which the security of this country so vitally depends.

The Senator referred to the export of cotton. I wish to recall to his attention specific figures. In 1954 the United States exported $125 million worth of cotton to Japan. The total import of cotton textiles to this country, mostly in specialty items which competed but little with American industry, was $23 million worth. Would not the Senator think that when we have a customer who takes $125 million worth of our products, of which we have huge unmanageable surpluses, in return for only $23 million worth of imports, largely noncompetitive, he is a valuable customer?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One point that might escape the eye is that by Japan's taking this cotton from the United States she is able to sell to customers to whom we cannot sell. The Senator from Tennessee is very familiar with the fact that all the nations of the world are seeking dollars, but they cannot get the necessary dollars to pay us for goods they would like to buy from us. In many cases they can trade with Japan because they do not have to have dollars in order to trade with that country.

Mr. GORE. I come back to the fact that there are only two ways by which other nations which do not mint or print dollars can obtain them. One is by trade with the United States, and the other is by grants and gifts from the United States.

Mr. LONG. The thought occurs to me that while I should prefer to have someone overseas buy cotton shirts made in the United States, if it came to deciding whether that person was going to buy a cotton shirt from Japan or from Russia, I should prefer that Japan get the customer in preference to Russia.

Mr. GORE. I see that the Senator and I are viewing the problem very nearly alike. I point out that the Soviet Union has made trade agreements involving the sale of cotton. However, I would not overemphasize the state of the cotton industry is international trade.

I have sought today to pinpoint the textile industry because it has been the chosen instrument of the tariff lobby with which to invade the South with protectionist philosophy, and because it is through this chosen instrument that the tariff lobby has had its most marked success in opposition to the passage of H. R. 1 without crippling amendments.

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator has picked a good example. Speaking as one who, in part, represents a State which has only a very small proportion of the Nation's textile production, I have received literally hundreds of letters from persons who wish to prohibit or prevent any expansion of trade in cotton textiles.

Mr. GORE. Contrary to the Senator's situation, I have the honor of representing, in part, a State which has much textile production. More than 60,000 persons whom I, in part, have the honor of representing are employed directly in the textile industry. The prosperity of many communities in Tennessee is dependent upon the textile industry. Therefore, when I discuss the question I do so with real interest, with genuine interest in the welfare of the industry, and I have undertaken to express my resentment at the misrepresentation of facts relating to that industry.

Mr. President, I point out to the junior Senator from Louisiana that, whereas there are many plants producing textiles in my State, the industry is growing in the State of Louisiana. There are now 15 plants in the State of Louisiana producing textiles.

Despite the spreading alarm, records show that the United States has increased her textile exports and decreased her imports as compared with prewar. With United States production of cotton cloth up by 2 billion square yards in 1953 over 1939, our exports in 1953 took a little over 6 percent of our production as compared with 4 percent in 1939. Imports were about one-half of 1 percent of our production in 1953, only about one-third the percentage of 1939.

So, despite this great cry of alarm, look at the trend. Look at the success with which the American textile industry, through the ingenuity of American workers and American management, has met the competition.

Our exports of cotton yarn were up to 17.2 million pounds in 1953 as compared with 9.9 million pounds in 1938, and our imports of cotton yarn were down to 200,000 pounds in 1953 compared to 1 million pounds in 1938. In the case of rayon piece goods, our position has likewise improved. Production has increased by almost 50 percent since 1938, imports in 1953 were 6 million square yards as compared with 3 million in 1938, and United States exports have risen from 26 million square yards to 216 million square yards in 1953.

These developments are not surprising. The United States textile industry enjoys a very strong competitive position, not only at home but also in foreign markets. How else could it export last year eight times as much cotton cloth as was imported? Even in 1954, when domestic production of cotton cloth fell below 10 billion square yards, exports helped sustain the industry.

In the case of cotton duck and allied fabrics, production in 1954 fell by 300 million square yards below 1953. Exports, however, increased by 1.5 million square yards—exports increased from 3.5 percent of production in 1953 to 4.5 percent in 1954.

As I have said, over 6 percent of our production of cotton-print cloth was exported in 1954.

In the case of denims, production declined from 394 million square yards in 1953 to 380 million square yards in 1954. But exports stayed up and rose, as a percentage of production, from 7.8 percent in 1953 to 9.2 percent in 1954. Meanwhile, imports of denims were insignificant.

Take cotton tapestry, upholstery, and drapery materials. Production in 1954 increased by 20 million square yards and exports increased from 3.8 percent of production in 1953 to 4.1 percent in 1954.

Imports were only a fourth of exports. As I have indicated, total exports of cotton cloth declined somewhat in 1954. But there is evidence that exports are increasing and helping to sustain the recovery in the industry. Our exports in each of the last 3 months of 1954 were actually greater than exports in the corresponding months of 1953.

Let me read some excerpts from a speech delivered by Mr. Matthew J. Cuffe, the president of the Textile Export Association of the United States to the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute at New Orleans on April 23, 1954. The text of his address appeared in the Journal of Commerce for April 26, 1954.

> I am certain that everyone is aware of how necessary a prosperous export trade is to the smooth and profitable functioning of our industry. Since the lifting of foreign trade restrictions early in 1947, more than 6 billion yards of American cotton textiles have been shipped overseas. This volume, together with military purchases, supplied that so-called plus business which enabled the industry to operate its equipment at a rate far in excess of the prewar average, to pay the

highest wages in the world, and at the same time furnish steady to overtime employment to a half million workers, and yield highly satisfactory returns to thousands of stockholders.

But even these figures fail to picture accurately the vast extent of our export trade. Customarily, the fluctuations in our foreign trade are measured in terms of countable cotton cloths. These figures do not include many items which cannot be measured in terms of yardage and are listed either in pounds, units or in dollars.

For example, our exports of countable cotton cloth last year amounted to 620.8 million square yards. Incidentally, this total does not include exports to territories and possessions of the United States such as Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska which amounted to almost about 75 million yards. In addition, our industry exported 17,235,000 pounds of cotton yarn, 20,879,497 pounds of remnants, a million and a half cotton blankets, more than 800,000 bedspreads, 228,000 dozen sheets and pillowcases, 370,000 dozen handkerchiefs, close to 4 million pounds of cotton bags, about 12 million yards of assorted drapery fabrics, plushes, pile fabrics, etc. I cite these figures as an examples of the range of the industry's foreign-trade interests. Loss of this business, I think you'll agree, would cause grave repercussions in our domestic merchandising and manufacturing centers.

After discussing the problems of restrictions abroad against our exports of textiles, Mr. Cuffe goes on to say:

I hope that what I have said does not lead anyone here to the belief that there is no room for American textiles in international trade and that the only course open to us is to retreat gracefully and concentrate on our domestic markets.

We in the export trade have consistently maintained that there are tremendous outlets for American goods which are being denied us by artifical and discriminatory trade barriers. We cannot hope to compete on a price basis with the low-count staples of Japan and India. Our mass production methods make it impossible for us to compete with so-called luxury items of Western Europe. But in the so-called middle ground American cotton textile manufacturers are supreme. There are no mills in the world which can produce denim, percales, chambrays, vat-dyed twills and drills, corduroys, sheets, towels and many other items at prices equal to our when quality factors are taken into consideration.

As Mr. Cuffe points out in his speech, it is the continued existence, and in many cases, the aggravation of restrictions abroad on our textile exports, which accounts for the decline in our exports of cotton textiles over the past few years. If these restrictions could be reduced in the future, then our exports would increase because of our strong competitive position. Mr. Cuffe finished his address by saying:

The so-called social transformations resulting from the war have produced so-called middle classes in many countries and these are the people to whom American textiles appeal. Removal of the trade bars directed against us would enable us to cultivate this new and large body of consumers and put our export trade on a solid footing.

This view is seconded by the economic advisor of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Dr. Claudius Murchison, in a study entitled "The Cotton Textile Industry and Foreign Economic Policy" of February 1954. Dr. Murchison feels that there is a great potential market for cotton textiles in the underdeveloped countries. He wrote, at page 19:

The startling paradox of the world cotton-textile situation is that, while a condition of overcapacity and production surplus exists in the major manufacturing countries, a condition of extreme scarcity prevails in the underdeveloped nations where the goods are most needed.

How can we hope to tap these important and expanding markets overseas? How can we hope to effect a reduction in the restrictions against our exports abroad so that we can gain access to overseas markets unless we give the President tools with which to negotiate?

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee upon the thesis he has so ably defended and advanced this afternoon. I am particularly interested in the quotation of a statement by Dr. Murchison, which the Senator has just read.

I wish to ask if he agrees with me that it raises the point that, after all, the great defense weapon for freedom for many decades to come may not be the economic productive power of the people in backward areas of the world, since their standard of living must be raised if we are to have any hope, at least, for permanent peace on this earth. Does the Senator agree with me on that general thesis?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his generous references to me and for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. MORSE. To take the basic cotton problem involved, when we consider the millions of people in the so-called under-developed areas of the world, and their need for textiles and textile goods, does the Senator agree with me that there is a great potential market which ought to be tapped in disposing of the cotton supply of this country; and that to the extent that that market is tapped, we start to build up the standard of living of those people?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. It is by that process plus the mutuality of trade that prosperity will be increased in this country and in other countries with which we are associated.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator says that, does he agree with me that if we could raise the standard of living of millions of people in, let us say, the next 20 years—and that is not so long a time—by a maximum of only 5 percent, we would thereby create a market availability for American industry which would return to us many times the amount of any investment which might be made under the kind of bill which is now being discussed in the Senate?

Mr. GORE. I not only agree as to the material returns, but I suggest that the returns of friendship, respect, and understanding might be even far more precious.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator's observation. I wanted to express this word of support of the Senator's position by relating it definitely to what I think is a very interesting observation in the Murchison study.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I, in turn, wish to inquire of him if, perchance, he read in the New York Times of today an article from Geneva, reported by a Mr. Hoffman, whom I know and for whom I have high regard, to the effect that there is developing in Europe a strong sentiment for isolating the American dollar in international trade.

Mr. MORSE. I have not read the article, but I would observe that a policy of economic isolationism on the part of Europe would be just as shortsighted as a policy of economic isolationism on the part of the United States, because I think mankind—and I prefer to discuss the problem from the standpoint of the obligations of mankind to future generations—will follow a self destructive policy if it adopts an economic isolationist program in every segment of the world.

I think the greatest and most effective way of fighting the vicious advance of communism and of checking it is by demonstrating the superiority of our system of economic freedom and of the choice of a system whereby the people become the economic masters and not the economic servants of the state. The latter type of system is what exists behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Hoffman reported that the prevailing sentiment, the sentiment of the abler and more progressive thinkers of Europe, was that economic isolationism in Europe would have the disastrous effects which the Senator from Oregon has stated he believes would result, and that such an enlightened sentiment prevailed now. But he stated that if the United States itself, turned toward a policy of economic isolationism, the result might be the growth and the eventual predominance of a sentiment in Europe to isolate the American dollar. Why? Because of the impracticability of trading with a nation which is not only the greatest exporter, but is also the greatest importer, and which refuses to face up to the fact that international trade is a two-way street.

Will we accomplish the desired ends that are of so great importance for the American textile industry by defeating or emasculating H. R. 1? The answer must be an emphatic "No."

One policy that can help to secure for our textile industry its share of overseas markets is that represented by the passage of H. R. 1. I believe this to be true for several reasons: First, an expansion of world trade and an increase in the ability of foreign countries to earn dollars will create favorable conditions abroad which will permit a reduction in trade restrictions which exclude some of our products from some foreign markets. Secondly, through the trade agreements mechanism, and that includes GATT, we can negotiate with other countries for a reduction and elimination of these restrictions. We can bring effective pressure to bear on these countries to eliminate discriminatory practices which penalize our exports.

Perhaps most important of all is the fact that passage of H. R. 1 is a symbol of the continuation of our historic policy which was initiated in 1934. It is a symbol of the stability and direction of our economic leadership of the free world. If

this country backslides on this vital policy, she can only expect that other countries will also withdraw. We would have much to lose from that. Already, there are pressures from textile producers in Canada and Latin America—the major export markets for our textiles—to protect their industries from American competition. Mr. President, you can be sure that if we move back to protectionism by defeat of H. R. 1, or by amendments which would cripple it, other countries will follow suit and give in to the demands of their own protectionists. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] envisioned that result, with its catastrophic consequences. The consequences for our whole economy, not only the textile industry, would be disastrous.

Mr. President, I have today emphasized the problems and circumstances of the textile industry as related to international trade, for three reasons, which I have already related, but which I should like to relate again in summary. One reason is my genuine interest in export trade and its effect on the economic system of the United States. The second reason is that it is in this field the propaganda of the tariff lobby has been most blatant and misleading and, at the same time, most effective. The third reason is that this special interest has received the first major concession of the Senate Finance Committee.

However, the textile industry is by no means the sole beneficiary of the amendments tentatively adopted by the Finance Committee. In fact, the protection provided for items and economic segments other than tetxiles, particularly some in which we have no imports, or only negligible imports due to unrealistically high tariffs, is considerably less defensible than the concessions to the textile industry. These I shall discuss later, in more detail, when the bill reaches the floor of the Senate, provided this amendment remains in the bill.

I would not have my emphasis on the textile industry today be misunderstood. Other industries and economic groups have joined in this onslaught of high-tariff lobbying. Perhaps I shall have occasion later to discuss the international economic problems and political activities of the chemical, coal, oil, and electrical-equipment industries, and perhaps others. I do not wish this brief reference to indicate any condemnation of these groups. Like the textile industry, each of them has genuine problems with which I am genuinely sympathetic; but I would not have the overall national interest of the United States submerged because of individual problems, and particularly because of misrepresentations with respect to them.

What I should like to emphasize most is the overall problem of economic balance. The United States is the world's leading exporter and its leading importer. Our economic position is so preeminent that what we do affects every member of the grand alliance of free nations.

It is no longer possible, as some persons seem to think, for us to regard international trade as solely a matter of domestic politics.

Fortunately, we are in a position where our own enlightened economic self-interest and world responsibilities converge in a trade policy that will permit an expansion of international commerce.

In closing, I should like to emphasize further, Mr. President, that the United States is not only the world's greatest trading nation, but also the world's greatest creditor nation. Like water, the flow of international economics seeks a level—a balance. The question for the Congress to decide is whether that balance will be achieved through two-way trade, curtailment of United States exports or continued foreign subsidy by United States taxpayers. As for me, I choose trade.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the Senator for a truly magnificent address on this subject.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I have heard many speeches concerning foreign trade. However, I believe the two best speeches made on the subject were both made by the same Senator, the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Any time he wishes me to come to Louisiana to speak, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. LONG. The Senator's speech this year on the subject was very fitting, as fine an address as the one which he delivered on the floor of the Senate last year, when he led the fight to try to see to it that we would have a liberal foreign trade program which would give us some hope of winning the battle between communism on the one hand and freedom on the other. We shall certainly welcome his leadership in the fight which will take place on the floor when the bill comes from committee.

I am frank to say, as a member of the committee, I am not happy about some of the amendments which have been adopted. Generally I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. Perhaps we may be able to save the bill from emasculation before it is passed.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. His statement is greatly appreciated and is a source of encouragement to me.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I desire to join the Senator from Louisiana in congratulating the junior Senator from Tennessee for the able presentation he has made. He has done a great deal of research and has presented a defense of the reciprocal trade program against the viewpoint from which it has been receiving its most severe attack.

In presenting his argument this afternoon the junior Senator from Tennessee has done something that more of us in the Senate need to do. When there is a pressure from a particular group or groups it is not easy to disagree with them. When, for the common good of all the people of the Nation generally, it is essential to disagree with such a group, it is very difficult to take the time to do the necessary research in order to present arguments for the common good. That is what the junior Senator from Tennessee has done this afternoon.

I hope before the reciprocal trade bill comes before the Senate for a vote other Members of the Congress and officials of the executive departments who are charged with responsibility in the matter will do as the junior Senator from Tennessee has done. He has vigorously presented the viewpoint that without a reciprocal trade program our trade could not expand, and that without such a program we would be working under many difficulties in trying to achieve a just and lasting peace.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I am grateful for his generous comments. It is my genuine hope that my effort today, which is the result of much work, will be helpful. At the risk of repetition, I wish to say again what I said to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that the United States Senate does have the facilities for research and for developing the facts, whereas many employees of the textile industry do not have such facilities.

I regret that the President has not provided forceful and effective leadership. But as I said to the Senator from Kentucky, that does not absolve the Members of this body, on which the Constitution has placed specific responsibility.

I thank the Senator; and I hope, with him, that other Senators will join in the discussion, will conduct research, and will dig into the facts, in order that the Senate may arrive at a conclusion which will comport with the national interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I, too, wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee for his very able remarks of this afternoon. Until the Senator from Tennessee took the floor, the enemies of freer trade had had almost full sway, both on the floor of the Senate and in the committee which is considering the bill. The pressures for special favors are heavy, and it is difficult to resist them. We must build up sentiment in favor of the general advantages of freer trade. The Senator from Tennessee has done that admirably, and has performed a public service of the first magnitude. I hope he will go on, from strength to strength, and from victory to victory.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, my gratitude for the generous comments and the sentiments of my distinguished friend, the eminent and able senior Senator from Illinois, is almost unrestrained. With his encouragement, I shall proceed to render to the best of my ability the small contributions of which I may be capable in this great battle.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT 64TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 22, 1955

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution have just held their 64th annual convention. It was one of the most successful conventions ever held by that great, patriotic organization.

Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution together with the veterans organizations of this Nation are the natural guardians of our liberty through constitutional government.

The Members of Congress would do well to study the work of the Daughters of the American Revolution in the light of pending legislation to divide the wealth of this country with the nations of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 23 resolutions adopted by the 64th convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

RESOLUTIONS

FLAG

Whereas the present Public Law No. 829 is somewhat confusing as to the correct position of the United States flag in relation to the banners of the United Nations, NATO, and other like world organizations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress of the United States to pass a clear and concise law making it unlawful at any time to fly any international flag or banner above or on the same level with the flag of this Nation within the borders of these United States or its possessions; be it further

Resolved, That a penalty for the violation of the sovereignty of the flag of these United States be included in this legislation.

REGULATION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Whereas the reciprocal trade-agreements program represents an unwarranted encroachment of the executive branch of our Government upon the legislative responsibility conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas as a result of reduction of tariffs under the reciprocal trade-agreements program various industries important to our healthy economy and strong national defense have been injured or forced out of business with consequent injury to and loss of jobs by the American workingman: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge Congress to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act (Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act) to expire June 12, 1955, and upon its expiration, the Congress should assume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through its agent, the Tariff Commission.

REDEDICATION TO RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES

Whereas the heart of atheistic Marxism is the denial of God, and the destruction of all symbols of religious faith; and

Whereas many religious leaders and publications are zealously advocating the sacrificing of the sovereignty of the United States for a world government under the United Nations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, earnestly requests our spiritual leaders to hold steadfastly to the faith of our fathers in the teachings of the Bible and to beware of the pitfalls of world government and the Socialist state.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA

Whereas the Soviet Union has constantly intervened in the affairs of Latin American Republics, and has used certain Central American countries as a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere in a conspiracy to gain domination of all Latin America, thus threatening the very existence of this Nation and the entire free world: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urges immediate strengthening of relations between the United States and all Latin American countries, through more technical, economic, and military aid to those countries that are being influenced by Communist propaganda against the United States, and against the capitalist system in the entire world.

RED CHINA

Whereas Red China has violated in many instances the terms of the Korean Armistice; and

Whereas admission of Red China to the United Nations would add to the already dangerous power of the Soviet Union in swaying the votes in the Security Council of the United Nations: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its previous stand and strongly oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

ANTARCTICA

Whereas Antarctica, a continent reported to be larger than the United States and Mexico combined, has untapped reservoirs of natural resources, said to be rapidly becoming of important material value; and

Whereas American citizens have discovered more of the South Polar continent than all other nations combined and have done nothing to validate its rightful claims; and

Whereas 7 other countries claim portions of the area, 1 country claiming the entire continent: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress immediately to take the necessary action to further explorations, to produce maps and to make investigation of mineral resources in Antarctica in order to lay the foundation to validate the rightful claims of the United States.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas it is our belief that the pooling of atomic information and resources among the nations constituting the United Nations would have the effect, not alone of investing immeasurable potentials for the destruction of the United States of America by its openly avowed enemies, but could result in the accumulation of unlimited physical energy by an international oligarchy, which through its monopoly, would be enabled to hold all nations of the world in terror and achieve such a tyranny as never before has been witnessed in human history: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the immediate abandonment of all such plans and concentrate attention and effort toward further discovery and application of all available measures for the protection of our Nation against the facilities which our enemies have already acquired, and when they deem it expedient, will unhesitatingly employ.

FOSTER TRUE PATRIOTISM

Whereas the theme of this 64th Continental Congress is "Foster True Patriotism," as stated in the major objectives of our national society, and chapters have used this topic for programs during the year; and

Whereas true patriotism and Americanism are needed during this crucial period more than ever before in the history of our Nation, in order to assure the preservation of our Constitutional Republic as envisioned by its Founding Fathers: Be it

Resolved, That all DAR chapters and members redouble their efforts to foster true patriotism and love of country.

LAWMAKING BY TREATY (BRICKER AMENDMENT)

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America is the greatest document for human liberty in 2,000 years of recorded history and, originally treaties were intended to be agreements between sovereign nations concerned solely with international affairs, and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements have been and are now being drawn which admittedly endanger American rights, make domestic laws, override the Constitution, give congressional powers to the executive branch of the Government, gives States rights to the Federal Government or to an international body, and cut across our Bill of Rights: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the immediate adoption of the Bricker amendment which will provide that no treaty or other international agreement in conflict with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect; and no treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States except by valid legislation duly enacted by the elected representatives of the American people.

UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

Whereas the United Nations is a group of 60 nations banded together for the sole declared purpose of preserving peace in the world with definite provision that there be no interference in the domestic affairs of any member nation; and

Whereas by the following assaults upon the Constitution of the United States it is now clear that a concealed purpose is to destroy the sovereignty of the United States of America in order to build a world government without the right of secession:

1. By the Fujii case in California, through which the Charter of the United Nations was substituted for the laws of the State of California;

2. In the Steel Seizure case, a Chief Justice of our Supreme Court claimed the right of the President to seize private property under the Charter of the United Nations;

3. The propaganda of the Declaration of Human Rights is used to confuse and conceal the true purpose of the Covenant of Human Rights—which would, if adopted, destroy free speech, free press, free religion and the right to own private property;

4. The Genocide Convention will, if adopted, deprive American citizens of the right to trial by jury and will make them subject to the provisions of a world court;

5. UNESCO is a deliberate plan to create public opinion for world citizenship—it is especially directed to the school children of the Nation and is patterned exactly after the Communist teaching in Soviet Russia; Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, implore the Congress of the United States to declare in unmistakable language the sovereignty of the United States of America, demand that the United Nations confine its activities to being a deliberating body only of sovereign nations and that all interference in the domestic affairs of the United States cease immediately and completely.

STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, renew its request that the Status of Forces Treaty be reviewed as soon as possible by the United States Senate to the end that means be found whereby the historic rights

of Americans serving on foreign soil both in the Armed Forces and in civilian service be reestablished.

FOR A SOLVENT REPUBLIC

Whereas the national debt of the United States exceeds $275 billion, courting inflation and bankruptcy; and

Whereas the recipients of American taxes in foreign aid have exceeded their production and foreign trade as recorded previous to World War II: Be it

Resolved, That all foreign aid be reduced as rapidly as possible and these billions of American tax dollars be applied on the national debt to promote a balanced budget and a financially secure United States.

FOUNDATIONS

Whereas there are approximately 7,000 foundations in the United States of America with resources in excess of $10 billion and an annual income of over $300 million; and

Whereas many foundations are using their tax-exempt funds to subvert our youth by directing American education toward an international viewpoint and disregarding the traditions to which they were dedicated: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, request the 84th Congress of the United States of America to conduct an unhampered investigation, the findings of which would expose to the public the foundations which are using their funds in a manner detrimental to American interests.

GREAT SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the underlying law relating to the Great Seal of the United States—the resolution of Congress of June 20, 1782—specifies certain colors for the component parts of the device but not the uniform shades of the colors: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States, the State Department and necessary divisions thereof, the fact that there is no departmental or official control of the shades of color used in the Great Seal of the United States and urge that master color plates of the Great Seal be devised and adopted to serve as an authentic guide so that all copies of the Great Seal shall have uniform shades of color.

YOUTH GUIDANCE

Whereas the report of the FBI informs the public that juvenile delinquency has greatly increased, especially in the lower age brackets, which situation now constitutes a serious and tragic menace both to the child involved and to the security of the Nation: Be it

Resolved, That the Daughters of the American Revolution determine to develop in their respective communities an increased and active interest in healthy and well-ordered training in the home and in the school; to emphasize the moral force of the church, to support worthy youth groups which meet the need for recreational activities, and to promote, wherever feasible, juvenile courts for the sympathetic understanding of the problem of the juvenile delinquent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolved, That the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm their adamant stand for control of education by the people through their States and local communities only and oppose Federal aid to education.

AMERICAN HISTORY A REQUIRED SUBJECT

Whereas one of the primary objectives of our National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, is to stress the understanding of American history and civics; and

Whereas the teaching of these subjects in our schools, colleges, and universities should be stressed in order to enable all young people to have a better knowledge of our country and governmental system essential for good citizenship: Be it

Resolved, That each State be urged to pass laws requiring that courses in American history be taught in our elementary, junior and senior high schools, and that at least one course in American history and civics be required for graduation in all colleges and universities, both State supported and privately endowed.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its previous stand on the policy of investigating committees, commend their efforts in exposing subversive activities and earnestly request the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the continuance of the courageous campaign by our duly elected legislators and their staffs.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT (M'CARRAN-WALTER ACT)

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414) which became effective on December 24, 1952, is the result of a 4-year study and compilation of the previous rules and regulations for immigration; and

Whereas many countries which claim an overpopulation and demand a refuge for their nationals in these United States have not fulfilled their treaties with the United States by furnishing the stipulated number of members in their Armed Forces; and

Whereas the act has been effective in the denaturalization and deportation of criminals and subversives and is operating in the best interests of the American people; and

Whereas there has been and continues to be, a concerted effort to undermine and destroy the provisions of the law and to present private bills to the Congress admitting great number of aliens: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm approval of Public Law 414 and urge all patriotic Americans to resist weakening amendments or private bills which would destroy the effectuality of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PROTECT AMERICA'S FUTURE THROUGH PATRIOTIC EDUCATION

Whereas the changing of the name Constitution Day to Citizenship Day in the matter of observance of September 17 as the date of the signing of our Constitution minimizes the importance of this all-important document in the minds of the American people and emphasizes the citizenship idea which tends to fall into the "world citizen" plan of propaganda, and in order to preserve, support, and appreciate our Federal Constitution it is essential to understand its provisions and principles: Be it

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the United States Congress to restore the designation Constitution Day to the date of September 17 in order that all Americans on this anniversary may rededicate themselves to the basic principles of this great document; and

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in every locality study and publicize the Constitution during its 168th anniversary week of September 17–23, 1955; request their mayors and governors to proclaim Constitution Week; and sponsor chapter, school, and public programs on the Constitution, especially emphasizing the primary purposes of good government as set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution and the freedoms as set forth in its Bill of Rights, so that it may continue to protect us and our posterity in this Nation under God.

FBI

Whereas the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirms its confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, with commendation for its past record; be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to appropriate funds adequate to continue and expand its effective services.

COMMENDATION OF FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its heartfelt appreciation to the esteemed former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, for his continued interest in, and activity for, the problems facing the Government and, in particular, the findings contained in his current report as Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER INDIANS

Whereas there is now before the Senate of the United States a bill, S. 401, which calls for the abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, removal of Federal guardianship over Indians and trusteeship over Indian land, within 3 years from the date of the enactment of the act; Be it

Resolved, That the 64th Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution commend the Bureau of Indian Affairs for its diligent study of problems relating to American Indians on reservations as wards of the Federal Government, and earnestly solicits the Secretary of the Interior to grant sufficient extension of time for proper training of these dependent people for complete cultural assimilation and integration into mixed community life; and

Resolved, That the State Societies and Chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution within the several States where Indian tribes exist on reservations, be requested to contact the members of their State legislatures for the purpose of urging that State and local governments assume greater responsibility for the economic and civic preparedness of those reservation Indians now woefully unable to earn a living in new surroundings, and for adequate educational opportunities for the Indian youth of these tribes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, these resolutions are the work of the shock troops of the Nation. Miss Gertrude S. Caraway has been President of the Daughters of American Resolution for the past 2 years, and she will continue for another year in that office. Mrs. Margaret Patton is chairman of the Daughters of American Revolution national defense committee. Together, these two fine ladies have spearheaded the work of this great patriotic organization.

EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, out of order, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for a 2-year extension of the Small Business Administration. On a later day, I shall discuss the bill. But at this time, as a Member of the Small Business Committee, I am introducing the bill.

I think it particularly apropos to introduce the bill today because of some exceedingly interesting hearings, in connection with military procurement, which a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee has been conducting during the past few days.

I believe it is important that the attention of business in the Nation be called to the testimony we have received in part

from the witnesses before the committee. I refer to the testimony that at present we are really going through a restricting procurement program. Military procurement is not now expanding; instead, it is restricting. That simply means that fewer orders are available for American business, large or small. Therefore, during this period of restriction, it seems to me that the Small Business Administration now has the additional burden of seeing to it that equity is done to small business, because, Mr. President, it is understandable that during a restrictive period there are going to be large business establishments—who, after all, are the prime contractors in the case of most of these contracts—that necessarily will want to hold as much of the business as they can, in order to take care of their own business needs. That is understandable; certainly it is human. Yet those prime contractors, those large business establishments, will be very much dependent upon small business in case the tables are turned—although we hope and pray that that does not occur—with the result that we would then find ourselves in need, because of worsening world conditions, of speeding up military procurement, rather than restricting it.

The testimony this morning, for example, given by an exceedingly able witness from the Air Force Small Business Policy Division, Mr. Waddell, made very clear the importance of our keeping in mind the fact that there is less business now, and that there will be even less business than at present, available to business firms which seek to obtain procurement contracts. I think—and I say this as a sort of advance rebuttal to those who will undoubtedly say, "In view of the fact that procurement is now on a restrictive basis, can we not bring about some administrative saving by getting rid of the Small Business Administration?"—that the argument is all the other way. I think it is even more important, in order to see to it that we do not push out of business those small businesses which we shall need in case world conditions worsen and we must speed up all at once our procurement policy, that we maintain the Small Business Administration as a watch dog, so to speak, of the equities, interests, and rights of American small business.

The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now presides over the Senate, is the chairman of our Senate Small Business Committee. I am sure he will agree that it is important that those of us serving on this very important committee in turn frankly advise American small business that the business simply does not exist in the quantity in which it existed, so far as military procurement is concerned, 2, 3, or 4 years ago. Also, we should say to the American public, "Let us be thankful that that is true." As I shall develop at greater length in a major speech on this subject later, I also believe that an increasing responsibility is placed on the Congress to follow a legislative course of action which will be helpful in expanding our economy, so that, on the civilian front, rather than the military front, there will be the business opportunity which American small business needs in order to give to American small business the opportunities for expansion which it must have if we are to have a healthy economy.

I think that is a somewhat appropriate introduction to the subject matter about which I shall speak in a few minutes this afternoon, because the subject matter I have risen primarily to address myself to goes to the matter of expanding the American economy through a governmental development of the great water resources of our Nation. I do not know of any single item within the civilian economy which offers greater business stimulus to large and small business than the maximum development of the potentials of the streams of America from the standpoint of the development of electric power, the development of the irrigation resources of our country, and the development of all the multiple purpose features of a comprehensive river development program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1802) to extend the Small Business Act of 1953 for 2 years, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HELLS CANYON DAM: FACTS VERSUS FALSE PROPHETS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I have been pleased to cooperate with the Senate leadership in postponing until this late hour the speech I shall now give. I have done so because of the fact that the excellent speech which has been given by the very able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] had been scheduled for delivery earlier this afternoon. I give my speech at this late hour only because of the fact that it has already been released to the press, and therefore I feel under obligation to deliver the speech today, instead of tomorrow.

"Divide and conquer" was the motto of the Hapsburg empire. It is the strategy of the Idaho Power Co. in its effort to defeat full development of the Hells Canyon site so that the company can maintain its monopoly empire.

On April 7 the Idaho Power Co. enlisted a new recruit, the Governor of Oregon. Until this month, Governor Paul Patterson has been playing the role of reluctant dragon with respect to taking any position whatsoever on the issue of full development of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River against inadequate exploitation of this great resource by the Idaho Power Co.

But on April 7 in Portland, Oreg., all this changed. This was the occasion of the last day of the field hearings on S. 1333, a bill to authorize Federal construction of the Hells Canyon project, which I introduced with 29 cosponsors: Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG.

Governor Patterson had read the multicolored propaganda of the Idaho Power Co. and walked up to the door of the recruiting office several times. Significantly, he did not enter while a candidate for the Governorship of Oregon. Finally, on April 7 he walked through and signed up.

It would be difficult to determine if Governor Patterson has any strong convictions of his own on this or any other important issue affecting the future of Oregon. It is fair to say, in examination of the position he took in Portland on S. 1333, that his convictions, if any, must be stronger than the line of reasoning which he used to justify them.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST GOVERNORS WEAR BLINDERS IN PUBLIC

Like the arguments advanced during the field hearings on the Hells Canyon bill by Governors Smylie, of Idaho, and Langlie, of Washington, those of Governor Patterson assume the kind of narrow parochial view which cannot see past State lines and is utterly unrealistic. That approach constitutes a clear and present danger to the State of Oregon and the rest of the States in the Columbia basin if it is allowed to dominate the policies of resource development in this region.

Governor Patterson and the other two musketeers of resistance to the 20th century—Governors Smylie and Langlie—have evidently failed to consult together on either geography or economics as it pertains to their own region. According to their public logic, the Pacific Northwest is not a unified area, unified by its river system, the Columbia. If each is locked against the other, as they advocate, if each greedily competes against the other to grab small advantages, Oregon will be the loser. These insular officials willfully ignore the basic fact that no surveyor's imaginary line can efface, and that rivers do not respect, State boundaries. They flow to the ocean across States, drain areas in many States, and carry with them potential uses which if developed fully and in harmonious relationship, will enhance the economies of all the States which lie within major watersheds like the Columbia River Basin.

THE POWER RESERVATION FOR EASTERN OREGON AND IDAHO

Governor Patterson flies in the face of this elemental fact, and bemoans with loud lamentations the provision of the Hells Canyon bill which would allow 500,000 kilowatts of power attributable to the project to be allocated to the underdeveloped areas in eastern Oregon and Idaho which have never obtained the stimulus of low-cost power because of the obstructionism of the Idaho Power Co.

Again, I point out that Governor Patterson's geography is astoundingly rusty. It is hard to believe, but apparently he is convinced that there is no Oregon east of the Cascades. Or, even more fantastic, perhaps he views that vast area as disaffiliated territory under the informal but effective rulership of the Idaho

Power Co. and the California Pacific Utilities Co.

OREGON'S POWER BENEFITS UNDER S. 1333

The 500,000 kilowatt reservation in my bill, S. 1333, applies to the drainage basin of the Middle Snake River. That includes a substantial part of Oregon, namely, Baker, Malheur, Union, and Wallowa Counties, which comprise 20 percent of the total area of the State of Oregon.

The reservation is what it says—a reservation. It is improbable that eastern Oregon and Idaho will be able to absorb immediately all of that 500,000 kilowatts when Hells Canyon Dam comes on the line. Idaho today does not use that much power. But, as the stimulus of that power does increase consumption, Oregon will receive the benefits of the authorized and as yet unfinanced dams on the lower Snake which high Hells Canyon alone can make feasible. In those terms, Hells Canyon will make possible 2¼ million kilowatts of capacity for the Columbia River system in which Oregon farms, homes, and factories will share.

I have a great deal more confidence than the Governor's testimony would indicate he has in the future economic development of Baker, Malheur, Union, and Wallowa Counties.

In order to assure their prosperity and in order to help develop the economic potentialities of those counties, we need, may I say to the Governor of Oregon, cheap power, not high-cost power from the Idaho Power Co. The people of these Oregon counties must have a choice between the high-cost power of the Idaho Power Co. and the cheap power that can be made available to them if we have the historic foresight to proceed to build a high Hells Canyon Dam at the Hells Canyon Dam site.

In other words, one of the great differences between the Governor and me is my abiding faith in the future economic potentialities of our State. To have those opportunities, we cannot afford to sell out, politically or otherwise, to the Idaho Power Co. The people of our State are entitled to the kind of protection that I am seeking to give them in the high Hells Canyon Dam bill.

I want every member of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, which is playing the private utility game in the Pacific Northwest, to understand my language. I speak to the Portland Chamber of Commerce as well as to the Governor of Oregon today when I say that the opponents of the Hells Canyon Dam are selling out the future interests of Oregon boys and girls in cheap power in the Pacific Northwest.

It is about time, Mr. President, that we lay it on the line in my State. As one who can be counted on to stand up and fight for future generations of Oregon boys and girls to their right to cheap power that can be generated at a high dam at Hells Canyon, I do not intend to be diverted one iota by the multicolored propaganda of the Idaho Power Co.

With respect to the Hells Canyon Dam I wish to say, as I shall present it to the people of the State of Oregon time and time again in the months immediately ahead, that we join now in an issue as to whether the representatives of the people in the State of Oregon will follow a course of action with respect to the development of the Columbia River Basin which will guarantee future generations and citizens of the Pacific Northwest the cheap power to which they are entitled and upon which the whole economic future of the Pacific Northwest depends.

HELLS CANYON BENEFIT TO WESTERN OREGON

The Governor failed to ascertain the fact that Hells Canyon project not only will turn out 686,000 kilowatts of prime power at site, but that Oregon west of the Cascades will benefit from Hells Canyon storage releases which will provide additional power from the eight downstream dams, on the line, under construction and authorized to the amount of 436,000 kilowatts equivalent to more than another Bonneville Dam. Additional downstream power benefits in the Middle Snake have not yet been computed but are substantial.

Let me restate that point. It is important that the people of Oregon understand what we are fighting for west of the Cascades, as well as east of the Cascades. We are fighting for a dam that will provide prime power west of the Cascades in an amount equal to the power that is being provided by Bonneville Dam. I do not propose to become a party to any program that plays into the hands of the Idaho Power Co. and which denies to the people of my State, both east and west of the Cascades, power resources that the high dam at Hells Canyon would provide. I leave such a sellout to the Governor of the State of Oregon.

Does the Governor assume that this additional electric energy made possible by Hells Canyon downstream firming will not go in good part to meet load requirements in areas in Oregon along the lower Columbia? Does he assume that the Idaho power plan, with about one-fourth of Hells Canyon storage, with no system intertie, with power at high cost designed to meet only the needs of the Idaho Power Co.'s service area, except for dump power interchanges, will benefit Oregon? Does he assume that Idaho Power will operate its projects like the Federal Columbia River Power System is operated, with electric energy at about 2 to 2.5 mills, and distributed over the regional transmission grid so that its benefits are spread to the utmost at the lowest possible cost consistent with good business practice?

The Governor's attitude in refusing to accept for Oregon a proper and substantial share of over 400,000 kilowatts of downstream prime power, plus that which will go into eastern Oregon reminds me of the old story of the farmer's colt who was backed up all winter against a haystack and starved to death because he didn't look around.

GOVERNOR PATTERSON IS WRONG ON THE FACTS

While on the subject of power production, I should like to set Governor Patterson right with respect to his statement that the John Day project would generate more energy than Hells Canyon. In terms of prime power, Hells Canyon will produce 1,122,000 kilowatts, at site and downstream. John Day will contribute 713,000 kilowatts to the Federal system.

I can join with the Governor in his feeling that John Day should be built. As a matter of fact, together with my Senate colleague from Oregon, and the Senators from Washington and Montana, I have announced that we will fight for an appropriation of $1.5 million for accelerated preconstruction work on this very necessary project, both to Oregon and to the region.

A John Day partnership bill with a new look has just been introduced by the Republican Congressman from eastern Oregon. It is much longer and more detailed than the bill put in by Senator Cordon and the same Congressman in 1954.

The new bill appears on its face to increase the contribution of the partners, but that is not really the case. The new bill continues the principal shortcomings of the old bill. For example, it is vague on when the partners pay. The old bill specified that the partners would repay the Federal Government $165 million, plus whatever other costs were chargeable to power—it did not say when. That was to be left up to a Government-utility agreement with only a 50-year limit provided. It did specify that interest charges were to be no higher than 2½ percent, which meant that the major partner—Portland General Electric—would save tens of millions of dollars on interest, because it could not issue bonds at such low interest rates. The new bill apparently leaves interest rates up to agreement with the Army engineers and FPC, which in the last 2 years have been allies of the private utilities. That could mean an interest bonanza by agreement rather than statute.

The interest gimmick in the 1954 bill became one of the most frequently discussed subject matters in the political campaign in the State of Oregon in 1954. We pointed out up and down the State that what this little interest gimmick at 2½ percent would mean would be a giveaway of millions of dollars for 50 years to the Portland General Electric Co. That issue drew blood, as the votes in the election showed. It was one of the causative factors.

How do they try to get around that little gimmick? They do not try to get around it by fixing interest rates specifically in the bill high enough so that the people of this country would not be paying more for money they borrow than Portland General Electric Co. would be paying back into the Treasury by way of interest to the United States Government.

They propose to leave the matter of interest to an agreement entered into between the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission on the one hand, and the partner on the other hand. That is not good enough, Mr. President. I will tell the Senate why it is not good enough. It is not good enough because there is no legislative control over the kind of agreement they would be able to get out of the Federal Power Commission on interest rates. The Federal Power Commission under this ad-

ministration has been playing the game of the private utilities. The President appointed as Chairman of the Commission a man who is known to be an opponent of Hells Canyon Dam. He took him right out of the Governor's political entourage in the State of Washington. Governor Langlie is one of the outstanding opponents of high Hells Canyon Dam. That is why I say that here is one representative of the people of the State of Oregon who is not going to go along with the kind of program which is contained in the new bill, whereby, instead of specifying a two-and-a-half-percent interest rate as they did in 1954—which was bad enough—they now say, "We will leave it up to an agreement between the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission on the one hand and the partner on the other."

Mr. President, I wish to say on the floor of the Senate today that my fear is that the people will get taken again if they go along with that kind of a gimmick. I want John Day Dam built; I want it built as fast as we can get it built. I have been fighting for it. Last year I fought for the funds for planning for John Day Dam. We got them through the Senate, but what happened? They were lost in the Senate-House conference. The junior Senator from Oregon and I are going to do everything we can this year to get at least a million and a half dollars for planning and preconstruction work on John Day Dam.

With reference to the new bill which has been introduced, there is a great deal of explaining which must be done about what the bill provides before it can be understood. It seems to me that the new bill is the same old wolf, but they skinned a new sheep for its clothing. I think the people of Oregon will see through it before we get through with our public discussions of both Hells Canyon Dam and John Day Dam.

The governor proposes a phony partnership which would result in another piece being removed from the comprehensive plan, another boost to the regional power rates, and another bonanza to the private power companies at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers. My associates and I, together with the majority of the people of Oregon and Washington, propose Federal development, release of power over the Bonneville grid and at BPA rates, and its operation in conformity with a unified hydraulic and electric power system. In other words, we propose full development, while the governor, using the private power company arguments, proposes inadequate development, high-cost power, and dismemberment of the comprehensive plan.

JOHN DAY IS A SUPPLEMENT NOT AN ALTERNATIVE

The John Day Dam, like high Hells Canyon, is a key unit in the Army engineers main control plan for the Columbia River Basin. It is essential to an integrated, multipurpose system for power, navigation, and flood control.

It is not an alternative to Hells Canyon.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that the escape which the Governor is trying to use by representing to the people of the State of Oregon that he is for the John Day Dam is no escape for him at all, because we need both dams. The John Day Dam is dependent upon high Hells Canyon Dam for the development of its maximum electric potential. Both are needed, and both are so economically advantageous in terms of paying for themselves that they are both sound investments.

It would seem that in Governor Patterson's book of strange logic it is perfectly correct for Oregon to take all the power from John Day, as proposed in the Cordon-Coon partnership bill of last year. But he would deny to Idaho and Oregon on the Snake drainage part of the power from Hells Canyon which is so urgently needed to bring these areas into a better economic life after having been deprived of Federal power except in driblets, since its development began.

I would also assume that Governor Patterson would, if following out the course of his logic to the bitter end, assume that Washington would be happy to provide a sizable block of Priest Rapids power to Oregon if that project is built by the non-Federal public bodies. I would also assume that he would be willing to negotiate a top-level agreement with Governor Langlie to obtain permission to anchor John Day on the Washington side of the river, and that Langlie and other Washingtonians would be favorably disposed to support John Day on this basis, with no power available for themselves.

If the Governor thinks any such arrangement will be worked out, he is sadly mistaken, because the people of the State of Washington know that, after all, they have regional interests and rights in the development of power out of the Columbia and Snake Rivers, and we cannot successfully take a narrow provincial attitude as the Governor has done with respect to high Hells Canyon Dam and not then be held to the same attitude when we come to the development of the John Day Dam. What we need to do is to recognize that this is a regional economic problem. It is not one which can be put into watertight compartments on the basis of State boundaries, because a State boundary cannot hold back the waters of these rivers. They are going to continue to flow across State boundaries, and we should have the vision and statesmanship to develop their economic potential in terms of their regional effects and meaning.

IF STATE LINES GOVERN POWER USE, OREGON WILL LOSE

I would like to ask Governor Patterson: After John Day, what then? Where are the big power producers which Oregon could claim as her own? They lie in Idaho, Washington, and Montana, not in Oregon. In the kind of dog-eat-dog atmosphere which characterizes the three musketeers in the governors' mansions of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, where will this leave Oregon when it searches for more power to keep its economy going and finds itself up against the similarly limited and greedy self-interest of the Republican leaders of Oregon's sister States?

Hells Canyon may have drawn these three musketeers together for the moment, but for the moment only. Right now we hear them declaiming "one for all and all for one." But tomorrow, as it has been in the past, their separate war cries will be "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost."

THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' SONG AND DANCE

The unique manner in which the arguments of the three musketeers cancel themselves out is worthy of some comment. Governor Smylie cried out in loud and pathetic tones that Idaho owned the Snake River, lock, stock, and barrel, and that the interests of present and future reclamation were her primary concern, and would not be sacrificed to benefit the insatiable downstream States.

HELLS CANYON POWER AND IRRIGATION

Governor Patterson, on the other hand, took the position that the use of Hells Canyon revenues from the sale of power to aid future reclamation in Idaho was a threat to power users in Oregon who wanted the product at the lowest possible cost. He also said that this proposal was completely unrealistic because there was no physical connection between Hells Canyon project and the upstream areas which were susceptible to irrigation.

I shall have more to say on the subject of irrigation in another major speech on Hells Canyon which I shall deliver at a later date. But it was rather amusing to hear the Governor, in his testimony before a Senate subcommittee in Portland, express such great concern about the use of Hells Canyon power revenues to help defray the cost, or part of the cost, of the irrigation development.

I wonder what the great liberal Republican, Charles McNary, would have said had he heard the Governor's testimony?

I wonder what the thousands of farmers, making their living on irrigated farms in the State of Oregon, will say once they have read the Governor's testimony.

I wonder what the farmers in the Prineville area will say, farmers who have been fighting for years for the development of an irrigation project on the Crooked River, the development of which will be dependent upon a part payment of the cost of irrigation out of power revenues. If the Governor intends to follow the principle he laid down in the Portland hearing, he will have to follow it consistently. He cannot say to a group of farmers in one State, "I am against using power revenue for the development of irrigation land in this section," and then take a different position in the Crooked River area.

The Governor's testimony on the irrigation point is testimony against the best interests of the farmers of the State of Oregon, whose lands require irrigation water, whose farming activities and very livelihood depend upon the development of those dry lands by seeing to it that water is brought to them.

In his testimony, the Governor expressed the view that he did not think it was consistent with good public policy to be paying part of the cost of the

irrigation development from power revenues. Let him go into the dry land farming areas of Oregon and tell that to the farmers. He will get his answer—and it will not be an answer in support of his position.

In his testimony, the Governor also said that the proposal in regard to reclamation was completely unrealistic, because there was no physical connection between the Hells Canyon project and the upstream areas which were susceptible of irrigation.

The Governor should obtain a little rudimentary education in these matters. Let me call to his attention that there are irrigation features in connection with Hungry Horse project with no physical connection between the two. Let me add that Davis Dam on the Colorado, and Keswick on the Sacramento, are power producers and do not irrigate 1 acre of land, but their power sales help make such an operation possible.

This has been part and parcel of the reclamation program of our Government for many years.

Governor Patterson is slightly confused, but this is a confusing time of year for those who go swimming in cold water out of their depths. At any rate, he should have compared notes with Governor Smylie in order to get their respective stories a little better straightened out.

LOW-COST POWER FOR IRRIGATION PUMPING IN OREGON

Governor Patterson's touching concern for Oregonians consists of opposing high Hells Canyon Dam. The obvious alternatives to the high dam are 1 or 3 Idaho Power Co. small dams in the Hells Canyon. They would be of no benefit to Oregon. They would perpetuate and strengthen the Idaho Power Co.'s monopoly position with its attendant high rates.

In strong contrast, low-cost Hells Canyon power would be of great aid to irrigation pumping in eastern Oregon. As I pointed out in 1953 when introducing the Hells Canyon bill:

> Compared with rates charged farmers in Oregon and Washington, Idaho rates—
>
> From the Idaho Power Co.—
>
> are exceedingly high. The farmer's monthly electric bill in Idaho is much higher than that of his neighbor in the two coastal States. What does this mean to the farmer who would like to irrigate new land by pump? The added cost frequently determines whether or not it is possible for the farmer to irrigate * * * to bring new land into production. It's a gross handicap to the State of Idaho, which needs new agricultural land for its sons and daughters.
>
> A comparison of power rates will illustrate the point. For instance, a typical pumping operation, involving irrigation of 100 acres with an average of 3½ acre-feet of water, lifted 100 feet, would cost $709.40 in areas served by the Umatilla Electric Co-op in Oregon, and the Big Bend Electric Co-op, the Benton County REA, the Columbia County REA, and the Okanogan Electric Co-op, all in the State of Washington. They all purchase low-cost power from the Columbia River system.
>
> In contrast to this cost of $709.40, the Idaho Power Co. bill for the same operation would be $867.10 or $155.70 more money which the farmer could be putting in the bank or spending with local businessmen. When the lift is greater, an even larger difference in pumping costs is involved.

Not only is there that great disparity, but 1 of the most amusing oversights in the Governor's testimony before the Senate committee in Portland on April 7 was his failure to tell the people of Oregon the number of kilowatts they will get from the Idaho Power Co. if the 3 small dams are built. There is no guarantee or assurance that they will get a single kilowatt. In fact, the hearings on Hells Canyon over the years have brought out, time and time again, that the Idaho Power Co. is seeking a permit to build the three low-head dams for use in Idaho, not in Oregon.

What is sought to be accomplished by my bill is to guarantee to the people of Idaho and Oregon 500,000 kilowatts to be set aside for the middle Snake River Basin.

POWER REVENUES FOR RECLAMATION

Governor Patterson protests that Hells Canyon revenue should not be used to help defray the costs of irrigation in Idaho, specifically the Mountain Home development.

The Governor was something less than complete in his discussion because Hells Canyon power revenues could be made available to Oregon irrigation developments under the same section of the bill. It provides in part:

> The initial works of the projects authorized by section 1 of this act and any additional works or division, including the irrigation features of the Payette unit of the Mountain Homes division, that may be authorized as hereinafter provided, shall be treated as one project for the purpose, among others, of providing for the application of project revenues to the return of reimbursable costs in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. Federal reclamation developments proposed to be constructed in the Central and Upper Snake River Basin may be authorized as works or divisions of these projects, but only if such authorization is specifically provided by an act of Congress.

I ask, Is the Governor opposed to such power revenue aid to irrigation in Oregon for feasible and worthy projects?

Apparently, from his testimony, he is.

There are still thousands of acres which need to be brought under cultivation in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. My colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], performed, I think, a signal service for the farmers of Oregon who are dependent upon irrigation waters when, in the hearings, he specifically asked the Governor of Oregon if his testimony meant, for example, that he likewise, as a matter of policy, would be opposed to the use of power revenues to help defray the cost of irrigation in the Crooked River area in the region of Prineville, Oreg. The Governor's answer was in the affirmative.

I am at a complete loss to understand how the Governor of Oregon thinks that the much-needed reclamation projects in Oregon and the other States of the Pacific Northwest can be developed unless the long-established reclamation policy of the Federal Government shall be continued, whereby part of the power revenues are set aside for reclamation purposes.

The reclamation laws have been a major factor in the growth of the West. Since the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, who provided the inspiration and impetus for large-scale western irrigation, hundreds of thousands of acres have been brought under cultivation in the semiarid regions of the reclamation states.

It is not surprising to find the Governor of Oregon parting company with the philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt, Charles McNary, and George Norris. I do not propose to join him in his campaign to preserve and extend the sagebrush domains of the Idaho Power Co.

HELLS CANYON STORAGE WOULD RELIEVE BROWNOUTS

Mr. President, it is strange that the Governor of Oregon should attack Hells Canyon Dam, because it would "be out of place in the logical timetable for Columbia basin development," and that other projects are more urgently needed.

The Governor should look around and remember, too. On March 23, because of low flow on the Columbia, interruptible power deliveries were curtailed 50 percent by the Bonneville Power Administration, and there was the usual flurry and fluster of attempting to get expensive standby steam generation on the line to meet this emergency. Let the Governor also remember the drought of 1952 and ponder. At the time there was great economic loss to the region because the waters of spring had gone to waste and none had been held back upstream to be released when there was need for uninterrupted power production downstream, which upstream storage at Hells Canyon would substantially aid.

Does Governor Patterson assume that much of the feasibility of John Day is not contingent upon upstream storage at Hells Canyon? Is he not aware that Hells Canyon releases will add 56,000 kilowatts of prime power to John Day that he is so anxious to build, or more than 8 percent of its total output? Is he not aware that Hells Canyon storage release will add 24,000 prime kilowatts to the Bonneville project, 50,000 to the Dalles, and 48,000 to McNary? Is he not aware that the four lower Snake dams depend almost entirely for their economic feasibility on Hells Canyon storage, which will add 249,000 prime kilowatts, or about 48 percent, to their output?

Where does he think he is going to get the votes in the Senate of the United States for funds for dams authorized, but yet to be built, when, in round numbers, they are dependent for one-third of their prime power production upon storage at Hells Canyon Dam?

Part of the political propaganda in the Pacific Northwest for the Idaho Power Co. is, "We cannot get the votes in the Congress to build Hells Canyon." Who said so? The Republican politicians.

And I say to the people of the Pacific Northwest, "The answer is at the ballot box."

The greatest handicap we have comes now from Republican representatives in

the Pacific Northwest. We did not have any trouble last year getting authorizations through the Congress of the United States for Cougar and Green Peter Dams as Federal projects. That does not bear out the Republicans' propaganda that Senators from the Middle West and the East will not vote for these great Federal projects, because the Senators from the Middle West and the East recognize the tremendous importance to eastern and middle western industry of an expanding economy in the West.

Mr. President, this is a unit nation now. We are dependent State upon State across this land, and upon the prosperity of each State. No more can we have economic isolationism within the country than we can have it within the world and still have prosperity.

What is the Eisenhower administration saying in regard to these two federally authorized projects, Cougar and Green Peter? "Well, we will recommend funds for them on a partnership basis." And Republican spokesmen are trying to sell a phony partnership scheme to the people of the Pacific Northwest for projects already authorized as Federal projects, and authorized last year as Federal projects. Get rid of the Republicans and give us some Democrats from the Pacific Northwest who will vote us appropriations.

Mr. President, I am not worried about votes from the Middle West and the East. I am worried about votes from the Republicans in the Pacific Northwest, who are primarily the spokesmen of the private utilities, and not of the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Governor if he is unaware that load growths in Oregon are dependent upon the development of these projects as part of the main control and comprehensive plans? Is he willing, then, to trade off an all-Oregon John Day, and nothing more for Oregon, in order to please the power company seconds in his corner who are cheering him on as he shadow boxes with the region's future?

A POSITIVE DAM PROGRAM FOR THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

My own position is clear. I am fighting for John Day as the next new start in the Pacific Northwest. But at the same time I am fighting for Hells Canyon as the next authorization this year and a new start with Federal preconstruction money next year. We have seen what lack of upstream storage has done on 2 grim occasions less than 3 years apart. And neither the people of Oregon, I, nor my associates in the Senate, who have given so generously of their support for Hells Canyon and full development of the Columbia, are going to relax our efforts to carry forward comprehensive harnessing of the Columbia system for all the people, not segmented, inadequate development of jealous States divided by nonstatesmen in office, and by the insidious propaganda of the private power companies which continually add fuel to the fires of provincialism in order to conquer by such destructive divisions.

The Governor of Oregon warned the public that even if the Hells Canyon bill were passed, what assurances would there be that there would be any appropriations for construction? I might ask in return if his phony partnership John Day bill would pass, what assurances of Federal moneys would there be? I can assure the Governor that if he were to lend his support to obtaining Federal appropriations for Hells Canyon, instead of using outlandish reasoning to oppose it, there would be that much more accomplished to assist. I can also assure the Governor that there will be as concerted an effort to proceed rapidly with the construction of Hells Canyon as my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest and I are now making to obtain money to prepare John Day for building.

THE FPC DODGE

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to deal with the final argument, if argument it could be called. by Governor Patterson against the vitally needed Hells Canyon project. It has such a familiar and counterfeit ring of Idaho Power Co. propaganda.

Governor Patterson wishes the Senate of the United States to stand breathless, immobile, and powerless to exercise its constitutional and lawful responsibilities to develop the rivers of the Nation while its own creature, the Federal Power Commission prepares its decision on the 3-dam application of the Idaho Power Co.

This is a modest proposal which resembles the request of a headsman to his victim to hold still so a clean decapitation can be better accomplished. The Federal Power Commission is not an objective administrative agency. It is rigged to give a decision in favor of the Idaho Power Co. plan. But on the basis of its composition, and the eerie chain of reasoning by which the FPC staff counsel recommended issuing the private license after recounting the overall superiority of the high Federal project, there is nothing else to expect.

As a lawyer, if an affidavit of prejudice is available, I do not believe in taking a client before a prejudiced judge. I believe in getting him into another courtroom. This great issue of the people of the country needs to be brought here to the Congress and decided here in the Congress, and not before a Federal Power Commission to which the President of the United States has appointed as Chairman a man whose enmity to a high Hells Canyon Dam is well known.

I do not intend to stand by, Mr. President, and let the proponents leave it up to the Federal Power Commission to get by with that "sleeper."

Mr. President, I wish to say that apparently the Governor of Oregon assumes that in the realm of foreign policy, war and peace, taxation, and other complex matters there is no questioning the ability of the Senate of the United States to proceed in the exercise of its powers of legislation. But any issue which affects the full development of our rivers, and particularly involving legislation which would result in removing once and for all the private power company threat against full use of the Hells Canyon reach of Snake River suddenly becomes too complex for the Congress to comprehend or to decide upon with intelligence, according to the Governor of Oregon and the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. President, there is nothing so complex about the comprehensive plan for the development of the maximum potential of the Snake and the Columbia Rivers that the Congress of the United States cannot solve and settle in a very statesman-like manner.

I can only say that Governor Patterson has made his maximum effort in this manner. If his future pronouncements on this important issue bear the same "Reddy Kilowatt" double-talk, mixed with medieval provincialism, as does his statement before the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee in Portland, the people of Oregon would be better served if he returned to his less difficult role of reluctant dragon. The issues of full and comprehensive development are too important to the future of Oregon, the Northwest, and the Nation to be discussed by such prattle as the Governor of Oregon emitted in his testimony before the Senate committee, in Portland, on April 7.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks certain communications I have received from various organizations in support of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

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

WISCONSIN STATE COUNCIL,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS
AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, A. F. OF L.,
Madison, Wis.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, and 22 other Senators, proposes the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon which would develop the full hydro-electric potential of the site and in addition it would provide water for irrigation, navigation and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas the erection of a high dam at Hells Canyon would be far superior to the proposal of building a series of low dams: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters assembled in semi-annual meeting in Madison, Wis., on April 21, 1955, go on record favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1333 and the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Wisconsin Representatives in Congress and to the National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 E. Salmon Street, Portland 14, Oreg., to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to Senator WAYNE MORSE, and to the General Office of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America at Indianapolis, Ind.

Executive board of the Wisconsin State Council of Carpenters: Walter Jensen, president, Madison, Wis.; John V. Mayett, first vice president, Superior, Wis.; Robert H. Strenger, second vice president, Madison, Wis.; Erven Schultz, secretary-treasurer, Neenah, Wis.; George Hoffmann, executive board member, Kenosha, Wis.; William A. Eckart, executive board member, La Crosse, Wis.; Harry Boerschinger, executive board member, Green Bay, Wis.; Edwin F. Kijek, executive board member, Wausau, Wis.; Walter Barnett, Executive Board Member, Eau Claire, Wis.; Henry C. Kreutzfeldt, executive board member, Milwaukee, Wis.; Joe Harrmann, executive board member, Milwaukee, Wis.; Wilburt Hahn, executive board

member, Wausau, Wis.; Albert Forer, executive board member, La Crosse, Wis.; August Trappler, executive board member, West Allis, Wis.; Val Schueller, executive board member, Marshfield, Wis.

Unanimously adopted.

EUGENE, OREG., *April 23, 1955.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteenth annual convention of Northwest Public Power Association endorsed Senate bill 1333 by resolution at general business meeting April 21.

Good luck.

CARL NEWCOMB
(For Gus Norwood, executive secretary, NPPA).

HELLS CANYON DAM

OROVILLE GRANGE NO. 985,
Oroville, Wash., April 6, 1955.

Whereas we believe that the construction of the high dam at Hells Canyon is essential to the full development of the power resources of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas estimates of our needs for electric energy for our growing industrial program show that anything less than the fullest possible utilization of our water resources will be inadequate for our needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Oroville Grange, No. 985, That we go on record as favoring Senate bill 1333 and urge the earliest possible enactment of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Hells Canyon Association, to Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON of Washington, to our Representative in Congress Hon. WALT HORAN; to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER of Oregon; to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY of Montana, chairman of the Senate Committee for Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Washington State Grange; and to Okanogan Co., Pomona Grange.

Adopted by Oroville Grange, No. 985, in regular session April 2, 1955.

OSCAR THORNTON, *Master.*
ISABEL THOMSEN, *Secretary.*

WESTLAND GRANGE, No. 827,
Hermiston, Oreg.

Whereas the necessity for building the high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, on the Snake River is very vital at this time; and

Whereas this high dam will provide flood control, storage, and unlimited electric energy, for the Northwest; and

Whereas the shortage of electric power now present, in the Northwest, it is imperative that this high dam be authorized and started: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Westland Grange, No. 827, in regular session this 8th day of April 1955, urges immediate action on S. 1333, and asks this Congress to pass legislation authorizing the start of this high dam in Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress, to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, GRACIE PFOST, and to the executive secretary of the Hells Canyon Association.

W. B. SMITH,
Master.
LILLIAN M. SMITH,
Secretary.

A RESOLUTION ON BILL S. 1333

LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN GRANGE, NO. 741,
Prineville, Oreg.

Whereas from a careful study of such information as we have been able to gather, both pro and con, concerning the question of the best use of Hells Canyon resources and believe we have arrived at a just conclusion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of Lookout Mountain Grange, No. 741, do hereby go on record as supporting measure S. 1333 as being in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

GEO. J. JEE,
Master.
FRANCES SHOOK,
Secretary.

Whereas there is at this time an effort being made to substitute a plan for multiple low dams for the Government proposed high dam in the Snake River, and the high dam being necessary for the development of the Columbia River to its fullest capacity; and

Whereas for the past several years, since the beginning of this development, we have seen the benefits accruing from the low-cost electricity to the people of the Northwest, particularly to the small-farm operator; and

Whereas under Government control, this increase in the use of electricity has demonstrated the fact that the public utilities have had the major part in the growth of the Northwest and in bringing to us the many advantages of low-cost power; and

Whereas with even the low rates for electricity, the dams are returning to the Government amounts of money annually to insure the repayment in the allotted time all of the cost of the dams; and

Whereas the high dam is a part of the system of development which takes into consideration the multiple use of water for production of electricity and also the great added advantage of flood control, irrigation, and water transportation, as well as recreational facilities; and

Whereas the construction of low-level dams would break the chain of planned development of the rivers, give a smaller amount of development, result in a higher cost of electricity to the present and future users; and

Whereas the entire Northwest area is dependent to a great extent on the furnishing of cheap power to many present and potential manufacturers, as well as the small, independent users of electricity; and

Whereas the past has shown us that the private power interests are more concerned in profit than development, and that they have failed to make the moves necessary to get cheap power to a large number of people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Siletz Valley Grange, No. 558, earnestly urges that every effort be made to see that the orderly and planned development of the Columbia River and its tributaries be carried out for the benefit of all the people, as opposed to a comparative few; and be it further

Resolved, That the full development of this area will be hindered by substituting the low dams for the high one.

This resolution passed by the members of Siletz Valley Grange at the regular meeting, April 4, 1955.

WALTER GAMPEL,
Master.
J. E. BLOOM,
Commissioner.

RESOLUTION 190

Whereas the Central Lincoln People's Utility District has the responsibility of providing electric service to approximately 45,000 people in western Lincoln, Lane, Douglas, and Coos Counties along the Oregon coast; and

Whereas the power demands of the district's service area during the past 10 years have increased more than tenfold and the present demands are expected to triple in the next 10 years; and

Whereas the demands for increased power supplies are general throughout the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the economic development of the Pacific Northwest will inure to the benefit of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the full potential economic development of the District's service area and the Pacific Northwest is dependent upon a continuing, abundant, low-cost power supply; and

Whereas full development of the hydroelectric power potentials of the northwest are a requisite for a continuing adequate power supply in the area; and

Whereas a Federal high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon is essential for full development of the power potentials of the Snake and Columbia Rivers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Central Lincoln People's Utility District, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon, That the district go on record as favoring the construction by the Federal Government of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon as proposed by Senate bill 1333; and be it further

Resolved, That the District's position on Senate bill 1333 be made known to the joint Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Congressional Delegations of the Pacific Northwest States, and other Members of the 84th Congress, 1st session.

Adopted this 29th day of March 1955.

MILLARD MARTIN,
President.

Attest:

JOHN GREENBO,
Secretary.

LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
LOCAL UNION NO. 2785,
The Dalles, Oreg., April 21, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to certify that local No. 2785 of the Lumber and Sawmill Workers of this city as well as those throughout the Northwest heartily endorse the introduction of your Senate bill 1333 for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

We will constantly be with you and your coworkers in your vigilant fight until its construction becomes a reality.

Yours respectfully,

ARTHUR V. MEANS,
President.
ELMER J. EDGERTON,
Secretary.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas a proposal to construct a federally financed high dam which would develop the full hydroelectrical potential of the site at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas a high level dam at this site would also provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum of flood control; and

Whereas the public interest would best be served by a high level multipurpose dam and not by a series of low level dams built by private utilities seeking to produce only electricity; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in the United States Senate and Congress by Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719 to accomplish the development of Hells Canyon to the maximum of resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Solano County, Calif., Building and Construction Trades Council endorse Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719; and be it further

Resolved, Copies of the resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators urging their support for a Hells Canyon federally financed high level dam; and be it further

Resolved, Copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

SOLANO COUNTY BUILDING
AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES
COUNCIL,
LOWELL NELSON,
Business Representative.

Adopted April 18, 1955.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD SHIPWRIGHTS, SHIP JOINERS, AND BOAT BUILDERS, LOCAL UNION, 1184,
Seattle, Wash., April 19, 1955.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Shipwrights, Joiners, and Boat Builders, Local 1184, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, at their regular meeting on April 15, 1955, unanimously went on record in support of Senate bill 1333, providing for a Federal-built dam at Hells Canyon.

Our membership is fully aware of the necessity of this project, in order that the fullest possible use can be made of the natural resources of the Northwest.

Respectfully,

JOHN B. WIGEN,
Business Representative.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, CARPENTERS LOCAL, NO. 1599,
Redding, Calif.

Whereas Senate bill 1333 proposes to creation of a federally financed high dam which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site. In addition, it would provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas the McKay proposal would turn the site over to a private utility which intends to erect a series of low dams for the production of electricity. These dams would not produce the full hydroelectric potential of the site. The difference in hydroelectric potential of a high dam as compared to a series of low dams would be lost forever and no irrigation for the people below: Therefore be it

Resolved, Carpenters Local Union, 1599, Redding, Calif., goes on record for Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719, and copies of this resolution be sent to our general secretary, Albert Fischer, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Hells Canyon Association, 1135 SE. Salmon Street, Portland 14, Oreg.; and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

GLEN HOLLIBAUGH,
President.

L. A. BROWN,
Recording Secretary.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate will, under the order previously entered, stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25, 1955:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 19, 1960. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

John R. Brown, of Texas, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Robert Lee Russell, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Ruben Rodriguez-Antongiorgi, of Puerto Rico, to be United States attorney for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years, vice Harley A. Miller, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Robert W. Oliver, of Alaska, to be United States marshal, division No. 2, district of Alaska, for a term of 4 years, vice Benjamin B. Mozee, term expired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by me under subsection (b) of section 504, in ranks as follows:

Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, 83A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, 296A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, in the rank of lieutenant general.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Adams, James F., O29968.
Akers, Russell F., Jr., O19243.
Alspaugh, Ralph, O19159.
Armitage, John D., O19014.
Ashworth, Edward T., O19052.
Ayers, Loren A., O18561.
Bailey, William A., O19264.
Ball, William E., O41586.
Bartlett, William G., O19047.
Bastion, Joseph E., Jr., O19162.
Bayne, Robert H., O19[illegible]7.
Beck, Thomas H., O19164.
Beckenbach, Charlie G., O29031.
Bell, James K., O29912.
Bernard, Lyle W., O19195.
Blanchard, Robert M. Jr., O19282.
Blandford, William O., O18990.
Boswell, James O., O19188.
Bowen, Claude L., Jr., O19244.
Boyles, Francis R., O29803.
Bridgewater, F. Clay, O19182.
Brindley, John R., O19087.
Britt, Albert S., Jr., O42237.
Bruno, Angel F., O39632.
Cahill, Edwin M., O19141.
Calhoun, William R., O19256.
Carver, George A., O19122.
Chapman, Ethan A., O19076.
Chapman, George H., Jr., O19064.
Chase, Charles H., O19095.
Chuck, Harry C., O51032.
Clainos, Peter D., O19269.
Clarke, Ernest M., O19183.
Cleveland, John A., Jr., O19136.
Coffin, Edward C., Jr., O51259.
Coleman, Frederick W., 3d, 019216.
Coleman, Hughe D., O39848.
Conway, Theodore J., O19015.
Corum, Dabney R., O19001.
Crawford, Joseph B., O19215.
Cubbison, Donald C., Jr., O19204.
Curren, William F., Jr., O38749.
Cyr, Arthur R., O19119.
Dahlen, Chester A., O19020.
Damon, William F., Jr., O19179.
Daniel, William J., O19019.
Daniels, Leonard P., O29550.
Daniels, Madison A., O51019.
Darnell, Carl, Jr., O19213.
Davidson, William G., Jr., O18862.
Davis, Hawthorne, O51013.
Davis, Hoy D., Jr., O18982.
Decker, Joseph F., O29999.
Degavre, Chester B., O19262.
Doleman, Edgar C., O19131.
Dolph, Cyrus A., 3d, O19170.
Douglas, Robert H., O19212.
Downing, Ellsworth B., O18986.
Downing, Walter A., Jr., O18991.
Due, William F., O19268.
Dunn, Charles G., O18996.
Duvall, Edward, O41921.
Edwards, Morris O., O19041.
Ehlen, Edward S., O19286.
Elder, Frank L., O19203.
Ely, William J., O18974.
Engler, Jean E., O19198.
Essman, Graydon C., O19242.
Evans, Roy T., Jr., O19140.
Evans, Thomas B., O19174.
Ferris, John W., O19097.
Fields, Kenneth E., O18957.
Fleming, William J., O28910.
Fletter, Randolph W., O19148.
Ford, Blair A., O18547.
Frame, Marshall W., O19103.
Franklin, Robert B., O19046.
Freaman, Jay H., O41458.
Frentzel, William Y., O19026.
Fritz, William G., O19069.
Fuqua, Stephen O., Jr., O19109.
Gandia, Amaury M., O19205.
Gee, Samuel E., O19251.
Gibb, Frederick W., O19222.
Gibbs, David P., O19189.
Gilbert, Douglas G., O19202.
Gillon, Paul N., O19048.
Given, William J., O19105.
Gray, David W., O18988.
Green, Duff, Jr., O42239.
Gretser, George R., O19126.
Grimes, Alston, O19252.
Grubbs, William E., O18146.
Hain, Robert W., O19072.
Hall, John R., O51265.
Hallock, Duncan, O18960.
Hanley, James F., O39591.
Harrell, Ben, O19276.
Harris, Benjamin T., O19166.
Harris, William A., O18976.
Harrison, William E., O29991.
Hartel, Frederick O., O19254.
Hazlehurst, Max W., O38723.
Henderson, Morris K., O19230.
Henry, Frank S., O18989.
Herb, Edward G., O18973.
Higgins, Elmer R., O38755.
Honeycutt, John T., O18975.
Hoult, Charles S., O42047.
Humphries, Ferdinand M., O19012.
Huntsberry, Walter A., O19200.
Hurlbut, Oren E., O19077.
Ireland, Thomas R., O51004.
Jensen, Walter A., O19006.
Johnson, Harold K., O19187.
Jones, Beverly DeW., O19081.
Jones, Clyde L., O19074.
Jones, Willie H. H., O39626.
Kaiser, Maurice E., O19165.
Kait, Harry C., O29532.
Kane, Andrew D., O42073.
Kevin, Hugh W., O41583.
Kibler, Edgar H., Jr., O19039.
Klanderman, Russell R., O19099.
Kleitz, Anthony F., O19145.
LaDue, Paul E., O19017.
Landaker, Chester L., O18353.
Lane, John J., O19021.
Lanning, Harley A., O39720.
Lawlor, Robert J., O19036.
Ledbetter, McWesley, O51096.
Leland, Alanson T., O42236.
Leslie, Robert C., O18993.
Letzelter, Cyril J., O19132.
Leydecker, Charles E., O19227.
Lincoln, Lawrence J., O18968.
Lonning, Stanley N., O19281.
Losey, Melvin D., O42235.
Lothrop, Guy C., O18992.
MacArthur, Donald P., O51216.
Macherey, Earl J., O19158.
Maclachlan, Walter L., O50948.
Marquette, William J., O42231.
Maston, Victor E., O19075.
Matheson, John D., O18962.

McCrary, Arthur A., O19037.
McKee, Basye C., O29041.
McMorrow, Francis J., O18995.
McNair, Charles F., O18383.
Merriam, Lauren W., O19002.
Messersmith, Joshua R., O19139.
Meyer, Richard D., O18963.
Meyer, Richard J., O19147.
Middlebrooks, Marvin A., O51440.
Miles, Charles H., Jr., O19151.
Miller, Austin A., O19228.
Miller, Edwin T., O30006.
Millett, Stephen J., O38690.
Minnich, Edgar R., O51197.
Montgomery, Gus H., O29993.
Moore, Leslie S., O51012.
Morrison, Burton O., O41658.
Neely, Robert B., O19114.
Nelson, Russell M., O18674.
Nichols, Wallace J., O30003.
O'Connor, Thomas J., O19125.
Olson, Hardin L., O19110.
O'Malley, Joseph H., O19061.
Otto, Samuel E., O19030.
Park, Richard, Jr., O19080.
Parker, Daniel, O19038.
Parr, Ivan W., Jr., O19255.
Patterson, Charles G., O19073.
Pickett, George E., O42131.
Pittman, Joseph M., O19121.
Plapp, Herbert C., O19059.
Polk, James H., O19028.
Pope, Phillip H., O19115.
Porter, Gwinn U., O19210.
Powell, Charner W., O19284.
Powers, George T., 3d, O19137.
Pritchard, James R., O19248.
Pryor, Ralph H., O29996.
Putnam, William DeM., O29605.
Quinn, William W., O19283.
Raff, Edson D., O19261.
Ratcliffe, Lamar C., O19034.
Remus, Joseph A., O19275.
Reynolds, Royal, Jr., O19238.
Risden, Richard A., O19278.
Ritchie, Walter P., O41646.
Robblee, Paul A., O42198.
Roberson, Gerald L., O19161.
Rogers, Henry H., O29992.
Rothwell, Franklin G., O19176.
Ruggaber, John C., O28943.
Russ, Sam W., O41555.
Ryan, William F., O19142.
Sassé, Francis M., O29807.
Sax, Samuel E., O51267.
Schmelz, Russell W., O29353.
Schull, Edson, O19236.
Scovill, John N., O19267.
Shakel, William C., O39612.
Sharove, Joseph, O42021.
Shepardson, Frank H., O19068.
Shinkle, John G., O18979.
Sibley, Alden K., O18964.
Simkus, Clyde C., O50998.
Skinner, Edwin C., O50985.
Skinner, Ernest B., O39710.
Skinner, James H., O19144.
Smith, Franklin G., O19154.
Smith, Kimball C., O29882.
Solomon, Maddrey A., O19194.
Sparrow, Herbert G., O19003.
Speiser, Robin G., O19104.
St. John, Ralph P., O39706.
Starbird, Alfred D., O18961.
Stephenson, Andrew D., O19201.
Stilwell, Joseph W., Jr., O19117.
Sweeting, Harry W., Jr., O19168.
Tague, Marcus O19090.
Talbot, Ralph, O19226.
Thompson, Robert P., O19098.
Thorlin, John F., O19067.
Trent, Joseph F., O17319.
Tripp, Robert C., O18972.
Tubbs, Harry S., O19056.
Turner, Robert A., O18987.
Tyson, Arthur W., O19120.
Urquhart, Henry C., O39754.
Van Way, George L., O19093.
Versace, Humbert J., O19152.
Wagstaff, David, Jr., O19246.
Wallace, Neil M., O19101.
Walters, Paul R., O19050.
Welling, Alvin C., O18983.
Wetherbie, Harold B., O41823.
Whelihan, William P., O19102.
Whipple, Sherburne Jr. O19130.
White, George W., O19079.
White, Hiram B., O14849.
Wick, Thomas H., O41689.
Wilkin, John L., O39847.
Willette, George, O17289.
Woestenburg, John M., O30004.
Wood, Julian C., O41651.
Zeller, Frank J., O19043.
Zierath, Frederick R., O19211.

To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Betzold, Curtis W., O19641.
Wilson, Neil O., O29256.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Aabel, Bernard, O29239.
Barrick, Carrol C., O19330.
Blair, Edgar A., O56803.
Blake, Allen J., O29229.
Cooper, Eugene G., O19614.
Daman, Eli E., O19703.
Hill, Guy C., O29272.
Huff, Rufus D., O29311.
Layer, Harland W., O19643.
Mackin, James H., O29300.
Marchek, Carlyle S., O29290.
Maxwell, Roy D., O29265.
Paige, Ralph E., O31023.
Partin, Everett W., O19699.
Prince, Carl M., O29288.
Sheen, Ernest T., O29268.
Thompson, Dale LeB., O39668.
Weidenkopf, Stanley J., O41771.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified:

To be captain

Hollander, Bennet N., O50693.

To be first lieutenant

Sneeden, Emory M., O68170.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be captain

Metcalf, Edward A., III, JAGC, O518681.

To be first lieutenants

Clinton, Everett E., DC, O2270453.
Doyle, Rita F., ANC, N753510.
Horner, James M., MSC, O2044519.
Liberty, Frances M., ANC, N799517.
Malewicz, Wanda, ANC, N752347.
McFarland, Paul H., Jr., DC, O1892073.
Young, Mary G., ANC, N901282.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Burt, Howard, O4024934.
Douglas, William F., O4024555.
Grace, Louis B., O4038147.
Holland, Charles R., O4038155.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Hughes, Charles M., O1885621.

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Hoover, Jerry L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Early, Ralph T.
Golden, Bruce E.
Heinz, Robert F., Jr.
Pla, Louis L., O4028508
Van Straten, James G.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1955, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Abel, Billy J.
Ackiss, Ernest L., Jr.
Adams, Gilbert S.
Anderson, James J.
Andre, Peter C.
Barber, Richard L.
Basten, Lawrence E.
Bate, Milford C.
Benoski, Joseph, Jr.
Bilyeu, Rolland R.
Blackburn, Paul L.
Boop, Dean A., Jr.
Brutscher, Baldwin L.
Burke, Roderick L.
Bush, Robert C.
Bussey, Charles D.
Butterfield, Dennis O.
Byrne, Edwin J.
Byrnes, Graham F.
Cluxton, Donald E., Jr.
Colleoni, Richard F.
Combs, John W.
Cook, John J., Jr.
Cooley, John R.
Cooper, Cortez A., Jr.
Dahl, Winston A.
Dahmen, Glen W.
Dambrauskas, Vincent
Dankers, William H.
Day, Edward A., Jr.
Dekle, Thomas A.
DeLeo, John B., Jr.
Dorman, James L.
Doyle, William E.
Durkin, Michael J.
Ebbeler, Jack H.
Ferguson, Charles H.
Fladager, Dean A.
Gable, John P.
Gallier, Gary L.
Gilliam, John J.
Goldsberry, Verne W.
Gunter, Gurnie C.
Haar, Franklin R.
Harl, Neil E.
Harris, William I.
Herzog, David E.
Hill, James R.
Hodgson, William E., Jr.
Hoeft, Herbert E.
Hope, Fred H.
Howard, William C.
Hubbard, Charles J.
Hughes, Douglas A.
Huskey, James E.
Jimenez, Adam
Joachimi, Ned A.
Jones, Royce E.
Kaufman, Gerald G.
Kingsbury, Dave R.
Kinnison, Jimmie G.
Korywchak, Frank
Krane, Robert A.
Lamons, Robert E.
Lawson, Warren G.
Londo, Richard J.
Lozar, Alfred J.
Lutz, Joseph C.
Lynch, David F.
Manna, Paul E.
Manning, Robert L.
Marlow, James W.
Marsh, Lemuel E., III
McDonald, Donald F.
McDonald, Thomas F.
McElrath, William T.
McGowan, Garrett E.
McMaster, Ronald R.
McNall, Jack G.
Medley, George W.
Meeker, Don E.
Meissner, Roger F.
Miller, Edward M.
Miller, Louis G.
Miller, Robert A.
Mitchell, James L., Jr.
Morton, Bryan D.
Murphy, Jerry C.
Neal, Jerome B.
Neal, William R., Jr
Openshaw, James A., Jr.
Orr, James M.
Osborne, Walton H., III
Ottinger, Joseph B.
Parker, Eugene W.
Payne, Robert W.
Perry, Earl E.
Pfaff, Robert A.
Pierce, John A.
Piper, Arthur D.
Plugge, Donald W.
Ragan, Robert M.
Ramsey, Roger R.
Raymer, David L.
Redd, Gail R.
Riordan, William T.
Robinson, Bobby L.
Rogero, Ralph S., II
Roster, Nicholas J.
Sage, Robert S.
Scanga, Robert P.
Scott, Douglas W.
Shippers, Ernon L., O4017511.
Smith, Robert G.
Staley, Richard D.
Stevens, Charles T.
Stewart, Charles E., III
Thompson, Douglas F.
Thompson, Frederick A., O4026931.
Ulcak, Ben J.
Underwood, John R.
Van Giesen, Robert E.
Vergot, William D.
Wiggins, Brook C.
Williams, Bruce H.
Wilson, James F.
Yates, Samuel M.
Zenk, Daniel R.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1955, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Donald Arthur Andrews
Billy Adair Arthur
Eugene Richard Auer
Thomas Joseph Auger
William Andrews Auxp
James Edward Barker
Gilbert Rodney Batchman
Vane Quentin Bates, Jr.
Paul Bazilwich, Jr.
Richard James Bean
Richard Douglas Becker
James Patrick Bergen
Ted Eugene Bishop
Ira Woodruff Black, Jr.
Norman Gene Blahuta
Philip Taylor Blanton
Charles Fred Bliss, 3d
Peter Demetrios Booras
Royal Charles Bosshard
William Perry Boyd
James Radcliffe Brokenshire, Jr.
Thomas John Brooks
John Mitchell Brown
Robert Bruce Brown
William Wiley Brown
Karl Avrum Brunstein
Donald Montgomery Buchwald
Alva Bartlett Bundren, Jr.
George Anthony Burkhart, Jr.
William Sylvester Burrus
Ronald Lee Cairns
John Nicholas Calley
Robert Elder Camp
Jack Preston Campbell
Walter Earl Campbell
Richard George Cardillo
Robert Dollar Carpenter
Francis Eugene Ceglowski
William Hanlon Chambers
Billy Junior Chance.
Robert Bruce Chapman
Richard Sales Cheesborough
Gerald George Chikalla
Alfred Anthony Cini
John Bell Clayton, 3d
Alton Hugh Coleman
James Allen Cooper
Lionel Robert Coyle
John William Crancer
Loomis Leslie Crandall
Thomas Tingey Craven
Alden Rudyard Crawford, Jr.
William Totton Cummings
Robert Joseph Cummins
James Theopold Darrah, Jr.
Raymond Edwin Dax
Clarence Albert DeLong
Edgar Ernest DeMaris
Robert Everett Deardorff, Jr.
Jerry Linwood Denman
James Anthony Devereaux
Daniel Wayne Dienst
Richard Wayne Dinwiddie
Kenneth Anthony Dion
Robert Ingomar Doerr, Jr.
Charles Robert Domeck
Neil Louis Dorward
John Paul Doyle, Jr.
James Everman Drummond
John Edward Dryer
Daniel Carlisle Dugan
George Arden Dulk
Roy Saulsbury Dunaway, Jr
Watha James Eddins, Jr.
William Henry Edwards, Jr.
Philip Harrison Enslow, Jr.
Lee Earl Erminger
John Sebree Farrington
John Autrey Feagin, Jr.
Paul Fetko
Peter Nick Fikaris
Herbert Charles Finger
David Dewees Finley
James Elmer Fiscus
James Elliott Fleeger
Norwood Wall Fleming
Arthur Gordon Follett
Richard Alfred Fontaine
Clifford Joseph Fralen
Joseph Powel Franklin
Wallace Greene Franklin, Jr.
Harold Dean Frear
Sheldon Jonathan Freed
Jack Wilson Frost
John Owen Funkhouser
Elisha Lloyd Gallup, Jr.
Harvey Arlen Garn
Forrest Theodore Gay, 3d
Charles Richard Gersitz
John Harry James Giddings
David Drew Gilpatrick
Kenneth Edward Ginter
Jack Goldstein
Richard Neil Gottron
Todd Porter Graham
William Alexander Graham, Jr.
Donald Haines Gransback
Richard Herbert Gray
Frank Upton Greer, 3d
James William Grey
John Charles Griggs
Edward Fox Grubbs, Jr.
Raymond Eric Gunderson
Edward Richey Guthrie
William Edward Haas
William McKell Hadly
Jerome Francis Hagan
Zach Hagedorn, Jr.
John Mark Hamilton, Jr.
Richard Lee Hargrove
Robert Wilson Hasbrouck, Jr
Richard Thurber Hawkins
Moody Echol Hayes
Ralph La Verne Henry
Robert Barrett Henry
Leo Anthony Hergenroeder.
Thomas Wade Herren, Jr.
Donald Constantine Hilbert
Robert Marble Hinrichs
Harold Richard Hoeferkamp
Willard Ames Holbrook
Thomas George Horst
David August Hufnagel
John Plympton Stuart Humphrey
Kenneth Kiyoshi Ikeda
Don Isbell
Robert Arthur Jackson
Paul James Jeffries
Cecil Donald Jellison
John Randolph Jeter, Jr.
Charles Rodney Johnson
Fredrick Graham Johnson
Richard Damon Johnson
Robert Peter Johnson
Stanley Morgan Johnson
Clifford Jones, Jr.
Warren Alexander Jones
Robert Emmett Joseph, Jr.
Irvin George Katenbrink, Jr.
James Hanlin Kinzer, Jr.
Robert Lee LaFrenz
Walter Howard Landers
Kaye Don Lathrop
Paul Thomas Lenio
Gerald Lewis
Theodore Joseph Livesay
Dean Albert Longbottom
John Philip Lovell
Samuel Newlon Lowry, Jr.
William Ernest Lozier
William Campbell Lucas, Jr.
Daniel Dean Ludwig
Bruce Stratton MacDonald
Alexander Ronald Macdonald
Daniel Karl Malone
Rudolph Sargus Malooley
John Ells Martling
Sidney Echols Mason
Clyde Massey, Jr.
John Rhodes Matteson
Stephen Anthony Matuszak
David Franklin Maurer
William Clifford Maus, Jr.
William Stephen May
Preston Brooks Mayson, Jr.
Thomas Weller McCarthy
Robert Rugh McClelland
John Cardinal McCloskey
J. Gordon McCormack
William Lewis McCulla, Jr.
Thomas Patrick McGrevey
Martin Cyril McGuire
Wilmer Lee McIlroy, Jr.
James Albert McIntosh
Leon Ellington McKinney
Carl Herbert McNair, Jr.
Martin Lewis McNamee
David Allen McNerney
Malcolm Vernon Meekison
Henry Watts Meetze
Edward Allen Mendell
Christopher Jesse Miller, Jr.
James Richard Miller
James Richey Conklin Miller
John Walton Miller
Cecil Myron Minich
Dan Moses
Thomas Lawrence Mullan, Jr.
Arthur Edward Muller, Jr.
Gary William Munroe
James Francis Murphy 3d
John Allen Myers
James Wyly Napier 3d
Gordon Raynor Negaard
Robert Winthrop Newton
Sterling Ramsdell Nichols, Jr.
Edward Wesley Nidever
Miguel Nieves, Jr.
William Dale Norvell
Robert Hugh Nourse
Francis Edmund O'Brien
Lee Donne Olvey
Godwin Ordway 3d
Louis Vernon Pace
George Wilson Page
Alton Brooks Parker, Jr.
Paul Francis Parks
William Trest Parks
Russell Levi Parsons
John Franklin Passaflume
Theodore Brooks Patterson
David Wilson Patton
John Cruickshank Pearson
David Lee Pemberton
Rex Van Noy Perkins
William Grayson Peters
Joseph David Pettet
James Julian Pirtle, Jr.
David Wayne Polly
Chester Hilton Pond
Donald Carruthers Poorman
John Henry Pratt
Thomas Allen Price
Hugh Quinn 3d
Rawleigh Hazen Ralls 3d
Allen Dwight Raymond 3d
Donald Emerson Reid
Benjamin Douglas Roberts
Frank Jay Robertson
Willard Luther Robinson
John Vincent Rock, Jr.
John Edward Rudzki, Jr.
Don Philip Rundle
James Herbert Ryan
Walter Joseph Ryan
Henry Lee Sanderson
Franz Peter Schauer
Madison Clinton Schepps, Jr.
John Lawrence Schick
Frank Joseph Schlotter
Robert Curtis Harkin Schmidt
Horace Schow, Jr.
Charles Allen Schuh
John Garnett Senger
Robert Lee Shaffer
Raymond Lowell Shideler
Richard Dean Shimunek
William Frederick Sietman, Jr.
Joseph John Skaff
John Francis Sloan
Donald Eugene Smith
Norman Maynard Smith

Wayne Richard Smith
Paul Richard Smor
Robert Louis Soper, Jr.
Norman Wayne Sparks
Alfred Joseph Spaulding
John Gill Spellman
Leo Robert St. Amour, Jr.
Robert Forrest Stanley
James Walter Staudaher
John Wiley Steakley
Charles Augustus Steinman
Richard Anthony Stemle
Wynne Bennett Stern, Jr.
Charles Hiram Stevens III
Michael Andrew Stevenson
Lawrence Edward Stockett
Howard Francis Stone
Robert Anthony Strati
William Bernard Streett, Jr.
James Ralston Strickland
John Howard Strom
Richard Bradley Struss
Paul James Sullivan, Jr.
Stanley Richard Sydenham
Charles Horace Symonds 2d
Louis T. Tebodo
Billy Montgomery Tennant
William Arthur Terrio
Joseph Norman Thomer
Theodore Eugene Thompson
James Edward Torrence
James Irving Town
Richard Morton Traut
Jack Durward Trawick
Edward Lee Trobaugh
Frank Daniel Troyan
Jon Conrad Vand'n Bosch
Harold John Vandersea
Joseph Fraser Vincent
John Alvin Viney
Roderic Bemis Vitty
Edmund Vulgas
Frank George Walton
Leo Vincent Warner, Jr.
Rodney Lee Waterstrat
Gilbert John Weden
Macon Wesson Wells
William Lloyd Welter, Jr.
Robert Charles Werner
Thomas Cato West
Robert Loyd Wheaton
David Eastwood Wheeler
Howard Clayton Whittaker
Robert Dudley Wiegand
Bruce Abbott Wilburn
William Howard Wilcox
William Carl Wildermuth
John Raymond Wing
William Mervin Wix
Frederick Frank Woerner, Jr.
Graham Wayne Wood
Harry Milton York
David Crawford Young, 2d
Edward John Zaborowski

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. William K. Phillips, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commandant, National War College.

Rear Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Paul L. Abernethy, Jr.
Jackie D. Adams
John W. Ailes IV
Donald M. Alderson, Jr.
Thomas L. Aldrich
Donald A. Alecxih
Howard W. Alexander
John C. Allen
Erns M. Anderson
Ray "J" Anderson
Alexander B. Aronis
Glenn N. Arthur, Jr.
James P. Ashford
George T. Atkins, Jr.
Donald J. Aven
William A. Bair
Winfield S. Baird, Jr.
Laurence C. Baldauf, Jr.
James T. Baldwin
John A. Baldwin, Jr.
Charles W. Ballew
Robert MacQ. Ballinger
John M. Bannon
James M. Barrett
Paul D. Batdorf
Glenn D. Bates
Leroy R. Bechelmayr
Joseph E. Bennett
Thomas P. Bennington
Roger G. Betsworth
Herbert K. Biegel
Michael E. Bishop
Gregory D. Black
Robert D. Blaine
Peter S. Blair
James R. Blandford
Russell M. Blythe
John R. Boardman
Edmund B. Bossart, Jr.
Francis T. Boucher
Luke S. Boudreaux III
Donall G. Bourke
Barry V. Bowen
Robert L. Boyd
Leonard A. Bracken, Jr.
John L. Brainerd
Carl T. Braun
Donald R. Briggs
Edward H. Browder
Thomas N. Brown
Victor A. Brown
James H. Brownlow
Harvey W. Burden
Frederick D. Butterfield
Patrick S. Byrne
Anthony C. Cajka
Rex S. Caldwell, Jr.
John R. Camp
Harry F. Campbell, Jr.
Thomas P. Cann
Elisha B. Caraway, Jr.
Verner R. Carlson
James McL. Carr, Jr.
Powell F. Carter, Jr.
Francis L. Castillo
David W. Caswell
Ralph N. Channell
Warren P. Chase
Walter B. Christmas
Angelo G. Cicolani
Carl C. Clement, Jr.
David W. Cockfield
Jonathan S. Coe
Roger L. Coffey
George O. Compton
Richard I. Comstock
Robert L. Conlan
David J. Conley
Walsh J. Conmy
Donald L. Conner
Samuel S. Conoly, Jr.
Robert F. Constans
James McN. Conway
Thomas H. Copeman, Jr.
Dale F. Crosier
Dennis E. Curtis
Gerald T. Dantzler
George W. Davis, Jr.
Thomas A. E. Davis
Albert L. Dawson
Charles R. Dedrickson
Russell C. De Esch
James L. DeGroff
George B. DeLano
Joseph C. DeLashmitt, Jr.
Lawrence S. Del Plato
Daniel C. Dennison
Rodericks S. Dickens, Jr.
Richard H. Dimse
Anthony J. Dopazo
John B. Draves
Edward M. Dower
Loring P. Dresel
Leonard G. Duffy
Joseph J. Dunn
David A. Durgin
Montague R. Duval
James P. Eadie II
Joseph M. Earley, Jr.
Richard D. Echard
Donald E. Eckels
Charles T. Edson
William Elias, Jr.
Robert E. Emery
Thomas R. M. Emery
Robert J. Englert
Billy M. Ervin
Francis J. Farino
Paul W. Fiedler
Harold C. Filbert
Myles E. Fladager
Walter R. Flowers
Edward R. Floyd
Harvey D. Foley
John J. Foran
William R. Forbes
Barton W. Fordham, Jr.
Joseph A. Forest
Robert R. Fountain, Jr.
Henry A. French
S. Pendleton Fullinwider, Jr.
Richard K. Gaines, Jr.
John W. Gallagher
Robert J. Galvin
Clark M. Gammell
John R. Ganey
Geoffrey L. Gardner
Joseph A. Gattuso
Leroy F. Gayle
Charles F. Gerhan, Jr.
Richard L. Gero
Richard B. Gilchrist
Gerald W. Gilstad
Quentin L. Glass
Charles L. Gooding, Jr.
Guy A. B. Grafius
Walter W. Graham III
Edwin H. Grant, Jr.
Jack A. Garrow
Clifford R. Graue
George W. Greene, Jr.
James F. Greene, Jr.
William T. Greenhalgh, Jr.
James M. Grego
James L. Griffin
Laurence H. Grimes, Jr.
Paul B. Grozen
Harold B. Grutchfield, Jr.
Sherred L. Guille
Gordon R. Guimond
James C. Gussett
Charles "R" Hagee
John D. Hague
David G. Hamilton
Frank P. Hamilton
Robert B. Hamilton
Lawrence V. Hansen, Jr.
"J" "E" Harmon
Lee D. Harmony, Jr.
Norman W. Harper
John V. Harter
Neil L. Harvey
Anthony A. Hastoglis
John B. Haynes
Donald C. Heckman
Lawrence L. Heisel
Raymond R. Henderson
Robert W. Hepworth
Kenneth L. Highfill
Raymond W. Hine
Robert M. Hinton
Paul M. Hoff, Jr.
William J. Holland, Jr.
Hartley O. Holte
John J. Hootman
Richard McB. Hughes
Richard L. Hunt
Tom G. Hussmann
Theodore K. Hyman
Robert P. Irons, Jr.
Thomas E. Irvine
Jimmie D. Jackson
Joe T. Jackson, Jr.
Aaron B. Jacobs
Edward F. Jardine, Jr.
Johns P. Jaudon
Paul O. Jessen
George L. Johnson
Lauren A. Johnson
Raymond F. Johnson, Jr.
Roger D. Johnson
Gerald L. Jones
Richard M. Jones
Douglas S. Jordan
Robert G. Judd
Kenneth I. Jurgensen
Donald S. Kaiser
Alfred W. Kavanaugh
Leo P. Keating, Jr.
Delbert V. Keener
Donald W. Kellerman
James P. Kelly, Jr.
William A. Kennington
Thomas G. Kiefaber
Edward A. Kingston
Donald E. Knepper
Frederick H. Koester, Jr.
Demosthenes N. Kolaras
Stanley D. Kolb, Jr.
Jerold D. Kowalsky
Albert J. Kozischek
Joseph J. Kronzer, Jr.
Ronald C. Kucera
William P. Kuhne
Stanley J. Kuplinski
Walter W. Lamb
William F. Lavallee
George E. Lawniczak, Jr.
Samuel W. Layn
Donald H. Lilienthal
John E. Lilly, Jr.
Donald B. Linehan
Charles W. Litzenberg
John F. Long
Stephen D. Lowe
Edward W. Lull
Randall M. Luzader
Allen B. MacDiarmid
Richard N. Mack
Joseph D. Mackenzie
Malcolm MacKinnon III
Joseph Malec, Jr.
Paul R. Manikowski
William H. J. Manthorpe, Jr.
Donald Martin
Donald L. Martin
George H. Martin
George W. Martin
Charles E. Masalin
Walter L. Matthes, Jr.
Mitchell D. Matthews, Jr.
Kenneth R. McCally
William E. McCarron, Jr.
William F. McCauley
Douglas R. McCrimmon
John R. McDonnell
William E. McGinnis
Donal E. McGonegal
Edward B. McHale
Alban T. McIsaac
Alfred S. McLaren
John S. McLaughlin
George J. McMurtry
John E. McNish
Robert T. Meloy
Robert S. Merritt
Edward L. Micjan
Richard J. Mieldazis
Robert M. Mielich
Justin A. Miller, Jr.
Robert N. Miller
Ronald D. Miller
Eric Milnor
Matt C. Mlekush
Thomas H. Moore
William H. Moore IV
John R. Morgan
Burton L. Munger
John J. Murphy
Henry C. Mustin
Robert U. Myers
Richard T. Nelson
Roger E. Nelson, Jr.
Edward C. Newbegin
Robert G. Newbegin IV
Byron B. Newell, Jr.
Charles L. Newman
Henry C. North, Jr.
Keith A. Nyhus
John W. Nyquist
Carl E. Oates
Charles M. O'Brien, Jr.
James M. O'Hara
Philip Oliver, Jr.
Walter E. Olsen
Gary E. Olson
Ross S. Olson
Edward G. Otrupchak
William R. Overdorff
Elton C. Parker, Jr.
John T. Parker, Jr.
Joel D. Patterson
Roy C. Paul
Daniel E. Peckham
Edward M. Peebles
Joseph F. Perez
Fred C. Peterson
Richard A. Peterson
John T. Pierce
Robert B. Pirie, Jr.
Charles M. Plumly
Robert D. Poland
Robert K. Pollak
Thomas B. Potter, Jr.
John H. Powell
William L. Pray
William N. Pugliese
David A. Reedy
Philip M. Reitzel
John W. Renard
William O. K. Rentz
David B. Reynolds
Preston A. Reynolds
William K. Rhodes, Jr.
Keith J. Rice
Robert C. Rice
Hallem B. Rich
John R. Richards
Myron V. Ricketts
James P. Riviere
John W. Roberts
Joel A. Robinson
Robert M. Robinson
Francis C. Rose, Jr.
James C. Rothrock
Kirk W. Rowe
Robert R. Rule
Philip H. Ryan, Jr.
Marvin L. Salomon
Carl H. Sanders, Jr.
Thomas E. Sandmeyer
George S. Sanstol
Wesley L. Saunders, Jr.
Wesley W. Saunders
John F. Schilpp
Frederick B. Schoenberger
Harry C. Schrader, Jr.
Thomas D. Schultz
Walter H. Schulze II
MacGregor G. Scott
Donald C. Shelton
Rolf A. Shepard
Robert E. Sherwood
Dan G. Shields
Thomas Shine, Jr.
Winfield M. Sides, Jr.
Stanley S. Skorupski, Jr.
Marshall T. Slayton
Charles R. Smith
Dickinson M. Smith

Edward G. Smith
John W. Smith
Lewis D. Smith
Robert L. Smith
William D. Smith
Winchester "C" Smith, Jr.
James R. Snow
Gary L. Snyder
Harry E. Spence
Thomas F. Stallman
Paul R. Steffenhagen
David M. Stembel, Jr.
Gordon LeR. Stephens
James R. Stevens
William Stevens
Charles R. Stewart
John E. Stewart
Walter J. Stewart III
Francis G. Stokes
George W. Stott, Jr.
Carl C. Strange, Jr.
John B. Streit
Charles J. Stuart, Jr.
Donald B. Stuart
Harley L. Stuntz III
Donald L. Sturtz
Dennis J. Sullivan, Jr.
Paul E. Sutherland, Jr.
Charles T. Sylvester
William G. A. Sympson, Jr.
John M. Tallman
Charles A. Tarver, Jr.
Carl H. Taylor, Jr.
Patterson C. Taylor
William J. Thearle
John R. Thune
Frederick W. Tindall
Donald G. Todaro
James F. Todd
Robert E. Tollaksen
Albert L. Toney, Jr.
Ernest J. Toupin, Jr.
William K. Tracy
George Tsantes, Jr.
Edmund L. Turner
Lee R. Turner, Jr.
Simon J. Ulcickas, Jr.
Fred S. Underwood
George H. Volk
Seaborn H. Wade, Jr.
Denis E. Waitley
William A. Walden
Eugene R. Walker
Homer N. Wallin, Jr.
Donald W. Walter
Joseph J. Walter
Edward A. Wardwell
Larry E. Ware
Frank B. Warren
Richard P. Warrick
Jerome F. Watson
Raymond A. Ways
John C. Weaver
Hugh L. Webster
Raymond L. Wehrmeister
Robert J. Westberg
Darrel E. Westbrook, Jr.
Bernard A. White
Lawrence S. Wigley
John E. Wild
John E. Wildman
Edward A. Wilkinson, Jr.
Charles H. Will, Jr.
Percy W. Williams, Jr.
John P. Williamson, Jr.
James L. Willis, Jr.
Derek W. Wilson
Gordon B. Wilson
John R. Wilson, Jr.
Carroll H. J. Wittner
Douglas A. Worth
Eric R. A. Woxvold
John M. Yuscavage
Charles J. Zadarozny
Otto A. Zipf
Emil J. Zseleczky

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Elif A. Andersen
Robert A. Barbary
Jack R. Bedenbaugh
Arthur G. Bedford
John A. Begley, Jr.
Arthur F. Braun
Edgar S. Causbie
Davis L. Clark
William G. Collier
Robert W. Davis
Richard W. Ellis
Paul S. Farans
John J. Flynn, Jr.
Laurence W. Frost
Robert F. Gallagher
Richard C. Hensler
James R. Holder
Samuel Jacobson
William E. Jerauld
John M. Jones, Jr.
Richard T. Knock
Donald A. Lovelace
Richard B. McLaughlin
Billy G. McSwain
Ray A. Mara
George W. Mead III
Arthur J. Mehrens, Jr.
Douglas M. Michelsen
David O. Miller
James R. O'Neil
Earl H. Pace
Richard H. Ribbe
Leonard P. Rittenberg
Richard A. Ruth IV.
Stephen R. Ruth
Robert D. Ryder
Carl Shumaker
Casimir E. Sojka
Willard G. Steadman III
Donald G. Straw
James W. Sweeney
Clarence J. Thurston
William E. Turcotte
Carl P. Vogel, Jr.
Robert B. Vollum

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy:

Hyneman M. Andress
Walton J. Grinke
Robert P. Phenix
Stephen W. Reszetar
Ernest H. Smith
Thomas N. Tate

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

John B. Acey
John A. Adams
Joseph E. Armstrong
William R. Ball
Allen W. Brown, Jr.
James J. Chmelik
Richard J. Cisewski
Josiah W. Collins
James G. Cowart, Jr.
John R. Curnutt
John W. DeWitt
David J. Dunn
Cecil A. Edwards, Jr.
Franklin P. Eller, Jr.
Robert L. Fischer
Wilfred S. Fisher
Bobby H. Freeman
Bobby F. Goins
John C. Gonzalez
John T. Gray
Wallace M. Greene III
Billy M. Grimes
Joseph T. Hawkins
Charles A. Henry
John H. Honse III
Michael D. Kandra
John I. Kelly
Donald J. Lange
Thomas J. Lapham
Robert A. LeBrun
Richard G. Little
Bill G. Lowrey
Robert A. Lynch
Carlos K. McAfee
Peter R. Maitland
James E. Masters
Donald R. Miller
John P. Monahan
John A. Morra
John B. Morris
Arthur H. Nussel
Edward R. Perron
James M. Perryman, Jr.
Robert O. Price
Robert E. Rodecker
Roger F. Scott, Jr.
Paul D. Slack
William P. Slattery
Robert D. Stuckey
Frederic LeR. Tolleson
John G. Toner
John T. Tyler
Alfred L. Vail
Calvin G. Weaver
Robert K. Wier
Eric H. Wieler

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold G. Adams
James L. Adams
John L. Adams
Winthrop R. Adkins
William M. Ahlenius
Herbert W. Ahrens, Jr.
Charles P. Ake
Dean C. Allard, Jr.
Neal M. Allen
Bruce T. Alligood, Jr.
Richard R. Allison
Thomas L. Allison, Jr.
Kent S. Allworth
Frederick J. Almgren, Jr.
Harris J. Amhowitz
George Anagnostos
Jon T. Anderson
Paul R. Anderson
Samuel A. Anderson III
George S. Ansell
Charles Antonacos
David W. Armstrong
George R. Armstrong
Donald M. Arveson
Robert H. Aslakson
George P. Atkins
Charles W. Austin
John H. Ayres
Hunter E. Babin
Allen L. Bader
Bruce A. Bailey
John P. Bailey, Jr.
Charles C. Baker
Jon A. Baker
Robert A. Baker
George K. Baldry
Geoffrey H. Ball
Stanley M. Ball
Robert D. Banz
Richard H. Barbe
Gale D. Barbee
James A. Barber, Jr.
Robert F. Bardwell
Charles B. Barfoot
Theodore W. Barger
Karl L. Barkley
Howard W. Barnes
Walter A. Barr
James J. Barrett
Fred H. Barrows III
Marion D. Bartlett
Wayne R. Bartley
Robert D. Bascom
Phillip D. Batton
John R. Batzler
James R. Bauder
John W. Bauerle
Erich E. Baumgartner
Norman T. Beal
Richard N. Bechtel
William H. Becker
Thomas S. Beeler
Charles E. Bell, Jr.
William R. Bell
Frank Belvin
Richard G. Bemis
John E. Bendel
Raymond "D" Bennett
John C. Bergquist
Thomas A. Bickerstaff, Jr.
Donald J. Bilinski
Robert O. Binkley
Edward E. Birkinshaw, Jr.
Robert W. Bjorndahl
Shem K. Blackley, Jr.
James S. Blaising
David D. Blanchard
Alan A. Blatz
John A. Blesch
Gene E. Bloch
Donald W. Blount
Herbert L. Boatwright III
Gill H. Boehringer
Archie M. Bolster
Russell L. Bolton
John J. Bonasia
Homer E. Bonds, Jr.
Edwin J. Bonner
William W. Bonneville
Philip E. Bonz
Joseph Bordogna
David L. Boslaugh
William LeG. Boss, Jr.
George T. Bostic, Jr.
Kirk L. Bosworth
Bruce E. Bothwell
Frederick R. Bott
Byron F. Boudreaux
Norman M. Bouton
Harry S. Boyd
Robert W. Boyd
James R. Bradish
Bedford C. Bradley
Jerald S. Bradshaw
Walter F. Brady, Jr.
Carl F. Bratton, Jr.
John C. Bray, Jr.
Stephen K. Breslauer
David G. Briggs
George W. Brockman III
Richard H. Brodeur
Charles J. Brown
Delbert L. Brown
Glenn C. Brown
James G. Brown
William H. Browning III
Merle W. Brubaker
Philip N. Buchanan
Theodore C. Buckshaw III
Robert C. Bueker
Donald D. Bunker
Robert B. Bunn
William J. Burch
Raymond F. Burke
Richard D. Burke
Donald J. Burkhart
John E. Burroughs
David G. Burton
Donal W. Butterfield
Robert D. Buzzard, Jr.
John C. W. Cadoo, Jr.
John E. Cahoon, Jr.
Walter K. Caldwell
John H. Calhoun, Jr.
Edward F. Cambridge
Jim F. Cameron
Charles N. Campbell
William S. Campbell
John M. Cantey
Oscar B. Carlisle
John W. Carlson
Leland J. Carlson
Frank C. Carlton
Frederick L. Carothers
Donovan V. Carr
Patrick F. Carr
Thomas U. Carr
Robert E. Carter
James F. Cartwright
David C. Carvey
Alan F. Casey
George E. Casey
John A. Casey
William K. Catching, Jr.
Allen W. Cater
Francis Catterson
Raymond L. Chalker
Dan D. Chandler
Edward A. Chapman, Jr.
Albert K. Chevalier
William S. Chilton
Howard E. Christensen
Jack P. Christopher
Fred M. Clark
William C. Clause, Jr.
Gene L. Cliff
James G. Cline
Emsley F. Cobb
Stanley H. Cochran
Michael B. Coffey
Jackson Coffin
Rulon F. Collett
Neuland C. Collier
Charles C. Collins, Jr.
Marcellus T. Coltharp
Kenneth E. Conn
Thomas P. Connally
John J. Connors
Robert A. Conquest
David R. Conrad
Stephen N. Cook
Lynton B. Cooper, Jr.
Don E. Corn
Paul A. Cornett
John J. Costello
James C. Cotting
Robert G. Courter
Donald E. Crabill
Robert C. Craig
Richard W. Crain, Jr.
Tom J. Cress
Jack LaV. Crittenden
Richard L. Croll
Wayne R. Crone
Billy D. Crouch
Alexander S. Cuenin III
Daniel M. Culhane
William A. Culpepper
Edward I. Cunningham
Raymond M. Currie
Charles E. Daley
John D'Aloia, Jr.
John L. Dampman
Jere R. Daniell II
Alan O. Dann
Rodger L. Darbonne
Ronald Darby
Carl F. Davis, Jr.
Charles N. Davis
Frederick G. Davis
Gregory H. Davis, Jr.
James C. Davis, Jr.
Richard H. Davis
Stanley R. Davis
James P. Day
John J. Deady
Marvin E. Deck, Jr.
Severin A. DeDeyn
William A. Deshler
Harry L. Devoe, Jr.
William L. Devries
Carl C. Dietz
Warren C. Dietz
Dan J. DiGiovacchino
Max W. Dixon
Sidney C. Dixon
Jeremy H. Dole
Bruce K. Donaldson
Henry S. Donaldson
James M. Doody, Jr.
Gerald P. Dougherty
John Downes, Jr.
"J" Patrick Doyle
Richard H. Dudley
John P. Duffy
George P. Dunigan
Theodore F. Dutko
George L. Dyer, Jr.
Walter O. Edberg
James V. Edelmon
Thomas H. Edgerton
Henry F. Edwards
Alfred O. Elder
William N. Elder
Charles P. Elliott
John L. Elliott
Robert C. Ellis
Robert L. Ellison
Harold B. Elsasser
Alden H. Elsea
Stanley W. Elwell
Ivan H. Enstrom, Jr.
Richard O. Erhardt
Kenneth J. Erickson
Gerald W. Eriksen
Robert B. Erskine
Jacob V. Eskenazi
Alexander J. Esrey, Jr.
Edwin Ettinger
Samuel D. Evans
James A. Everts
William F. Exley
Willard L. Fadner
Fred E. Falke, Jr.
Allen P. Fancher
Richard H. Faulkner
Edward S. Ferrell
George F. Fickeissen
Edward P. Fillion, Jr.
Hulon P. Fillingane
Walter J. Finke, Jr.
John G. Finley
Charles D. Fisher
George M. Fitting
Robert F. Flacke
James T. Fleming, Jr.
Jerome D. Fleming
Thomas R. Foard
Larry B. Flood
Frederick F. Fordon
Ronald Forehand
John G. Forester, Jr.
James N. Fowler
John D. Fowler
Francis H. Fox
Mylo G. Fox
Fred R. Frank
Joe Frank
Jo W. French
Bruce H. Frisch
James C. Froid
Richard H. Frye
Gary M. Fuller
John W. Fuller
Robert V. Fultyn
James R. Funck
Daniel J. Fuss
Thomas E. Gainor

Joseph E. Galbraith
Robert G. Galli
Barry J. Galt
Barry T. Galvin
William H. Garland
Theodore C. Garrett
Robert W. Garver
Thomas A. Gasser
Richard G. Geer
Scott Gerrish
Robert J. Gibbons
Gerald H. Gilbert
Charles W. Gilgore
Jack W. Gillespie
Jerry T. Gillett
John H. Gilligan, Jr.
Paul L. Giuffre
James G. Givens
Gerald L. Glahn
Burton J. Gleason
Robert W. Goedjen
Robert B. Goetz
Milton LeR. Goff III
George DeW. Goodrich
Rex J. Goodwin
Perry G. Gorham
Donald A. Gottschalk
Bernard B. Gragg, Jr.
James G. Graham
Loren R. Graham
Galt Grant
Roger B. Granum
Stephen D. Green III
Donald L. Greene
Robert C. Greene
Edward P. Griffing
Donald M. Grimes
Glenn W. Groenewold
Charles C. Groff
Richard L. Grogan
Donald L. Gross
Gordon W. Grossman
Aubrey J. Gruber
Byron C. Gwinn II
Robert C. Haavind
Michael C. Hadow
Karl H. Hagenau
Frederick W. Hahn, Jr.
Charles W. Hall
Edward A. Hall
Howard R. Hallet, Jr.
Donald M. Halley, Jr.
Harry D. Hamilton
William O. Hamilton III
Rodney E. Hammond
Frederick D. Hamrick III
Robert P. Hanson
William E. Happersett, Jr.
Thad H. Harden
Arlington R. Harman
Lawrence S. Harnes
Clio A. Harper, Jr.
Donald K. Harris
William A. Harris, Jr.
Richard M. Harvey
George F. Harvie
Jerry R. Haupt
Frederic H. Hawkins
Jan. R. Hawthorne
Hugh A. Hazle
Joseph F. Heaps
James E. Hemphill
Thomas F. Henderson
Jack A. Henry
William R. Henry
Robert R. Henzler
Wesley C. Herbol
Diego E. Hernandez
Herbert F. Herndon
Robert O. Herrmann
James L. Hesburgh
John L. Heuser
John A. Hickey
Joseph F. Higgins, Jr.
Russel "K" Hileman
Emerson W. Hilker
Bruce E. Hill
Henry H. Hillman
William G. Hine
Oscar T. Hines, Jr.
Thomas W. Hirtle
Douglas S. Hobbs
Sidney N. Hockens
Banjamin E. Hoffman
Robert L. Hogg
Lowell J. Holloway
James E. Holmes
George F. Hoober
Gordon W. Hope
Jack E. Hooper
John G. Hordyk
Serge P. Horeff
Douglas G. Hoskins, Jr.
John T. Houk, Jr.
Norris W. Howard
James B. Howe, Jr.
Albert L. Huber
Harry L. Huggins
George D. Humphrey, Jr.
Griffith L. Humphrey
Elmer LeR. Hunt
Herman L. Hunt
John B. Hunt
Charles T. Hunter, Jr.
Robert M. Hunter
William B. Huntley, Jr.
Marc A. Hurt
Willis G. Hyde
Clifford F. Ide
Gary D. Irish
David E. Isselhard
Robert N. Jack
Manly L. Jackson
Tommy H. Jackson
William R. Jackson, Jr.
James H. Jacobsen
Harry R. James III
Thomas A. Jansing
Donald R. Jebens
John E. Jedlicka
David H. Jenner
Fred O. H. Jensen
Harvey J. Jensen
Harvey R. Jewett, Jr.
Bruce Johnson
Bruce D. Johnson
Earl J. Johnson
Linwood E. Johnson
Richard W. Johnson
Tucker I. Johnson, Jr.
William T. Johnson
Gary D. Jones
Roycroft C. Jones, Jr.
Waldo D. Jones II
David L. Jordan
Rudy E. Joyce
William B. Joyce
John A. Judge
Bruce C. Juell
Frederick P. Kaempfer
Richard E. Kameros
Lenni W. Kangas
James H. Karlen
Donald K. Kassel
Marvin S. Katzman
Ralph H. Keeler
Charles M. Kelley
Donald R. Kelley
Lawrence C. Kelly
Dale L. Kemmerer
Wallace C. Kemper, Jr.
Robert J. Kendra
Robert M. P. Kennard, Jr.
Robert P. Kennedy
Robert E. Kenny
James C. Kerbin
Paul R. Kerrigan
Leslie P. Kewley
Roy V. Keyes, Jr.
Richard C. Keyser
Burdell E. Kietzmann
James M. Kilpatrick
Ronald K. Kimmel
James C. Kinard
Fred N. King
Alexander G. Kirby, Jr.
Harvey R. Kirby
Theodore A. Kircher
Clyde K. Kislingbury
Joseph E. Klein
Thomas R. Kloves
Dale R. Klugman
Donald R. Kneepkens
Dwain LaV. Knepper
Robert R. Knepper, Jr.
Stephan H. Knight II
Everett F. Knowles
Richard J. Koch, Jr.
John H. Koslov
Robert L. Kramer
Harold G. Kraus
Henry P. Krienke
Eugene L. Kritter
John L. Krizek
Joseph J. Laferty
Rodney D. Lake
Chapman L. Lam
John P. Lamers
Frederick W. Lander, Jr.
Peter H. Langer
Jay R. Larson
John D. Lauck
Gene P. Laughlin
Clark R. Lawrence
George B. M. Lawrence, Jr.
John M. Leaver, Jr.
Charles E. LeBoeuf
William P. Lee
John P. Lehman
Edward C. Leibig, Jr.
John S. Leighton
John M. Leivestad
Ronald C. Lengyel
Lawrence L. Leonard
James E. Lesh
John H. Letarte
Gerald Levey
Walter G. Lieberman
Austin M. Lindsey
David H. Lively
John V. G. Lockhart
Eugene V. Lofdahl
Donald E. Lotton
John J. Love
Max H. Love
Dana E. Low
Daniel B. Lucas, Jr.
Carl W. Ludvik
Davidson Luehring
Eugene P. Lund
Carl D. Lundin
David A. Lyle
James A. Lyons
Francis A. McCarthy
Robert J. McCarty
Robert C. McClanahan, Jr.
Jack E. McClelland
Kenneth DeW. McCloskey
Mark McCormick
Verl E. McCoy, Jr.
Peter W. McDaniel
Michael P. McDermott, Jr.
Donald A. McGee
Donald E. McGrath
Joseph G. McGrath
James D. McKinney
Richard K. McLeod
Peter C. McMahan
Charles J. McMahon
John J. McMahon
John A. McMinn
Raymond W. McNamee, Jr.
Richard P. McNerney
Robert H. McSweeny
Robert P. McVoy
Richard J. Macaleer
Neil L. MacFarlane
David L. Mack
Henry C. Mack, Jr.
Joseph P. Mack
William E. Madison
Evan W. Madsen
William T. Mahaffey
Peter D. Maher III
Richard D. Maltzman
Mark W. Mandelker
Charles R. Mandly
James D. Mansfield
Paul J. Marbach
Charles R. Marchand
Lloyd P. Marsh
Miles E. Marsh
John Marshall, Jr.
David V. Martin
George J. Martin, Jr.
James A. Martin
James E. Martin
John A. Martin
Richard L. Mathews
Joseph D. Mathewson
Carter C. Mathies
Rudolph Matzner, Jr.
James H. Mauldin
Robert D. May
Peter Mayerson
Stuart B. Meach
David D. Meacham
William J. Mebes
Wade I. Melton
Robert J. Merikangas
Ricardo A. Mestres, Jr.
Bertram L. Metzger, Jr.
John W. Meyer
Cardell E. Miller
Eldon J. Miller
Robert W. Miller
Ronald A. Miller
Vaden T. Miller
Robert T. Milligan
Roy C. Milton
Robert T. Minkoff
George M. Minot
George F. Minser
Charles R. Mohr
Theophilus B. L. Molloy
Robert S. Moore
Thomas W. Morgan
Thomas J. Morris, Jr.
Dexter C. Morrison
John H. Morrison
Robert McK. Morrison
Roy J. Morton, Jr.
Robert E. Mortvedt
John W. Mossbarger
James E. Murphey
Thomas H. Murray, Jr.
Charles M. Murrin
John D. Musa
Joseph E. Myers
Russell Myers, Jr.
James H. Nagel
Ronald E. Narmi
Gary B. Nash
Thomas W. Nedwek
Donald L. Nelson
Lowell B. Nelson
Hugh McK. Newsom
Jesse S. Newsom, Jr.
James H. Newton
Richard L. Nichols
Richard M. Niedbala
John L. Niklaus
Allan K. Norberg
James H. Norman
Stuart E. Norris
James Norton
William D. Noteboom
Winslow B. Oakes
William J. Oberle
John D. O'Brien, Jr.
William O'Brien III
Patrick J. O'Donnell
Chauncey G. Olinger, Jr.
John C. O'Meara
Gordon B. Orbesen
Albert F. Ott
John L. Overbey
Curt L. Owen
William C. Owen
Daniel I. Padberg
Donald E. Palmer
Philip M. Palmer
Thomas W. Parent
Donald H. Parkinson
Frank Parra
Jerry A. Parsons
Donald C. Paulson
Ronald G. Payne
William L. Payne
David M. Paynter
James A. Pearson
Herbert C. Pendergast, Jr.
John J. Pepas
Franklin H. Perry
Phil M. Perry
Francis V. Pesenti
Richard A. Peters
Brock A. Peterson
Kenneth R. Peterson
Gordon L. Petri
Phillip A. Petty
Norman S. Phillips
Kent L. Pickard
Lovett B. Pickren
Joseph L. Pierce, Jr.
William H. Pierce
Robert E. Piper, Jr.
Anthony J. Pitz
Richard K. Plummer
Wayne G. Pizak
Edwin D. Porter
James E. Poth
Eric D. Potter
Maurice T. Pozzi, Jr.
Keith F. Prater
Loren M. Pratt
Gordon R. Prentice
George B. Pressly
John V. Prestia
Alan E. Price
Alan H. Price
Willie B. Pruitt
James L. Purdy
Alfred L. Purrington III
Sylvester A. Puzio
Michael D. Pybas
William J. Quinn
William L. Ragsdale
Robert L. Rain
Richard L. Ralston
Ross Rammelmeyer
Charles F. Ramsey
Donal M. Rand
William E. Ratliff
James E. Rattan
David E. Rawnsley
Kenneth F. Read
John G. Reeder
John N. Rees
Malcolm C. Rees, Jr.
Gerald E. Reid
Philip J. Reilly, Jr.
Thomas L. Reise
Robert V. Rice
Bill "A" Richards
Gordon R. Richards
William G. Richardson
Frederick W. Richter
Huntley N. Ricker
George McK. Rider
George E. Riddell
Ronald E. Ries
Ivers W. Riley, Jr.
Thomas R. Riley, Jr.
Ira "D" Riskin
Todd D. Ritter
Harold S. Roach, Jr.
John L. Robertson
Terrell P. Robinson
Ray W. Rodman
John E. Roe, Jr.
William F. Roemer
Brien B. Rogers
Charles L. Rogers
Thomas F. Rogers
James L. Rollins
Robert W. Rose
Hayden A. Ross-Clunis, Jr.
Mario A. Rossi
Ralph A. Rossi
Harvey Rubin
Leon I. Rue
Lowell H. Ruff, Jr.
Robert D. Rummel
Willard H. Rusk
Edward DeK. Russell, Jr.
Franklin E. Russell
Ernest H. Salter, Jr.
Charles R. Samuelson
Louis F. Sander
William A. Sanders
Gerald L. Sauer
Robert C. Saunders IV
William K. Schafer
David E. Scherer
Edward R. Schickler
John R. Schinabeck
Joseph R. Schlichter
Gilbert A. Schroeder
Albert B. Schultz
Karl E. Schwarz
Austin B. Scott, Jr.
Gary L. Scott
George W. Scott
Ronald D. Scott
Thomas W. Scott
William D. Scott
Chester J. Schuler
Charles E. Seager
James H. Seaton
Kenneth C. Seawright, Jr.
Robert "B" Segal
Richard A. Semmler
Paul J. Sengstock, Jr.
Floyd B. Shacklock
John P. Sheehy
John R. Sherman
Lawrence L. Sherman
John H. Shippee
Richard L. Shoup
John Shulick, Jr.
James W. Shumate
Gilbert K. Sievers
Robert G. Sievert
Erwin Sigrist
Allan J. Silberger
John R. Sill
Larry K. Simmering
Charles V. D. Singer, Jr.
Ray D. Sipes
Melvin J. Sires III
Vincent M. Skrinak
Robert W. Skyles
Harold D. Sleet
Kenneth J. Sliwa
Bernard J. Sloan, Jr.
Charles E. Smith
Charles R. Smith
Douglas A. Smith
Robert W. Smith
Roy J. Smith
Thomas K. Smith
Thomas R. Smith
Dimitry Smorsch
Manuel B. Sousa
Charles M. Southall
Richard J. Spangenberg
George M. Spartalis, Jr.
John F. Speer
Carl W. Spitzer, Jr.
James A. Stackpole

John H. Staehle
Franklin R. Standerfer
Arthur W. Standley, Jr.
Frederick B. Steketee
Edward V. Stephenson
Reay Sterling, Jr.
Frederick R. Stewart, Jr.
Robert N. Stewart
John A. Stichter
James L. Stidham
Walter W. Stoeppelwerth
Bernard J. Stortecky
Peter R. Story
Richard W. Stott
John T. Strain
Ralph N. Straley II
Raymond S. Strangways
William R. Stratton
Thomas L. Strub
Douglas M. Stuart
Newell M. Stultz
John J. Sullivan
Ronald K. Sundfors
William A. Sybers
Donald J. Taggart
Edward B. Talbot
Alex O. Taylor, Jr.
Henry L. Thacker, Jr.
Colin C. Thomas
William I. Thomas
Richard E. Thompson
William Q. Thornburg
George D. Tice, Jr.
William T. Todd II
George F. Towne III
Bernard J. Tracey
Jeffrey W. Traenkle
Donald P. Trepte
Dean E. Troxell II
James R. Tucker
John L. Turnbull III
Laurence L. Turner
Donald M. Ulbrich
George E. Ulrich
Walter G. Updike
Robert E. VanDermay
John E. VanDeWater
Richard W. VanHorn
David B. VanHulsteyn
Richard W. VanPelt
James A. VanValkenburg
Eugene H. Vaughan, Jr.
John M. Vaughan
Anthony J. Venetti
Carl VerSteeg
Robert J. Vogel
Lewis C. Wade
Thomas L. Waddell
Donald L. Waggoner
Gerald D. Wagner
John E. Wahl
Raymond J. Wahlgren
James R. Walker
John A. Walker
John D. Wallace
Kenneth T. Wallenius
Lawrence P. Walsh
William A. Walsh
John T. Walter, Jr.
Thomas G. Warburton
Byron LeR. Warmee
John S. Warner
Harry C. Watts
Horace C. Wauson, Jr.
Wayne R. Weatherhead
Terry M. Weathers
James G. Webster III
Donald P. Wefer
Richard L. Weis
Gerhard F. Wellmann
Alfred H. Wells, Jr.
John E. Wengert
René DuW. Wernicke
Rodney K. Wernicke
Harold O. White
Kohen E. White
Treatwell M. White, Jr.
Charles W. Whitehead
Frank C. Witney
Ralph C. Wiggins, Jr.
Bruce S. Wilkinson
Edmund S. Wilkinson, Jr.
Mark R. Willcott III
Arthur G. Williams
Frederick D. Williams
Gerald G. Williams
Hugh C. Williams
Kenneth M. Williams
Norman T. Williams
Talmage T. Williams, Jr.
Edmund P. Willis
Allen D. Wills
James A. Wilson
John C. Wilson
Peter D. Wilson
Victor L. Wilson
Wayne W. Wilson
Richard N. Winfield
Cleon W. Winslow
Daniel J. Wolkensdorfer
Gerard E. Woodbury
James H. Woodson
Thomas A. Woodward
Theodore H. Wuerfel
Donald G. Wylie
Robert F. Wyvill
Lawrence L. Yost
Richard A. Young
Charles E. Zamzow
Marshall V. Zinner
Robert H. Zuege
Allen D. Zumbrunnen
Richard F. Zwetsch

John F. Carr (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Stanley J. Bielobocky
Leonard J. Cullen, Jr.
John D. Cunningham
Merrill S. Garnett
John R. Law
Henry J. Lerian, Jr.
William W. Lippstreu
Frederick G. Pfister
George P. Rejebian
Wister L. Ritchie, Jr.
Sarantis R. Sarantos
Oscar V. Simpson, Jr.
Charles M. Steiner
William B. Stewart, Jr.
Herbert A. Tabor

The following-named (ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

B. Lewis Avera, Jr.
Harry K. Barber
Richard W. Carr
George L. Capwell, Jr.
John D. Crawford
Felix L. DePinto
Alan J. Fohl
Michael V. Gaddis
James R. Green
Charles H. Hayes
Kenneth Keen, Jr.
Patrick G. Kirby
Joseph M. Lorimier III
Paul N. Pappas
Vito M. Solazzo
John P. Tauro
Francis C. Taylor
George A. Thomas, Jr.
Fred J. Vanous
Henry A. Wilde, Jr.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James D. Ahearn
Peter D. Binkley
Russell L. Currier
Thomas W. Dye
Bernard T. Eilerts
Charles K. Engle
Thomas G. Felke
Russell H. Gills
Thomas E. Howard
David L. Jeter
George H. Leach
Albert D. Leahy, Jr.
William K. MacNulty, Jr.
Thomas B. Mickley
Harvey P. Pittelko
William T. Read
David Rice
John A. Rogers II
Wade H. Royston, Jr.
Donald E. Sudduth
Henry J. Zoubek

The following-named Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Bainbridge
George H. Ellison
George G. Evans, Jr.
Don H. Hadden
Edward P. Hand
Robert R. Hull
John E. Hurley, Jr.
Clifford B. Johnson
John R. Kostelecky
Thomas H. O'Leary
Charles A. Pisaturo
Van S. Reed
Harold Schofield
Carl B. Sterzing, Jr.
William R. Thomas
William G. Thursby
Walter N. Yanochik

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Walter Howard Schad, Brewton, Ala., in place of M. C. Leigh, retired.

ARIZONA

Jimmie L. Matheson, Fry, Ariz., in place of V. J. Schrader, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Helen H. Mitchell, College Heights, Ark., in place of Floyd McAlister, transferred.

Teddy E. Miller, McCrory, Ark., in place of I. L. Dunnam, retired.

Isaac H. Roland, Malvern, Ark., in place of J. T. Alderson, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Harry Sorensen, Grover City, Calif., in place of M. H. Wharton, resigned.

John Herman Gengler, Marysville, Calif., in place of T. A. Gianella, retired.

Walter B. Townsend, Universal City, Calif., in place of C. W. Deming, retired.

Rudolph F. Loewe, Visalia, Calif., in place of E. R. Connelly, retired.

FLORIDA

Wayne R. Dickerson, Dade City, Fla., in place of W. V. Gilbert, retired.

B. Maxine O'Neal, Nocatee, Fla., in place of J. D. Carlton, retired.

GEORGIA

Louis J. O'Connell, Augusta, Ga., in place of B. E. Lester, retired.

Ben Dayton Newton, Shady Dale, Ga., in place of J. M. Athon, resigned.

Ruth R. Myers, Smithville, Ga., in place of S. M. Lunsford, removed.

Reginald D. Reynolds, Sumner, Ga., in place of E. L. Ellis, retired.

ILLINOIS

Frank Y. Mueller, Christopher, Ill., in place of D. C. Bacon, resigned.

Patricia Ann Higar, German Valley, Ill., in place of Edith Wieman, retired.

Alfred St. Aubin, Harvey, Ill., in place of F. G. Ring, resigned.

Lucy L. Stone, Hooppole, Ill., in place of W. G. Ellers, resigned.

William G. Needham, Maple Park, Ill., in place of M. H. Cofey, resigned.

Earl S. Wagher, Oneida, Ill., in place of F. L. Thayer, resigned.

INDIANA

Glen D. Bray, Amo, Ind., in place of W. F. Brewer, resigned.

Mark M. Hadley, Coatesville, Ind., in place of A. B. Newman, retired.

Joseph E. Fouts, Greens Fork, Ind., in place of S. E. Reese, deceased.

Helen L. Ort, New Haven, Ind., in place of M. L. Garstka, removed.

Robert L. Spencer, Thorntown, Ind., in place of H. E. Patterson, removed.

IOWA

Mable C. Schuck, West Point, Iowa, in place of M. C. Sallen, deceased.

KANSAS

Lincoln T. Gribben, Havana, Kans., in place of A. M. Whistler, retired.

Milton M. John, Jr., Saint John, Kans., in place of G. E. Bartlett, resigned.

KENTUCKY

James G. Smith, Burlington, Ky., in place of Newton Sullivan, retired.

John C. Hicks, Hindman, Ky., in place of O. M. Sturgill, removed.

LOUISIANA

Walter Y. Kemper, Jr., Berwick, La., in place of H. E. Hebert, retired.

MAINE

James O. Ricker, West Enfield, Maine, in place of A. I. M. Ewing, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Allan C. Williams, Jr., Falmouth Heights, Mass., in place of W. G. Craig, retired.

Walter K. Parker, Lenox, Mass., in place of C. H. McCarthy, retired.

Jessie M. Andrews, Monponsett, Mass., in place of A. J. DeSorcie, retired.

MICHIGAN

Frank E. Bauer, Athens, Mich., in place of C. W. Holt, retired.

Philip B. Wood, Bangor, Mich., in place of F. W. Kime, resigned.

Owen A. Kern, East Detroit, Mich., in place of F. W. Schroeder, deceased.

Grant D. Maudlin, Royal Oak, Mich., in place of B. S. Trace, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Arnold E. Weflen, Clara City, Minn., in place of L. J. Voight, deceased.

Cecil R. Campbell, Ellendale, Minn., in place of J. B. Neugebauer, retired.

Bernard R. Anderson, Kerkhoven, Minn., in place of H. T. Kennedy, retired.

Donald O. Nelson, Tyler, Minn., in place of M. G. Pedersen, retired.

Donald T. Johnson, Waseca, Minn., in place of D. C. Brown, declined.

MISSISSIPPI

James D. Mills, Jr., Carthage, Miss., in place of J. H. Henderson, resigned.

Thomas A. Elder, Coldwater, Miss., in place of H. L. Callicott, retired.

William Yerger Guilbert, Collins, Miss., in place of G. B. McIntosh, resigned.

Dewey D. Patterson, Tupelo, Miss., in place of E. R. Rankin, deceased.

MONTANA

Adolph Freier, Box Elder, Mont., in place of N. M. Spangelo, retired.

Robert F. Haurigan, Custer, Mont., in place of H. J. Webster, retired.

NEBRASKA

Teddy W. Mundell, Kimball, Nebr., in place of J. J. Cromie, resigned.

Lee Curry, Ponca, Nebr., in place of D. J. Ehle, transferred.

NEVADA

Gretta J. Schenck, Indian Springs, Nev., office established April 16, 1953.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bernerd A. Marcotte, Epping, N. H., in place of J. P. Masse, deceased.

Francis H. Malony, Gilsum, N. H., in place of L. A. Wright, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Sherwood A. MacPherson, Bridgeton, N. J., in place of W. M. MacPherson, retired.

Morton S. Howell, Broadway, N. J., in place of J. S. Howell, retired.

Nicholas J. Caruso, Hoboken, N. J., in place of John Schuemann, Jr., deceased.

Evelyn H. Way, Ocean View, N. J., in place of R. B. Downam, resigned.

NEW YORK

Henry W. Clas, Albany, N. Y., in place of J. P. Hayes, removed.

Lyle W. Palmiter, Alfred Station, N. Y., in place of I. O. Lewis, retired.

Herbert Improte, Centereach, N. Y., in place of A. V. Herron, resigned.

Margaret K. Schneider, Clay, N. Y., in place of C. F. Driscoll, retired.

George A. Albrecht, Long Island City, N. Y., in place of Moses Symington, retired.

James D. Collins, Niagara University, N. Y., in place of W. J. Glavin, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.

Raymond Truett Warlick, Lenoir, N. C., in place of N. H. Gwyn, retired.

John Clyde Garrison, Morganton, N. C., in place of M. B. Kibler, retired.

William B. Early, Old Fort, N. C., in place of F. M. Bradley, retired.

Thomas F. Littlejohn, Ruffin, N. C., in place of S. C. Worsham, retired.

Nancy F. Harris, Wake Forest, N. C., in place of J. R. Wiggins, retired.

Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N. C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.

OHIO

Gladys L. Via, Gratis, Ohio, in place of A. J. Bratton, resigned.

Fred J. Jurisch, Phalanx Station, Ohio, in place of R. A. Clark, transferred.

Blaine Van Tilburg, Rockford, Ohio, in place of G. R. Kinder, retired.

OREGON

John Prentiss, Nehalen, Oreg., in place of L. I. Mead, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

James P. Burgoon, Ashville, Pa., in place of T. J. Murphy, deceased.

John P. Oberholtzer, Mohrsville, Pa., in place of F. C. Swoyer, resigned.

Kermit E. Thomas, Osceola Mills, Pa., in place of J. F. Dugan, retired.

Viola E. Fulmer, Smicksburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dodson, deceased.

Mary E. Reagle, Wheatland, Pa., in place of R. E. Haney, retired.

Edwin A. Barnitz, York, Pa., in place of W. D. Rinehardt, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Junot Franco-Soto, Sabana Grande, P. R., in place of M. A. Franco-Soto, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Spencer R. Elliott, Winnsboro, S. C., in place of P. A. Matthews, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Lyle Elward, Deadwood, S. Dak., in place of G. C. Kenworthy, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lela Crawley Scroggins, Lupton City, Tenn., in place of Edith Caldwell, retired.

Herman S. Kinchen, Ramer, Tenn., in place of J. E. Barnes, retired.

TEXAS

Jesse A. Armstrong, Angleton, Tex., in place of E. L. Coale, resigned.

Patricia K. Fisher, Greggton, Tex., in place of N. M. Hall, removed.

Anna B. Shults, Portland, Tex., in place of L. H. De Mouche, retired.

Charles E. Paxton, Sweetwater, Tex., in place of M. J. Sweeden, resigned.

R. T. Savage, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.

A. D. Wilson, Westbrook, Tex., in place of M. E. Powell, retired.

UTAH

Gwendelyn F. Gottfredson, Circleville, Utah, in place of Orion Gottfredson, deceased.

VERMONT

William C. Nawrath, Manchester Center, Vt., in place of L. F. Martin, Jr., resigned.

Henry W. Handfield, Poultney, Vt., in place of O. W. McShane, retired.

VIRGINIA

Thornton S. Terry, Axton, Va., in place of R. D. Davis, retired.

Lawrence R. Kipps, Bealeton, Va., in place of J. C. Kehoe, deceased.

Willis E. Crews, Clover, Va., in place of A. C. Turner, Jr., deceased.

Lucinda S. Sims, Ruckersville, Va., in place of Lottie Herndon, retired.

Troy B. Slate, Saltville, Va., in place of J. A. Buchanan, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Jack A. Middle, Mabton, Wash., in place of H. C. Smyth, deceased.

Calvin M. Langfield, Troutlake, Wash., in place of M. M. Aldahl, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Eleanor Hess Lavencheck, Carolina, W. Va., in place of P. M. Satterfield, resigned.

Walter M. Ferrell, Kenova, W. Va., in place of H. S. Lambert, removed.

Helen E. Eagan, Nellis, W. Va., in place of R. K. Eanes, resigned.

Virginia T. Bailey, Page., W. Va., in place of T. F. Settle, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Rhoda A. Burns, Blue Mounds, Wis., in place of H. S. Emerson, removed.

Earl E. Horn, Port Washington, Wis., in place of J. H. Biever, removed.

Darnell W. Kadolph, Weyauwega, Wis., in place of I. J. Rieck, deceased.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 25, 1955:

POSTMASTER

Clyde A. Coggins to be postmaster at Nipton in the State of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the inspiration of all that makes life noble and worthwhile, wilt Thou now kindle within our minds a clear vision of Thy divine will, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Strengthen us daily with a deeper sense of those spiritual resources which will enable us to safeguard our heritage of freedom and share it with all mankind.

May we be numbered among those who are not afraid of evil tidings but whose hearts are always strong and steadfast, trusting in the Lord.

Show us how we may hasten the dawning of that glorious day when our hopes and longings for peace on earth and good will among men shall be a blessed reality.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1955, was read and approved.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, by request, an administration bill which may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1955." Senator SPARKMAN has introduced the same bill in the Senate by request.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section analysis and a brief summary of the bill may be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1955."

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "July 1, 1955" and inserting "July 1, 1960."

SEC. 3. Section 203 (i) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "the total amount of insurance outstanding at any one time under this proviso not to exceed $100,000,000."

SEC. 4. Section 204 (f) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized, with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments for insurance issued on or after July 1, 1955, and, with the consent of the mortgagee or mortgagor, as the case may be, with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments issued prior to such date, to effect the settlement of certificates of claim and refunds to mortgagors at any time after the sale or transfer of title to the property conveyed to the Commissioner under this section and without awaiting the final liquidation of such property for the purpose of determining the net amount to be realized therefrom."

SEC. 5. Said act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking clause 1 of section 207 (c) and inserting:

"(1) not to exceed $12,500,000 with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstanding under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $12,500,000, or, if the mortgage is executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of clause (b) (1) of this section, such dollar limit with respect to any one mortgage instrument and with respect to the aggregate amount of such commitments shall be $50,000,000."

(2) by striking clause 1 of section 213 (b) and inserting:

"(1) not to exceed $12,500,000 with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstand-

ing under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $12,500,000, or, if the mortgage is executed by a mortgagor regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States or agencies thereof, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, such dollar limit with respect to any one mortgage instrument and with respect to the aggregate amount of such commitments shall be $25 million; and."

(3) by striking clause (i) of section 220 (d) (3) (B) and inserting:

"(i) not to exceed $50 million with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstanding under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $50 million; and."

(4) by striking "$5 million" in sections 213 (c), 221 (d) (3), and 803 (b) (3) and inserting:

"$12,500,000 with respect to any one mortgage instrument and such that the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued and outstanding under this section at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area and involving the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control, as determined by the Commissioner) shall not exceed $12,500,000."

SEC. 6. Section 217 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "July 1, 1954" and inserting "July 1, 1955", and by striking "$3,500,000,000" and inserting "$4 billion."

SEC. 7. Clause (a) of the second sentence of section 227 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "under section 221" and inserting "under section 221 if the mortgage meets the requirements of paragraph (3) of subsection (d) thereof."

SEC. 8. Section 604 (f) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph at the end thereof:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Commissioner is authorized, with the consent of the mortgagee or mortgagor, as the case may be, to effect the settlement of certificates of claim and refunds at any time after the sale or transfer of title to the property conveyed to the Commissioner under this section and without awaiting the final liquidation of such property for the purpose of determining the net amount to be realized therefrom."

SEC. 9. Section 803 (a) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before such date" and inserting "pursuant to a certification by the Secretary of Defense or his designee made on or before such date and a commitment to insure issued on or before June 30, 1956."

SEC. 10. The second sentence of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby amended by striking in clause (a) thereof "designate hereunder" and inserting "designate hereunder or (iii) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued pursuant to the preceding clause (ii)."

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 11. (a) Section 103 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "$100 million, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100 million on July 1 in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively: *Provided*, That (subject to the total authorization of not to exceed $500 million)" and inserting "$500 million, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $200 million on July 1 in each of the years 1955 and 1956, respectively: *Provided*, That."

(b) Section 106 (e) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking $35 million" and inserting $70 million."

SEC. 12. The Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 344) is hereby amended—

(1) by inserting "urban renewal," after "urban redevelopment," in the title;

(2) by inserting ", and Urban Renewal" after "redevelopment" in the heading of title I;

(3) by inserting "and urban renewal projects" after the term "urban redevelopment projects" in each place where that term appears in title I;

(4) by inserting "urban renewal," after "redevelopment," in the heading of title III;

(5) by inserting "urban renewal," after "urban redevelopment," in sections 301 and 303;

(6) by inserting "or urban renewal" after "urban redevelopment" in section 304;

(7) by inserting "as amended," after "(Public Law 171, 81st Congress)," in sections 101, 301, and 304);

(8) by inserting "as amended," after "Housing Act of 1949," in the clause numbered "(1)" in section 304; and

(9) by inserting ", as amended," after "this act" in sections 101, 301, and 304.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

SEC. 13. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting section 10 (i) and inserting the following:

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Authority may, with respect to low-rent housing initiated after March 1, 1949, enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 1, 1954, for not to exceed 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 35,000 additional dwelling units on July 1 of the years 1955 and 1956, and may enter into such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered into hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions with respect to each such 35,000 additional dwelling units shall terminate 2 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into except with respect to low-rent housing for a locality respecting which (1) the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has made the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or (2) there is being carried out a project covered by a Federal aid contract executed, or prior approval granted, by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into unless the governing body of the locality has, by resolution, approved such additional units: *And provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into unless the number of such additional units does not exceed the number of families of low income, eligible for admission to such units, which the Housing and Home Finance Administrator estimates will be displaced within the metropolitan or housing market area of such locality as a result of Federal, State, or local governmental action."

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

SEC. 14. The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking section 6 (c) and inserting:

"(c) The original stock subscription for each institution eligible to become a member under section 4 shall be an amount equal to 1 percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of the subscriber's home mortgage loans, or such higher percent not exceeding 2 percent as the board shall by regulation prescribe, but not less than $500: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall permit a member to reduce the amount of stock held by it to below 2 percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of its home mortgage loans as of the effective date of the housing amendments of 1955, but no such member shall be required to subscribe for additional stock until such time as the amount of stock held by it does not equal that required by such regulation. The board shall from time to time adjust the amount of stock held by each member so that, as nearly as possible, such member shall at all times have invested in the stock of the Federal home loan bank at least an amount calculated in the manner provided in the preceding sentence (but not less than $500). If the board finds that the investment of any member in stock is greater than that required under this section or under regulation of the board, upon application of such member, the bank shall pay such member for each share of stock in excess of the amount so required an amount equal to the par value of such stock, or, at the election of the bank, the whole or any part of the payments which would be so made shall be credited upon any indebtedness of the member to the bank. In either such event, stock equal in par value to the amount of the payment or credit, or both, as the case may be, shall be surrendered and canceled. No share of stock shall be surrendered and canceled if the effect of such surrender and cancellation would be to violate the provisions of section 10 (c) requiring the amount of stock held by such member to equal at least one-twelfth of the outstanding advances to such member."

(2) by striking the first sentence of section 6 (i) and inserting: "Any member other than a Federal savings and loan association may withdraw from membership in a Federal home loan bank 6 months after filing with the board written notice of intention so to do, and the board may, after hearing, remove any member from membership, or deprive any nonmember borrower of the privilege of obtaining further advances, if, in the opinion of the board, such member or nonmember borrower (i) has failed to comply with any provision of this act or regulation of the board made pursuant thereto, (ii) is insolvent: *Provided*, That any member of a bank which is a building and loan association, savings and loan association, cooperative bank or homestead association shall be deemed insolvent if the assets of such member are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including the holders of its withdrawable accounts, or (iii) has a management or home-financing policy of a character inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of this act.";

(3) by repealing section 6 (l); and

(4) by striking the period at the end of section 7 (a) and inserting a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the board may by regulation increase the number of elective directors of any Federal home loan bank having a district which includes five or more States to a number not exceeding twice the number of States comprising such district, but such additional elective directors shall be apportioned as nearly as may be practicable in the same manner and order as is provided for the apportionment of elective directors under

subsections (c) and (d) hereof. The term 'States' as used in the preceding proviso shall mean the States of the Union and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 15. The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the proviso at the end of the second paragraph of section 5 (c) and inserting: "*Provided*, That no such loan, unless so insured or guaranteed, shall be made in excess of $2,500."

SEC. 16. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking section 403 (d) and inserting: "(d) Any institution which applies after the effective date of the housing amendments of 1955 for insurance under this title shall pay, in the event its application is approved, an admission fee in such amount as the Corporation shall determine, taking into consideration the total cost of processing all insurance applications."

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 17. Section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 702. (a) In order (1) to encourage municipalities and other public agencies to maintain at all times a current and adequate reserve of planned public works the construction of which can rapidly be commenced, particularly when the national or local economic situation makes such action desirable, and (2) to help attain maximum economy and efficiency in the planning and construction of public works, the Administrator is hereby authorized to make advances to public agencies (notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended) to aid in financing the cost of engineering and architectural surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, or other action preliminary to and in preparation for the construction of public works: *Provided*, That the making of advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to assist in financing the construction of any public works so planned: *And provided further*, That advances outstanding to public agencies in any one State shall at no time exceed 10 percent of the aggregate then authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund established pursuant to subsection (e) of this section.

"(b) No advance shall be made hereunder with respect to any individual project unless it is planned to be constructed within a reasonable period of time, unless it conforms to an overall State, local, or regional plan approved by a competent State, local, or regional authority, and unless the public agency formally contracts with the Federal Government to complete the plan preparation promptly and to repay such advance or part thereof when due. Subsequent to approval and prior to disbursement of any Federal funds for the purpose of advance planning, the applicant shall establish a separate planning account into which all Federal and applicant funds estimated to be required for plan preparation shall be placed.

"(c) Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid without interest by such agency when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started: *Provided*, That if the public agency undertakes to construct only a portion of a planned public work it shall repay such proportionate amount of the advances relating to the public work as the Administrator determines to be equitable: *And provided further*, That in the event repayment is not made promptly such unpaid sum shall bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the Government's demand for repayment to the date of payment thereof by the public agency.

"(d) The Administrator is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purpose of this section.

"(e) In order to provide moneys for advances in accordance with this section, the Administrator is hereby authorized to establish a revolving fund which shall comprise all moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to this section, together with all repayments and other receipts in connection with advances made under this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such revolving fund, in addition to the amount authorized by this section as originally enacted, the further amounts of $12 million, which may be made available to the revolving fund on or after July 1, 1956; $12 million which may be made available to such fund on or after July 1, 1957; $14 million which may be made available to such fund on or after July 1, 1958; and such additional sums which may be made available from year to year thereafter as may be estimated to be necessary to maintain not to exceed a total of $48 million in undisbursed balances in the revolving fund and in advances outstanding for plans in preparation or for completed plans with respect to projects which, in the determination of the Administrator, can be expected to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time."

SEC. 18. Effective upon the date of enactment of this act the basic rate of compensation of the Community Facilities Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Section 1. This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Housing Amendments of 1955."

Section 2. Extension of title I home repair and modernization program: This section would extend the FHA title I home repair and modernization program for 5 years to July 1, 1960.

Maintenance of a high level of construction activity, improvement of individual properties in need of modernization or repair, and proper maintenance of the existing housing inventory of the Nation are all affected significantly by the availability of adequate consumer credit for modernization and repair loans. The FHA title I program has contributed significantly toward assuring an adequate supply of such credit.

Availability of insurance protection for this type of credit encourages lenders to make these loans available to borrowers in smaller communities and eligible borrowers in larger communities who might otherwise have difficulty in arranging loans. In this connection, it should be noted that credit for home-repair purposes is not as readily available (without some measure of governmental encouragement) as is consumer credit for automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and other consumer durable goods. In these fields, the dealer normally receives credit support from the manufacturer. In the case of home-repair loans, however, manufacturers of paint, lumber, gypsum, nails, and other products are each likely to have a relatively small stake in the repair or improvement job done by the local firm. The manufacturer or wholesale supplier is thus rarely interested in backing up credit for a repair or improvement job, especially when the largest cost item is locally applied labor. In addition, the local automobile dealer, appliance or department store itself normally has a better line of credit than the carpenter, painter, small contractor, or hardware merchant who may supply the services or materials for home repairs or improvements. Finally, it should be noted that an automobile, radio, or refrigerator can be made subject to a chattel mortgage and can be repossessed, while items financed under title I become part of the house and cannot be repossessed. Neither is it practical in the case of a repair loan to go through the expense of obtaining secondary real-property mortgage security. It is for these reasons that home repair or improvement loans, in the absence of title I aids, will be unavailable to many borrowers, or else be available at exorbitant interest rates or fees.

Insurance activity in excess of $60 million monthly under this program since the effective date of the 1954 act amendments reflects the continuing usefulness of the program. Also, the title I program of insurance for modernization and repair loans constitutes an integral part of the urban-renewal program for neighborhood conservation and improvement which was adopted in the Housing Act of 1954.

In order that the lending institutions and dealer organizations may make appropriate plans for participating in both the urban renewal program and other modernization and repair, the title I program would be extended for 5 years as provided in this section. This is equivalent to the most recent previous extension from March 1, 1950, to July 1, 1955.

Section 3. Repeal of separate limitation on insurance authorization for farm-housing mortgages insured under section 203 (i): The Housing Act of 1954 perfected a consolidation of all outstanding mortgage-insurance authorizations (previously provided under sections 8, 203, 217, 603, 610, 701, 803, and 903) into a single authorization provided for under section 217, and eliminated the separate insurance limitation for each of these sections. This consolidation simplified FHA administration of the insurance authorizations and Presidential actions related thereto.

The Housing Act of 1954 created several new mortgage insurance programs which are operated under the single mortgage-insurance authorization, including farm-home mortgage insurance under section 203 (i). However, unlike the other sections, section 203 (i) contained a separate subsidiary authorization limitation of $100 million.

In the interest of reducing the record keeping with respect to the farm housing program and the necessity for recurring estimates of the amounts of outstanding balances on these farm housing mortgages, the separate authorization control of this program should be eliminated and the insurance volume under this program be consolidated for control purposes with other insurance activity under section 203. To accomplish this purpose, the special limitation for section 203 (i) would be repealed.

Section 4. FHA settlement of certificates of claim: This section would enable the FHA to make final settlement of certificates of claim held by mortgagees, and refunds to mortgagors, at any time after the sale or transfer of title by the FHA to sales housing acquired by FHA in cases of defaulted mortgages. The provision would apply to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments for insurance issued on or after July 1, 1955. Also, if the mortgagee or mortgagor consents, the provision would apply to mortgages insured pursuant to commitments issued prior to that date. The section would carry out a recommendation made by the General Accounting Office for the purpose of saving personnel expenditures and other administrative expenses. (Comptroller General's Report on Audit of FHA for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1953. H. Doc. 53, 84th Cong., p. 6.)

Under the provisions of section 204 of the National Housing Act (which relates to sales housing mortgages, but not to rental housing morgages) the mortgagee receives, in case of default on the mortgage, the benefits of FHA insurance in the form of (1) debentures in an amount equal to the "value

of the mortgage" as defined in the act, which does not include the full amount of earned interest and does not ordinarily fully compensate the mortgagee for foreclosure costs and other expenses or advances made by it (debentures are issued in multiples of $50 and provision is made for a cash payment to adjust the difference between the value of the mortgage and the aggregate face value of debentures, not to exceed $50), and (2) a certificate of claim in an amount equal to the difference between the debentures (and cash adjustment) and the amount which the mortgagee would have received if the mortgagor had paid the indebedness in full at the time of the conveyance to the Commissioner.

In each such case the Commissioner acquires the property covered by the mortgage. The certificate of claim, plus an annual increment of 3 percent, becomes payable to the mortgagee only if the net amount realized by the Commissioner from the property exceeds the Commissioner's outlay with respect to the property, including debenture principal and interest and all expenses of the Commissioner in dealing with and disposing of the property. If any excess should remain after payment of the certificate of claim, the Commissioner pays the excess to the mortgagor.

The existing provisions of section 204 do not permit settlement of the certificates of claim and payment of any excess to a mortgagor until final liquidation of the Commissioner's interest in the property, since "the net amount realized" from the property can only be determined after final payment has been made by the purchaser. For example, if a Commissioner-owned property is sold to a purchaser making a 10-percent downpayment and executing a 20-year mortgage for the remainder of the purchase price, settlement of a certificate of claim may not now be made until such mortgage is paid in full, thus requiring the maintenance of records for a period of 20 years before settlement of the certificate of claim can be made.

A study based upon a sampling of homeownership properties acquired and sold by the Commissioner indicates that the proposed amendment would result in a financial benefit to the FHA because the earlier settlements will result in simplified accounting and reduced recordkeeping. The financial savings may become very substantial if there arises a high volume of insurance claims.

Section 5. Revision of mortgage limitations for multifamily projects: This section would revise the present statutory mortgage limitations for multifamily projects. The $5 million limitation for projects with private sponsorship would be changed to $12.5 million, and the mortgage limitation would be applied both to each individual mortgage instrument and to the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments outstanding at any one time under each section of the act with respect to projects in the same housing market area which involve the same mortgagor (or mortgagors under substantially the same control).

In February 1938, section 207 of the National Housing Act was amended to provide that no insured mortgage under that section shall involve a principal obligation in an amount exceeding $5 million. Prior to that time, section 207 permitted a $10 million maximum. Statutory language similar to the 1938 amendment has been used to establish mortgage limits for private housing corporations in each multifamily project program enacted since that date, namely sections 213, 220, 221, 608, 610, 803, and 908.

From 1938 until the summer of 1954, the $5 million limitation was administratively applied as a limitation solely on the amount of a single mortgage instrument. This application extended even to a point of insuring two individual mortgages for a single sponsor for contiguous properties on which the physical improvements were, for operating purposes, essentially a single structure.

Alternative administrative decisions might, under present legislative authority, place a limitation with respect to operations of a single sponsor or groups of interrelated sponsors on either: (1) the aggregate mortgage indebtedness insurable in all insured projects without regard to location, (2) the aggregate mortgages insurable within a single housing market area, or (3) the aggregate mortgages insurable within a single development, that is, housing on contiguous sites, capable of being managed as a single project.

The first alternative would preclude insurance exceeding $5 million on projects with a single sponsor or interrelated group of sponsors even though the projects involved were located in such widely separated locations that no competitive relations within any housing market are in any way affected by the fact that aggregate mortgages exceed $5 million. Such a control would, in effect, be designed to place a limit on the total concurrent benefits which any program of the National Housing Act could make available to any one sponsor.

The second alternative would limit the amount of mortgage insurance for a single sponsor in a housing market area (or metropolitan area) to the $5 million limitation. Such a limitation would be directed toward avoiding any semblance of monopoly of opportunity to serve an existing housing demand within a housing market, which might otherwise occur if simultaneous commitments were approved for several projects in scattered locations within a metropolitan area.

The third alternative would limit the amount of mortgage insurance to $5 million on one or more mortgages if the projects involved were so closely related that they present the appearance of constituting an integrated project or if management as a single project is in fact feasible. This limitation would be designed particularly to preclude such a concentration of newly created rental housing in a limited sector of a housing market that one sponsor or group of related sponsors could either monopolize the opportunity to serve rental housing demand in a single small section or could expose the FHA to an excessive risk of insurance loss because of inadequate marketability in a single section.

The present administrative application of the $5 million limitation by the FHA is that no one sponsor or group of interrelated sponsors shall receive project-mortgage insurance on one or more mortgages exceeding $5 million within a single housing market area so long as the projects securing mortgages are under construction or still attaining initial occupancy. This interpretation aims to minimize (1) monopolization of opportunity at a given time to serve new market demand in that market area and (2) undue risks of market absorption.

In the case of section 220 housing in urban renewal projects, these restrictions are not applied if local government determinations have identified and contracted with a single sponsorship for a larger aggregate of housing and if the Housing and Home Finance Administrator has approved an urban renewal plan for the area which involves a larger aggregate of housing under a single sponsorship. In all projects, the maximum insurable mortgage within the $5 million limitation is determined by FHA analysis of the marketability of the number and quality of rental units proposed for construction. Thus, in smaller communities or in relatively slow-growing areas, individual projects may be limited, as a result of market requirements, to mortgage amounts substantially below the $5 million limitation.

With due recognition of the increase in construction costs since 1938, it is evident that the administrative policy now in effect under sections 207, 213, 221, 803, and 908 limits mortgage insurance for a single sponsor within a single housing market to a substantially smaller amount of rental housing than could have been covered by a single mortgage in 1938, when the $5 million limitation was adopted.

For purpose of clarification, two amendments are incorporated in this section of the bill. First, that the maximum insurable mortgage amount limitation for private housing corporations under substantially the same control be established at $12,500,000 for sections 207, 213, 221, and 803. Second, that the comparable limitation for section 220 be established at $50 million. In the case of each of these sections, the limitation would be applicable to projects insured under the particular section within a housing market area as described above.

The $12,500,000 limitation constitutes an upward adjustment of the $5 million limitation first established in February 1938 in keeping with the intervening increase in construction cost levels as indicated by the E. H. Boeckh, Inc. indexes of construction costs for apartments, hotels, and office buildings (increase of 150 percent from 1937 average to October 1954).

The $50 million limitation proposed for section 220 would establish for private corporations operating in urban renewal projects the same limitation now in effect under section 207 of the National Housing Act for public bodies. Use of a similar limitation appears reasonable in view of the fact that in the urban renewal operations to be insured under section 220, the governing body of the locality is required to prepare and submit the overall plans for specific urban renewal undertakings and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator's approval of such plans is required before FHA mortgage insurance can be made available.

The proposed amendment would make four major changes in, or addition to, the language of the statute. The $5 million limitation would be changed to $12,500,000 (except that for section 220 projects, the limitation would be $50 million); the limitation would be applied not only to a single mortgagor, but also to mortgagors under substantially the same control; the limitation would cover an entire housing market area, not merely an individual housing project; and finally, the limitation would not apply to two or more mortgages even though the sponsors were the same and the structures on contiguous sites, if the mortgages are not simultaneously in the commitment stage (that is, the stage prior to the completion of the project and final endorsement of the mortgage for insurance). In such cases, no additional commitments would be made available until the marketability of such units had been established by the response to the previous project.

Section 6. Increase in FHA mortgage insurance authorization: This section would amend section 217 of the National Housing Act (the FHA general mortgage insurance authorization) to authorize FHA mortgage insurance up to the aggregate of outstanding insurance liability and commitments on June 30, 1955 plus $4 billion. The revision of section 217 to base insuring operations after June 30, 1955, on outstanding commitments and insurance in force on that date plus the indicated increase in authorization is intended to show in the current legislation the additional amount of insurance liability which the agency is expected to assume during the ensuing fiscal year. The amount of unused authorization under existing legislation remaining on June 30, 1955 (estimated to be over $600 million) would be merged with the new additional authorization proposed. Thus, the new additional authorization is estimated to be under $3,400,000,000.

Current budget estimates of mortgage insurance operations during the 1956 fiscal year indicate a gross use of insurance authorization totaling $7,397,600,000. After allowance for return of authorization through expiration of commitments, scheduled repayments on outstanding insured mortgages, and complete prepayments of such mortgages, the prospective net use of insurance authorization for mortgage insurance programs during that fiscal year is estimated at $3,998,800,000.

Section 7. Removal of cost certification requirements from section 221, single family homes: As adopted in the Housing Act of 1954, section 227 of the National Housing Act provides for a certification of cost by the mortgagors on all properties with mortgages insured under section 221, including both single-family homes for sale and rental projects. To the extent that construction under section 221 consists of single-family homes built in projects, the difficulties of cost certification substantially outweigh any possible benefits to be derived from the certification.

In such construction, as under section 203, homes produced in subdivision developments by operative builders are completed in succession and are transferred upon sale to an owner-occupant mortgagor. Upon such transfer, the cost to be certified would be the sale price of the property, a figure which is already reported to FHA and used as a basis for determining one of the limitations to the insurable mortgage amount. In this type of case (just as in the case of the construction of a single home for sale) the cost certification procedure serves no additional purpose.

For properties which are not sold upon completion, the builder may have the mortgage endorsed for insurance, with the mortgage amount limited to 85 percent of value, instead of 95 percent of value, thereby tripling the percentage of equity value. Also, on such transactions, total costs allocable to a particular structure may not be subject to final allocation, either because the expenditures may not yet have been completed (such as street surfacing) or the appropriate allocation among all units produced may not yet be establishable because construction operations on other parts of the subdivision are still under way.

Thus, with respect to single-family homes, the cost certification for the owner-occupant duplicates another established procedure, and as to the builder the certification would need to be done on a tentative or estimated basis. Accordingly, this section of the bill would, in effect, provide that under section 221, cost certification requirements shall be restricted to multifamily operations, as is the case in other FHA programs.

Section 8. FHA settlements of certificates of claim—section 603 Housing: This section would add the same provision with respect to section 603 mortgage insurance (covering World War II and post war veterans' emergency housing built for sale) as would be added by section 4 of the bill with respect to other FHA sales housing. This section of the bill would thus enable FHA to expedite final settlement of certificates of claim, and refunds to mortgagors, in connection with sales housing assisted under section 603. Of course, no further mortgage insurance commitments can be made under section 603.

Section 9. Extension of FHA title VIII (Wherry Act) military housing program: Under existing law, title VIII of the National Housing Act, the FHA Wherry Act military housing program, expires June 30, 1955. This section would extend title VIII for only those projects which are certified by the Secretary of Defense prior to June 30, 1955. Also all commitments by FHA to insure those projects must be made during the following year. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense so that existing title VIII operations may be concluded in an orderly manner.

Section 10. Termination of insurance authority under title IX: This section would merely provide a technical amendment to continue title IX insurance for outstanding commitments on July 1, 1955. The Housing Act of 1954 restricted title IX insuring operations to (1) outstanding commitments on July 31, 1954, and (2) projects designated by the President between July 31, 1954, and July 1, 1955. There has been only one Presidential action to authorize title IX operations since July 31, 1954, and there is no information to indicate prospective requests for further Presidential actions.

Accordingly this section would not extend title IX except with respect to any commitments which may possibly yet be issued prior to July 1, 1955, and remain outstanding on that date.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 11 (a). Capital grant authorization: Under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, capital grants in the aggregate amount of $500 million were authorized to carry out the title I slum clearance and urban redevelopment program, and this authorization was made available for the broader urban renewal program under the Housing Act of 1954. Section 11 (a) of the bill would increase that authorization by an additional $200 million to be made available on July 1, 1955, and another $200 million to be made available on July 1, 1956. Also the President would be authorized to increase the authorization at any time or times by an additional $100 million.

By December 31, 1954, a total of $429,852,000 of capital grants had been committed, including a $50 million reserve for possible overruns. It is estimated that by June 30, 1955, the entire $500 million capital grant authorization now in the law will be committed, including a $50 million reserve for overruns. A commitment of capital grant funds for a project is effected when the original allocation of an advance for surveys and plans is made. The commitment consists of the reservation of capital grant funds for such project based upon estimates of the capital grant needs for the project. From time to time, as the planning work progresses, revisions may be made in the capital grant reservation to bring it in line with later estimates. Reservations of capital grant funds do not represent legally binding obligations of the Federal Government to pay such capital grants. Such obligations are created when a contract for capital grant is executed following the completion of the surveys and plans. However, a reservation does indicate that a project approved for planning advances may in the normal course of events be covered by a contract for a capital grant, chargeable to a legislative authorization in effect when planning commences, in substantially the amount reserved. To that extent, therefore, such capital grant funds are earmarked or committed for such project. By June 30, 1955, the entire $500 million authorization will be thus reserved or committed. It is estimated that $194 million will actually be obligated by such date under title I contracts providing for the payment of capital grants.

By the end of fiscal year 1955 additional capital grant authorization will be required for the title I urban renewal program. By December 31, 1955, it is estimated that capital grants in the aggregate amount of $585 million will be committed, of which $60 million will represent a reserve for overruns. By June 30, 1956, a total of $700 million will be committed, of which $70 million will constitute a reserve for overruns. Thereafter, it is anticipated that the commitment of capital grants will increase at a more rapid rate. The broadened scope of the program and the anticipated increase in the number of municipalities that will participate in the new urban renewal program will accelerate capital grant commitments to the point that the balance of the increased capital grant authorization would be fully committed in about 2 additional years.

The need for providing at this time for the entire additional authorization of $500 million in capital grants (to become available as described above) arises out of the type of program involved. Many months of preliminary work are required to develop an urban renewal project. The local community must engage in long-range preparatory activities involving such matters as establishing and maintaining an appropriate urban renewal organization, hiring and training personnel, engaging experts, making surveys, preparing plans, revising capital improvement programs, and providing funds. In order to undertake such time-consuming and expensive activities, local communities need the assurance that capital grant funds are authorized and will be available at the time needed by the communities.

Moreover, the Urban Renewal Administration normally does not make even planning advances for any project unless there is available adequate capital grant authorization to cover the project. This means that without the capital grant authorization the planning of many urban renewal projects cannot be commenced by local communities, nor can the program be carried out at an orderly and efficient pace. The additional authorization is thus essential to enable local communities to commence and carry out necessary preparatory activities and to keep the urban renewal program moving forward to achieve the objectives of the Federal law.

Section 11 (b). Capital grants authorized for any one State: Under section 106 (e) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, not more than 10 percent of the capital grants authorized may be expended in any one State, provided that an additional $35 million (subject always to the limitation on the total authorization) of capital grants may be allocated to local public agencies in States in which more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted by those States has been obligated. By the close of fiscal year 1955, it is expected that this $35 million cushion will be committed. On December 31, 1954, $12,047,000 of the $35 million was committeed. Upon the basis of applications in process and anticipated, it is estimated that by June 30, 1955, the full $35 million will be committed.

The proposed increase in the capital grant authorization would double the maximum amount that could be made available to local public agencies in any one State under section 106 (e). For a period of time this increase in the maximum amount that can be made available in any one State would afford ample margin for meeting the urban renewal needs. But as the urban renewal program gains momentum, it is anticipated that the 10-percent maximum under the increased authorization with the $35 million cushion now provided will not be adequate for local public agencies in several States. Other States may not be able, for various reasons, to avail themselves of the maximum available Federal assistance. It is, therefore, desirable to make appropriate provision in the law to enable local public agencies with extensive urban renewal programs to utilize, within the maximum of an additional $35 million cushion, capital grant funds which other States will not need.

It should be noted that the $70 million amount in section 106 (e) would not be in addition to, but rather would be within, the total capital grant authorization.

Section 12. Urban renewal in Territories: This section is a technical amendment to permit Territories to take full advantage of the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended by the Housing Act of 1954, making financial assistance available for urban renewal projects. The Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 authorized the governments of the Territories to enact laws

which would authorize municipalities or public authorities in those Territories to carry out slum clearance and redevelopment projects which would be eligible for financial aid under title I of the Housing Act of 1949. However, the Housing Act of 1954 added provisions to the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize Federal aid to urban renewal, which includes aid not only for land acquisition and clearance for redevelopment as previously provided, but also aid to help in preventing the spread of slums and blight through the rehabilitation and conservation measures. This section would broaden the authority of the Territories in this respect to cover the broader urban renewal activities.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Section 13. Continuation of public housing and modification of restrictions: This section would authorize additional public housing for 2 more years at the rate authorized for fiscal year 1955 under the Housing Act of 1954. It would maintain the basic purpose of meeting the relocation needs of families of low income displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal projects under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or by other governmental action. The section would, however, make necessary and desirable modifications of statutory restrictions which are holding up the provision of housing needed for those families and preventing the use of the authorization intended by the Congress. Accordingly, the section would amend subsection 10 (i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (as amended by the Housing Act of 1954) to make the following changes:

1. The authority to enter into new annual contributions contracts for additional public housing would be increased by 70,000 units, in increments of 35,000 becoming available annually beginning July 1, 1955. This conforms to the recommendation of the President in his state of the Union message. The present authorization (for 35,000 units expiring June 30, 1955, under present law) would be extended to June 30, 1956, and each of the new increments of 35,000 units would remain available for 2 years after the first date on which it becomes available. Thus, the 35,000 units becoming available on July 1, 1955, would remain available until the middle of 1957 and the 35,000 units becoming available on July 1, 1956, would remain available until the middle of 1958. This would establish a reasonable deadline for using the authorization without unduly disrupting program operations.

2. As under the existing law, the restrictions in the revised subsection 10 (i) would be made applicable to annual contributions contracts, thus effectively controlling the size of the new program. However, it would be made clear that preliminary loan contracts, under the revised subsection, would not be subject to these restrictions, in order that preliminary planning could start at a date early enough to assure that the low-rent housing will be available when needed to rehouse low-income families displaced by governmental action. This is consistent with the present provisions of subsection 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, which makes definitive contracts for low-rent housing and title I urban renewal projects subject to the approval of a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight, but does not make preliminary or planning loans subject to such approval. The proposed language, however, would permit preliminary loan contracts for only a sufficient number of units to assure that annual contributions contracts could be entered into for the number of units authorized.

3. There would be incorporated in the revised subsection the requirement (presently included in section 101 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949) that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator make the determination and certification relating to a workable program as prescribed in that section. The new language provides, however, as in the case of FHA mortgage insurance under section 221 of the National Housing Act for housing for displaced families, that the workable program requirement is not applicable in the case of a locality where there is being carried out an urban redevelopment project covered by a Federal contract executed, or prior approval granted, by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, before the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954. This is in recognition of the fact that the concept of a workable program is newly created by the Housing Act of 1954 and requires time for development of techniques and procedures; and where a title I project has been approved previously it ought not to wait for approval of a workable program before public housing or section 221 housing can go forward to provide dwellings for the families displaced by the title I project. Existing law permits the undertaking and completion of such title I projects although the community does not have, or will not have, a workable program. There will thus be the same problem of relocating displaced families of low income from those projects as from projects in communities having workable programs, and public housing should not be barred where needed for such families.

4. The present requirement that there must be a title I urban renewal project being carried out in the community is eliminated, since it seems unfair to deny public-housing assistance for displaced families in communities which have workable programs and eliminate slums without Federal aid under title I. This would be parallel to the provision with respect to FHA insurance under section 221 for housing for displaced families which is predicated on the elimination of slums but does not require the carrying out of a title I project as a condition precedent to such insurance.

5. In place of the present requirement of a certification by the local governing body that the project is necessary to assist in meeting the relocation requirements of section 105 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the proposed legislation would require only that the local governing body approve the additional units by resolution. This would carry out the apparent intent of the existing requirement but eliminate language which has raised serious questions of interpretation. The present language would also be inconsistent with the proposed removal of the requirement that there must be a title I project being carried out in the community.

6. The present law requires that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator determine that the additional units will not exceed the total number to be needed for families to be displaced by Federal, State, or local governmental action. The proposed amendment would require, in lieu of this provision, that the House and Home Finance Administrator make a determination that the additional units will not exceed the number of low-income families to be displaced (within the metropolitan or housing market area) by Federal, State, or local governmental action, thus making it clear that the Administrator is not required to take account of vacancies which may occur in existing low-rent housing projects. The proposed legislation would permit new housing to be provided for families to be displaced by all governmental action without affecting occupancy in existing projects, which could then continue to serve other eligible families of low income. Such eligible families include those (1) who leave the slums on their own initiative without being forced out as a result of governmental action, (2) who are displaced by private enterprise which is clearing a slum site on its own initiative, or (3) who are displaced as a result of fire or other catastrophe.

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Section 14 (1). Change in amount of required stock subscription by member of Federal Home Loan Bank: The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, enacted in 1932, originally required that each institution eligible for membership in a Federal Home Loan Bank must subscribe to the stock of that bank in an amount equal to at least 1 percent of the aggregate unpaid principal of all the home-mortgage loans held by such institution (but not less than $1,500, which amount was later reduced to $500). That requirement was not changed further until 1950 when a new subsection 6 (1) was added to the act requiring an increase in the amount of stock subscription from 1 to 2 percent for the purpose of acquiring additional funds to enable the Federal home-loan banks to retire all Government stock holdings in these banks. All of the stock held by the Government in these banks has now been retired and there is no longer necessity for the higher stock ownership. Therefore, this section would provide that the Board could determine the amount of required stock subscription, but that in no event could it be less than 1 percent nor more than 2 percent of the aggregate of the member's home-mortgage loans. However, it would be provided that this would not reduce at any time the amount of stock required to be held by a member below the amount required to be held as of the date of enactment of this section.

An additional safeguard which would avoid any substantial reduction in the amount of stock subscriptions arises from the existing requirement in section 10 (c) of the act that at no time shall the aggregate advances by a Federal home-loan bank exceed 12 times the amount of bank stock held by the member institution. Any appreciable increase in demands by a member institution for advances from the bank would, in most cases, necessitate an increase above 2 percent in subscriptions to the bank stock in order to maintain the required 12-to-1 ratio.

Section 14 (2). Termination of bank membership: This section would amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act so as to provide that any member institution may be removed from membership if in the judgment of the Board it is insolvent or the character of such institution's management or its home-financing policy is inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of that act. A member institution (which is a savings and loan or building and loan type) would be deemed insolvent if its assets are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including the holders of its withdrawable accounts.

The act currently provides that no institution shall be eligible to become a member of a bank if in the judgment of the Board its financial condition is such that advances may not safely be made to it or if the character of its management and home-financing policy is inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the provisions of the act. There is, however, no provision for removal of a member institution for these grounds once the institution becomes a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

A conservator can be appointed for a Federal savings and loan association on grounds somewhat similar to those just referred to. Also, under the Housing Act of 1954, legislation was enacted which authorizes the termination of insurance of accounts of an insured institution for somewhat similar grounds. However, a State-chartered institution which is a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank System but is not insured could not be deprived of further membership, although if such an institution were insured, its insurance could be terminated.

This section would thus merely fill a gap in the statutory authority of the Board to terminate benefits to unsound institutions.

The section also expressly provides that a Federal savings and loan association may not voluntarily withdraw from membership. These institutions are required by law to become members of a Federal home-loan bank. The present law requiring these institutions to be insured does not permit them to voluntarily cancel insurance of accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Section 14 (3): This is a technical amendment.

Section 14 (4). Increase in the number of elected directors in certain Federal home-loan banks: The Federal Home Loan Bank Act presently provides for a board of 12 directors in each Federal home-loan bank. Eight directors are elected to each board by the members of the bank and four are appointed by the Home Loan Bank Board. This section would permit the Board, in any district in which there are more than four States (that is, more than half the number of elected directors), to increase the directorate so that there could be as many as, but not more than, twice as many elective directors as there are States.

Because certain of the Federal home loan bank districts, such as the Greensboro district, with 7 States and the District of Columbia, and the San Francisco district, with 9 States as well as Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam, contain so many basic units, proper recognition cannot, in all cases, be afforded. At present the Board in its regulations attempts to provide for each State to be represented on the board of directors of the bank of its district. In the case of the San Francisco district this is, of course, at present impossible and the Board has been compelled to adopt the method of treating two States as if they were one. By regulatory provision, the representatives of these two States have been alternated. Furthermore, the present law so limits the elective directors that fair consideration cannot be effected giving recognition to the relevant financial importance of the institutions in the various States, while recognizing representation for all States. In the San Francisco district, the California members comprise approximately 57 percent of the entire membership and hold approximately 73 percent of the entire outstanding bank stock of the San Francisco bank. The proposed change would permit all States to be represented on the board of directors and permit recognition to be given to the relevant financial importance of the institutions in the various States.

Section 15. Removal of $2,500 limitation on FHA and VA improvement loans by Federals: This section would make a correction in the existing law to remove a $2,500 limitation as applied to the amount of an FHA or VA insured or guaranteed loan made by a Federal savings and loan association.

Prior to the Housing Act of 1954, FHA or VA insured or guaranteed repair loans made by a Federal savings and loan association were not subject to a special dollar limitation. The applicable limitations were thus the ones provided for all lenders in the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. However, in enacting an amendment increasing from $1,500 to $2,500 the maximum amount of an eligible Federal association loan not insured or guaranteed, the Congress also imposed the $2,500 restriction on an insured or guaranteed loan (thus prohibiting a Federal association from making, for example, a $3,000 FHA title I loan for construction of a new structure). This was apparently done inadvertently, and it is important that the statute be corrected.

Section 16. FSLIC admission fee: The present law requires that the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation charge (in addition to premiums) lending institutions an admission fee as an initial payment for obtaining insurance coverage. That admission fee must be based upon the reserve fund of FSLIC and must constitute an equitable contribution to that fund. This section of the bill would change that requirement to provide that lending institutions applying for insurance hereafter shall pay an admission fee as determined by FSLIC, taking into consideration the cost of processing the applications. This would carry out the recommendation of the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 371, p. 16, 83d Cong., April 26, 1954) and make the admission fee requirement more consistent with general insurance operations. The statement of the General Accounting Office with respect to this recommendation contains the following:

"We recommend that the National Housing Act be amended to eliminate the existing requirement for the payment of an admission fee based on the reserve fund of F. S. & L. I. C. and to authorize the imposition of a fee on newly insured institutions commensurate with the direct and indirect cost of granting insurance coverage.

"The admission fee charged by FSLIC against newly insured associations is required by law to be based on the reserve fund of FSLIC and to be, in its judgment, an equitable contribution * * *.

"We believe that a newly insured association's contribution to an insurance reserve fund should be confined to payments for services and benefits actually received, i. e., insurance premiums for protection to be received by its investors. Further, a fee based on the ratio of the reserve fund to the total insurance risk (which would satisfy the legal requirement for an equitable contribution) might be so large as to discourage applicants for insurance membership. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation does not charge admission fees against newly insured banks, and to our knowledge other similar risk enterprises do not make such charges."

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 17. Reserve of planned public works: This section would amend section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, which authorized the third public works advance planning program. The proposed amendments would carry out the recommendation contained under the heading "Coordination of public works planning" appearing in section 4 of chapter 3 of the Economic Report of the President, which was transmitted to the Congress on January 20. That report contains the following statement:

"A problem of great interest * * * is the stimulation of public works planning in States and localities. Many smaller communities have projects within their master development plans for which funds are not immediately available to produce preliminary engineering surveys and designs. Assistance to such communities would help them to develop plans for public works ready for initiation, which otherwise would take months to prepare in case of need. Such a reservoir of planned public works should be of considerable magnitude to be effective. The sum of $1.5 million made available by the Congress last year for planning advances—that is, interest-free loans—to States and municipalities was a good beginning but no more than that. It is recommended that the Congress enlarge substantially the appropriation for planning advances, and that a revolving fund be established for this purpose. The need for building a reservoir of ready-to-go projects has been recognized in three separate programs of planning advances, established by the Congress within the past decade. This experience indicates that the need for preparedness, being itself continuous, is not well met by programs of limited duration."

The bill would make the following changes in the present law:

(1) The Housing Administrator would be authorized to establish a revolving fund for the making of planning advances. In addition to the $10 million authorized to be appropriated by section 702 as originally enacted there would be authorized to be appropriated to the fund twelve, twelve, and fourteen million dollars to be made available on or after July 1, 1956, 1957, and 1958 and, in addition, such appropriations from year to year thereafter as may be estimated to be necessary to maintain not to exceed a total of $48 million in outstanding advances (and any undisbursed balances in the fund) for plans of projects which can be expected to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time.

(2) Advances outstanding to public agencies in any one State would be limited to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate then authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund. Under the present law not more than 5 percent of appropriations may be expended in any one State.

(3) The July 1, 1957 expiration date for the present program would be eliminated, and the new introductory language of the revised section 702 would make it clear that a reservoir rather than a shelf of planned public works is intended.

(4) As under the present law, local public agencies must agree to complete the plan preparation promptly and to repay advances when the construction of the public works is started. Provisions would be added to the law, however, which would require a public agency to repay proportionate amounts of advances when only a portion of the construction of a planned public work is undertaken by the local agency.

The bill would continue provisions in the present law which state that the advances are designed to finance the cost of engineering and architectural surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, or other action preliminary to and in preparation for the construction of State and local public works. By definition, public works excludes housing. The bill retains present provisions of law which make it clear that the making of planning advances in no way commits the Congress to assist in financing the construction of the public works planned.

Section 18. Salary of Community Facilities Commissioner: This section would make the salary of the Community Facilities Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency the same as that of the heads of its constituent agencies. The Housing Act of 1948 has fixed this compensation at $15,000 per annum.

A new constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, known as the Community Facilities Administration, was established by the Housing Administrator's Reorganization Order No. 1 of December 23, 1954. There was transferred to that administration the office of the Commissioner of Community Facilities, and the title of such office was changed to Community Facilities Commissioner.

The Community Facilities Commissioner is presently receiving $14,800 per year pursuant to Public Law 359, 81st Congress and Public Law 375, 82d Congress. This proposed section would therefore give the necessary statutory authority to increase the compensation of the head of this new constituent unit so that it would be equal to the compensation received by the heads of the constituent agencies and the head of another new constituent unit of the agency, the Urban Renewal Administration. Although the salary increase provided by this section would be very small, it would serve the purpose of providing consistency in the salaries paid the heads of the constituent agencies and units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Urban Renewal Commissioner already receives the same salary as the heads of constituent agencies by virtue of section 106 (a) (1) of the Housing Act of 1949 and the Housing Administrator's Reorganization Order No. 1.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955

INCREASE IN FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION

The FHA general mortgage insurance authorization would be increased to authorize FHA mortgage insurance up to the aggregate of outstanding insurance liability and commitments on June 30, 1955, plus $4 billion. This increase would take care of the estimated amount of housing construction which will be assisted by FHA mortgage insurance during fiscal year 1956.

EXTENSION OF FHA TITLE I HOME REPAIR AND MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The FHA title I home repair and modernization program would be extended for 5 years to July 1, 1960. Under this program the FHA insures lending institutions against loss on home repair and modernization loans. FHA liability is limited to 90 percent of loss on individual loans and to 10 percent of all title I loans held by a lending institution.

REVISION OF FHA MORTGAGE LIMITATIONS FOR MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS

The present statutory limit on the dollar amount of a multifamily housing project mortgage, where the mortgagor is a private corporation, would be increased from $5 million to $12.5 million. This limit would apply to mortgages insured under sections 207 (the major FHA rental housing program), 213 (cooperative housing), 221 (low-cost housing for families displaced in slum-clearance areas and by governmental action), and 803 (military housing) of the National Housing Act. The limitation on FHA mortgages financing multifamily housing in slum clearance or urban renewal areas under section 220 of the National Housing Act would be increased from $5 million to $50 million, where the mortgagor is a private corporation. This conforms to the dollar ceiling now in the law with respect to multifamily housing mortgages where the mortgagor is a public body.

The dollar limit would apply not only to the amount of the mortgage which is insured but would also apply to the aggregate amount of any commitment or commitments issued by FHA to the same mortgagor and outstanding at any time with respect to a project or projects in the same housing market area. The effect of this provision would be that no mortgagor could receive from FHA a commitment to insure the mortgage on a proposed multifamily project as long as another project in the area covered by a commitment in the maximum amount to the same mortgagor is still under construction or still attaining initial occupancy. If a corporation seeking an FHA commitment is under the same or substantially the same control as another corporation which has an FHA commitment, the two corporations would be considered to be the same mortgagor for the purpose of this limitation. The limitation would not apply to two or more mortgages, even though the sponsors were the same and the structures on contiguous sites, if the mortgages are beyond the commitment stage.

OTHER FHA AMENDMENTS

The separate authorization of $100 million under section 203 (i) of the National Housing Act for farm-housing mortgages insured under that section would be eliminated. This provision would be removed to reduce record keeping and the insurance volume under this program would be controlled in the same manner that other section 203 sales housing mortgages are controlled under the general FHA mortgage insurance authorization.

Provisions with respect to properties acquired by the FHA under foreclosed mortgages would be amended to enable the FHA to make final settlement of certificates of claim held by mortgagees and refunds to mortgagors at any time after the sale or transfer of title by the FHA to the property acquired. Under the present law such final settlement and refunds cannot be made until the housing which has been sold by FHA has been completely paid for, which may involve as much as 20 years in cases where 20-year mortgages are taken by FHA in payment for the property. The amendment would result in savings through simplified accounting and reduced record keeping.

The present requirement in the National Housing Act for cost certification by the mortgagor on all single-family housing covered by mortgages insured under section 221 of the National Housing Act would be removed. Section 221 housing is low-cost housing for families displaced by slum clearance operations or governmental action.

Title VIII FHA military-housing program (Wherry Act) would be extended for only those projects which are undertaken pursuant to a certification by the Secretary of Defense prior to June 30, 1955, and a commitment to insure issued on or before June 30, 1956.

Title IX FHA defense housing mortgage insurance would be made available for any outstanding commitments on July 1, 1955, to insure under that title. Title IX would otherwise expire on that date.

INCREASE IN CAPITAL GRANT AUTHORIZATION FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

The capital grant authorization in title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, for Federal assistance to slum clearance and urban renewal would be increased by $200 million to be available after next June 30 and an additional $200 million after June 30, 1956. The President would also be authorized to provide an additional $100 million of authorization. The present law provides that not more than 10 percent of the capital grant authorization may be expended in any 1 State except that an additional $35 million may be allocated to local public agencies in States in which more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted in those States has been obligated. The $35-million limit would be increased by the bill to $70 million.

TERRITORIAL ENABLING ACT AMENDED TO AUTHORIZE URBAN RENEWAL LEGISLATION

Amendments would be made in the Territorial Enabling Act of 1950 to broaden the authority of the governments of the Territories to enact laws for urban renewal activities. Under the 1950 act they were authorized to enact urban redevelopment laws. Since urban renewal activities are broader than urban redevelopment activities authority is needed to enact the broader urban renewal laws.

SEVENTY THOUSAND ADDITIONAL LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AUTHORIZED

The Public Housing Administration would be authorized to enter into new contracts for 70,000 additional low-rent public housing units with the authorization becoming available at the rate of 35,000 on July 1, 1955, and 35,000 on July 1, 1956. Each year's authorization would be available for 2 years. That is, the authorization for 35,000 units which would become available on July 1, 1955, would remain available until June 30, 1957, and the 35,000 units authorization becoming available on July 1, 1956, would be available until June 30, 1958. In addition, the authorization in the present law for 35,000 units (provided in the Housing Act of 1954) which expires June 30, 1955, would be continued to June 30, 1956.

MODIFICATIONS IN STATUTORY RESTRICTIONS ON PUBLIC HOUSING

Modifications would also be made in certain statutory restrictions on the provision of low-rent public housing which have been found to be so restrictive as to prevent the provision of the housing by the time it is needed for housing families displaced by slum clearance and urban renewal operations.

Under the present law no new agreement of any kind with respect to public housing can be made with a community except where there is already being carried out a slum clearance and redevelopment or urban renewal project with Federal assistance under the Housing Act of 1949. This requirement would be changed so that preliminary contracts could be entered into for public housing which will permit planning at a stage early enough to assure that the low-rent housing will be available when needed to rehouse low-income families displaced by slum clearance or other governmental action. Further, public housing assistance would be permitted in communities which have workable programs for the prevention and elimination of slums even though they are not undertaking a redevelopment or urban renewal project assisted under the Housing Act of 1949. This would permit assistance in these communities where slum clearance is being accomplished without Federal assistance.

Communities which are carrying out slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs under the provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 prior to its amendment by the Housing Act of 1954 would be excepted from the requirement that communities must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums before new public housing contracts can be entered into. The requirement of a workable program would continue to apply to all other communities entering into new contracts.

Under existing law, the local governing body must certify that the public housing project is necessary to assist in meeting requirements for housing families displaced from slum-clearance projects being assisted under title I of the Housing Act of 1949. In place of that requirement, the proposed legislation would require that the local governing body adopt a resolution approving the public housing project.

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be required to find that the number of new public housing units to be provided in a community does not exceed the number of families of low income eligible for admission to the housing which he estimates will be displaced within the locality as a result of governmental action. The present law requires that the Administrator determine that the number of new units will not exceed the total number to be needed for displaced families. This change would make it clear that the Administrator is not required to take account of vacancies which may occur in existing low-rent housing projects. This would permit new housing to be provided for displaced families without affecting occupancy in existing projects, which could then continue to serve other eligible low-income families. Such families include those (1) who leave the slums on their own initiative without being forced out as a result of governmental action, (2) who are displaced by private enterprise which is clearing a slum site on its own initiative, or (3) who are displaced as a result of fire or other catastrophe.

STOCK SUBSCRIPTION REQUIREMENTS OF MEMBERS OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS REDUCED

The requirements for stock subscription by members of Federal home loan banks

would be changed to require that the original stock subscription for each lending institution eligible to become a member shall be an amount equal to 1 percent of the aggregate of the subscriber's home mortgage loans, or such higher percent not exceeding 2 percent as the Home Loan Bank Board shall prescribe by regulation, but not less than $500. This would be in place of the present requirement that a member shall acquire and hold stock in an amount equal to at least 2 percent of the aggregate of its home mortgage loans and purchase contracts, but not less than $500. A member would not be permitted to reduce the amount of stock held by it to below 2 percent of the aggregate of its home mortgage loans as of the effective date of the Housing Amendments of 1955. However, a member would not be required to subscribe for additional stock until such time as the amount of stock held by it does not equal that required by the regulation of the Home Loan Bank Board. The proposed reduction in stock subscription requirements are a result of the retirement of all Government holdings of stock in the Federal home loan banks so that there is no longer necessity for the higher stock ownership by members of the banks as a means of obtaining funds for such retirement.

TERMINATION OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK MEMBERSHIP AND ADVANCES

Provisions would be added to the present law to permit the Home Loan Bank Board, after hearing, to terminate membership of a lending institution in a Federal home loan bank, or the making of advances to nonmember borrowers if, in the opinion of the Board, such member or nonmember borrower has a management or home-financing policy of a character inconsistent with sound and economical home financing or with the purposes of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act. The present law merely requires that the Board find failure to comply with provisions of the law or regulations of the Board or insolvency. Provisions would also be added that a member which is a building and loan or savings and loan association, cooperative bank, or homestead association shall be deemed insolvent if the assets of such member are less than its obligations to its creditors and others, including the holders of its withdrawable accounts. The addition of these provisions will assure that the standards for termination of membership and advances by a Federal home loan bank are the same as the standards of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for termination of insurance of accounts of an institution so that institutions whose insurance has been terminated will not continue as members of a Federal home loan bank and to receive advances.

INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF ELECTED DIRECTORS IN CERTAIN FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS

The Home Loan Bank Board would be authorized to increase the number of elective directors of any Federal home loan bank having a district which includes five or more States so that there could be as many as, but not more than, twice as many elective directors as there are States. This would permit representation for each State in a district and permit recognition of the relevant financial importance of institutions in the various States.

REMOVAL OF $2,500 LIMIT ON FHA AND VA IMPROVEMENT LOANS BY FEDERALS

The present law would be amended to permit Federal savings and loan associations to make FHA or VA insured or guaranteed repair loans without regard to the $2,500 limit placed on repair loans made by the associations which are not insured or guaranteed by FHA or VA. The limit on FHA or VA loans would be that provided in the National Housing Act or Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

FSLIC ADMISSION FEE

The admission fee paid to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation by lending institutions applying for insurance of their accounts would be changed to be in an amount determined by FSLIC taking into consideration the cost of processing the applications. Under present law the admission fee must be based upon the reserve fund of FSLIC and must constitute an equitable contribution to that fund. The change has been recommended by the General Accounting Office.

ADVANCES FOR PLANNING PUBLIC WORKS

The July 1, 1957 expiration date for the present advance planning program would be eliminated and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator would be authorized to establish a revolving fund for the making of planning advances to local agencies for the preparation of a reservoir rather than a shelf of planned public works. In addition to the $10 million authorized to be appropriated by the present law, there would be authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund $12, $12, and $14 million to be made available on or after July 1, 1956, 1957, and 1958 and, in addition, such appropriations from year to year thereafter as may be estimated to be necessary to maintain not to exceed a total of $48 million in outstanding advances (and any undisbursed balances in the fund) for plans of projects which can be expected to be undertaken within a reasonable period of time. Advances outstanding to public agencies in any one State would be limited to not more than 10 percent of the aggregate then authorized to be appropriated to the revolving fund. Under the present law not more than 5 percent of appropriations may be expended in any one State. Provisions would also be added to the present law which would require a public agency to repay proportionate amounts of advances when only a portion of the construction of a planned public work is undertaken by the local agency.

SALARY OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMISSIONER

A new provision of law would be enacted to make the salary of the Community Facilities Commissioner of the Housing and Home Finance Agency the same as that of the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing Agency, which under the Housing Act of 1948, is $15,000 per annum. The Community Facilities Commissioner is presently receiving $14,800 per year pursuant to Public Law 359, 81st Congress and Public Law 375, 82d Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES IN ANTARCTICA

Mr. MARSHALL. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a resolution adopted last week by the Daughters of the American Revolution urging immediate action by the Congress to take steps to validate the claims of the United States in Antarctica.

Minnesota delegates have always been active in this effort and they are to be commended for arousing a national awareness of the great potential of this area.

As the resolution adopted by the 64th Continental Congress of the DAR pointed out, American citizens have discovered more of the South Pole continent than all other nations combined and have done nothing to validate its rightful claim.

The society has urged that further exploration be undertaken in order to produce maps and surveys of mineral resources as groundwork for validating the claims of our country. This vast area comprises one-tenth of the earth's land surface and represents one of the last great frontiers.

Following is the text of the original resolution passed by the 60th annual State conference of the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution in March 1955:

ANTARCTICA

Whereas the United States of America has discovered, explored, and claimed more territory in the south polar region than all other nations combined; and

Whereas this region not only is an untapped reservoir of natural resources, but is of extreme strategic value in the interest of our national defense; and

Whereas the United States of America has done nothing to advance the claims so acquired, although seven other countries each claims a portion of Antarctica, and one nation lays claim to all of it:

Resolved, That Congress be urged to pass House Joint Resolution 25 and to take all steps necessary to protect and preserve our claims to Antarctica.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2225) amending section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRIEST, HARRIS, WILLIAMS of Mississippi, WOLVERTON, and HINSHAW.

JASPER (ARK.) HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. TRIMBLE. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, our young people are the leaders of the future. It is always inspiring to have them come to see us and allow us to share their enthusiasm and good sense.

From our own district last week, we were happy to have the graduating class of the Jasper High School. Jasper is the county seat of Newton County, Ark., and is a beautiful city nestled in the bosom of the Ozarks, not far from Diamond Cave, one of the scenic wonders of the country. These children are fortunate, indeed, to be able to claim such a lovely locale as their home.

While they were here, they visited the Capitol, saw the Congress in session, made a tour of the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court, visited the Washington Monument, the Bureau of Engraving, the White House, Smithsonian Institution, Mount Vernon, Arlington National Cemetery, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and other points of interest. They were fortunate, too, to see a big-league ball game between the Washington Senators and the Boston Red Sox.

A hand salute to each of these youngsters and their sponsors. They are a credit to their country.

In the group were sponsors Arch Smith, superintendent of the Jasper schools, Mrs. Erma Dee Spears, and Mr. Lewellen, and the following students: Guy Young, Bobby Burdine, Emma Faye Hensley, Dalton Ham, Garner Milam, Lester Waters, P. J. Hensley, Coy Boen, Lawrence Smith, Irene Brasel, Euteva Kilgore, Patty Phillips, Doris Sloan, Anna Thomas, Joan Spencer, Louise Kelley, Nina Robinson, Jerry Lynn Reynolds, Clayton Reynolds, Barbara Jo Twyman, and Wanda Lea Webb.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, FOREIGN QUARANTINE DIVISION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H. R. 5798 to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to the compensation of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division. This bill would do two things. First, it would establish overtime provisions for quarantine officers as the same as those for Customs and Immigration Service. Secondly, with some exceptions, it would require that in cases of overtime performed at the request of private shipping company representatives, the requesting party reimburse the United States for the cost.

In the 83d Congress, H. R. 6253, a somewhat similar bill introduced by me, was passed unanimously by both Houses but the President withheld his approval and thus it did not become law. This measure, H. R. 5798, is designed to overcome Executive objections to the other legislation in that it does not spell out overtime rates. It simply recognizes the claim of inspectional employees for equal treatment with other inspectional groups. It deals with a pattern and not a pay structure.

The problem of shipping operators whereby their vessels are required to anchor at quarantine until morning when arriving after 6 p. m. results in costly delays amounting to as much as $5,000 a ship per day. Therefore, shipowners are willing to reimburse the Federal Government for out-of-hours inspection costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will expedite consideration of this legislation. I believe if the House and Senate take favorable action on H. R. 5798 with this changed provision, the previous White House objection would be overcome.

The President, as he stated he would last August, has provided for a study of overtime and premium pay and H. R. 5798 is designed to fit in with any changes in pay structures which might come out of recommendations resulting from this study.

Because of the peculiar circumstances of out-of-regular-hours service in meeting and inspecting ships where arrival times are uncertain and the inconvenience to inspectors is out of proportion to hours worked, liberal overtime rates are traditional and warranted. The study of such overtime rates instituted by the President is bound to recognize these unusual factors, but regardless of the outcome of this study, everyone agrees a quarantine inspector should be treated on the same basis as the customs and immigration inspectors because all three services work under identical conditions.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 4876, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RIGHTS OF STATES TO LEVY AND COLLECT CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the State of Iowa recently adopted the following concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as possible legislation whch will secure and make certain to the States of the Union the power and right to levy and collect certain taxes:

House Concurrent Resolution 20

Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.*, v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and the preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule here complained of; and

Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union of any portion of their power to tax government contractors there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in the balance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 56th General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as possible legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union and the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the law of any State of the Union, except such taxes the direct incidence of which would be upon the United States.

THE HARD-MONEY HIGH-INTEREST POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the hard-money, high-interest policy is starting all over again. If present policies of the Federal Reserve are carried out, it will be much harder than the hard-money policy of 1953, which almost caused the country to suffer from a ruinous depression.

Farm prices are down. They have been going down a long time. There is not much hope of farm prices starting upward again soon under present policies and outlook.

OVER 3 MILLION UNEMPLOYED

Today we not only are suffering from low farm prices but we still have more than 3 million workers unemployed. We have more than 100 distressed areas in the United States, many of them with an unemployment rate of as high as 11 and 12 percent. These are distressing signs in our economy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman about that, but I

noticed the latter part of last week about how many hundred thousand was it?—the gentleman perhaps noticed it—we have to take care of. They told those in the northern half of the country to go south, and we would take care of them. Now they say there are not any jobs for them. How long does the gentleman think that can go on?

Mr. PATMAN. Who is the gentleman quoting?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In Friday's Post. I know it is not a very good quote, but that is the source.

Mr. PATMAN. I will read it with a great deal of interest, because I know the gentleman is keeping up with things like that. I appreciate the fact that he has called it to my attention. I will read it.

ADJUST ECONOMY FOR 1956 ELECTION

Mr. Speaker, in a newsletter put out by people who discuss banking, currency, and monetary matters in general, there is a very frank statement contained in the first paragraph of the issue published the last few days concerning this new policy of the Federal Reserve to cause hard money again and high interest rates. I will quote it exactly:

> Politically, there is fear that good business will not be sustained until the presidential election in 1956.

In other words, those in charge of our monetary system, the money managers, our money masters, placed in charge by this Congress, have decided they should look at our economy from the standpoint of next year's election. They have decided that this economy cannot continue prosperous throughout this year and next year—1956, too. So it is in their interest to look at it from the strictly political standpoint, that is, it is in their interest, in other words, to cause a recession now and have the economy go down so that commencing a while before the election next year, they may have an expanding economy and be before the people just before the election in a more favorable light. In effect, that is exactly what this says, and that is the kind of talk we are hearing from every corner. And that seems to be the policy of causing hard times now so that the time will be so much better in 1956 and the economy, in particular, will look so much better in 1956, just before the general election. It says further in this newsletter, which is so highly regarded in banking circles:

> Steps to dampen the rate of business expansion in order to spread out the duration of good times are naturally under consideration.

Any reader of this letter is impressed with the fact that the people who prepare it for distribution among banking and financial leaders are very close to the money masters, the money managers, and that they know what is going on. Therefore, let me repeat that this writer says that our money masters certainly have under consideration the fact that steps to dampen the rate of business expansion in order to spread out the duration of good times are naturally under consideration.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. What will be the effect of upping the rediscount rates in the various Federal Reserve centers?

Mr. PATMAN. It is more psychological than real, but it has a devastating psychological effect. The banks do not want to go into debt to the Federal Reserve banks any more. They got caught that way one time and they did not like it, and they are not going to go into debt if they can help it. The money masters in fixing this rate and in upping this rate one quarter of one percent is giving notice to all the banks and all the people who deal in credit—"get harder—get harder with money; raise your interest rates because this is your signal that money is going to get harder."

It is strictly psychological, that is, more so than real, but it hurts the little man more than anybody because this wholesale interest rate is reflected immediately in the interest rate that the small man must pay.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. What is the meaning of the upping of the interest rate by Secretary Benson on disaster loans, up to 5 percent?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I think that was terrible. It was wholly unjustified. There was no reason at all. Of course, I would not accuse Secretary Benson of having any intention of making it hard on people already in distress. I would not accuse him of that, but the result is that it makes it much harder on those already in distress, and it was not necessary to do it.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman have any information that about May 1 the FHA, and possibly the VA, may tighten down on all FHA and VA loans, in order to bring back hard money?

Mr. PATMAN. They are already doing it. This upping of the rediscount rate is the signal. Even GI loans are selling as low as 92. They are Government guaranteed, guaranteed by the Government of the United States, and money has already gotten so hard in many sections that that paper can only be sold if they will reduce the price of it down to 92, or a loss of 8 percent on the Government-guaranteed GI loan. It is a disgrace. It should not be permitted. It can be stopped if the Congress wants to take action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join the gentleman in his expression of regret regarding the news that disaster loan interest rates have been raised from 3 to 5 percent in the drought areas. I know of no previous time when the Government has endeavored to make money out of disaster, and out of the distress of human beings, but in this instance the interest rate on these disaster loans has been raised to the highest point of any interest rate that I know of that is being charged on Government loans. Yet that is the policy just put into effect by Secretary Benson. I certainly share the gentleman's feelings about it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an increase of 66⅔ percent to people who are in distress and cannot help it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean the interest rate on loans that have already been made has been increased?

Mr. PATMAN. I was not talking about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are not talking about loans that have been made?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I got that information several months ago. I have been so busy on other matters that I have not mentioned it. But that happened several months ago. Most of those disaster loans bear a 5 percent rate instead of 3 percent. There was no public announcement made of it at the time it was done. I do not know that they deliberately concealed it, but I heard about it in conversation with one of the officials several months ago when I made inquiry about interest rates being increased on other loans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman has been busy. He did a very fine job with me in the Small Business Administration Committee. But does the gentleman mean that disaster loans that have been made—that the interest rate on those loans has been increased?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not in a position to intelligently answer the gentleman's question, but I know they have been increased from 3 percent to 5 percent. Whether or not they had the power to go back and rewrite the contracts and increase the interest rate I do not know, but they have increased the interest rate on disaster loans from 3 percent to 5 percent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, let us get that clear.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to get it clear right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. PATMAN. But the point is the disaster-loan interest rates have been increased. It is not a matter of any great concern right now for the purpose of my discussion whether it applies to former loans or not.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The new interest rate went into effect January 3, 1955. It has been effective on all loans made since that date.

Mr. PATMAN. There was no public announcement made?

Mr. EDMONDSON. None whatsoever.

Mr. PATMAN. It was only known publicly a few days ago, although I heard it several months ago when I was making an inquiry about increases in

interest rates. I did not see any announcement of it. So I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that all loans made since January 3 have carried the higher rate.

Mr. RAINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman anticipate that the raising of the rediscount rate will foretell an increase in interest rates generally?

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly does, just like the administration started out to do in January 1953. It charged more interest, and the people who pay interest are compelled to take more and more from their limited budgets and pay it in the form of interest and service charges and have less and less to buy the goods in the form of comforts, necessities, and even luxuries of life.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman arguing that money should be made easier in the sense that interest rates should be lower, and it should be easier to buy on installment or to borrow at a lesser rate of interest?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the terms in the recent past, meaning in the last few years, have been rather reasonable. As to installment purchasing, I am not talking about the commercial rate of interest as much as I am the Government rate of interest. I do not believe the Government rate of interest should be arbitrarily increased, and that is what has been going on. Whenever you arbitrarily increase the Government rate of interest that eventually goes clear across the board. If you raise the rate from 2½ percent to 3 percent that means a one-half percent increase which eventually goes clear across the board, and affects all debt, public and private.

Our national debt today represents a large part, almost one-half of the entire outstanding debt of the Nation. About a year ago the entire outstanding debt was $640 billion; that is public debt, private debt, all debt of all kinds, $640 billion. A 1-percent increase in that debt means $6.4 million a year. That is about $40 per annnum for every man, woman, and child. That makes a heavy burden on the people to pay interest rates. So the trend now makes it harder on the fellow who pays interest rates and make it easier and more profitable to those who are collecting interest; that is exactly the trend; there is no dispute about it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands, I think, with the other Members of the House, that we are soon to be confronted with a $3.5 to $4 billion foreign aid bill; and we are told that under the foreign aid bill this year emphasis will be put upon loans to foreign governments. I doubt that the gentleman from Texas believes we are going to lend very much of this money, but if we do, does the gentleman think that foreigners will pay us 5 percent on the $3.5 or $4 billion that will be put out to them?

Mr. PATMAN. If they do it will be a new policy; in fact, I am going to look with a very critical eye on these recommendations and suggestions about additional loans to foreign countries to bolster the economy of a foreign country when we are denying our people the same opportunities here at home.

The Export-Import Bank with a billion-dollar capital furnished by the United States Government can make loans, big and little, all over the world, except in the United States; they can build steel mills in Argentina, and they are; they can build different projects all over the world at a low rate of interest; they can lend money to the big business or little business of foreign governments in foreign countries, but the people in our own country do not have that aid. We have the Small Business Administration created in 1953 which may make a loan up to $150,000, that is all, just $150,000; in other words, enough to let small business compete with other small businesses, but not enough to let them compete with any large business, not a dime. But they will let them have all the money they want in foreign countries! That part is not good, it is not good.

They have discovered a small area in foreign operations including loans which is not covered and they are trying to organize another RFC worldwide in scope, the INF, to cover a small area which is not covered. This INF is being sponsored by the world bank. We will hear more about it soon.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman just referred to the fact that the Export-Import Bank can make loans at a low rate of interest anywhere in the world except the United States—and he is so right about that, tragically right. But the Farmers' Home Administration has the power under the present law to make these loans at 3 percent. Our committee, or at least the Subcommittee on Credit of the Committee on Agriculture, was concerned about this very matter and called Mr. McLeaish, and he appeared before us last week. He went into this very matter and I personally asked him if they did not have the power to make these loans at 3 percent. He said they had. Mr. McLeaish expressed some concern and said that maybe there ought to be some distinction between a loan of a half million dollars and a loan of $1,500, which is their average. I think probably there should be. I asked him if he did not have the power at the present time to make a distinction in the interest rate and he said they had. We asked him why he did not make that distinction and he said he supposed that the Congress wanted him to bring about uniformity in interest rates. Had he wanted to bring about uniformity it seems to me he went about it in a very strange way because the present law provides that the interest rate on these noncritical, on these nondisaster loans that have been made simply to enrich somebody shall be 5 percent, but we leave discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants as to whether he will raise or lower the interest rates on these disaster loans. Two or three years ago when we had the floods in the Missouri Valley, the interest rate was lowered and was fixed at 3 percent for those people who suffered a disaster. Now the interest rate has been raised for the people who have suffered a disaster in the form of a drought, a freeze, or other kinds of disaster. I do not think that the Congress ever intended anything of the kind. The Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration admitted within the last 3 days that he had the power to fix 3 percent had he wanted to but he did not want to.

Mr. PATMAN. I appreciate these interruptions and I appreciate especially the interruption of the gentleman from Texas because he has made a contribution to what I have to say.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am indeed glad to hear that the gentleman is going to scrutinize the foreign giveaway program this year. We will welcome him to that little fraternity that has carefully scrutinized them for a long time.

Mr. PATMAN. I will be there and the first thing I am going to do, and I hope the gentleman will look upon this favorably, is to insist that before we send anything overseas to bolster up the economy of any country we set aside a billion dollars a year here for soil and water conservation and for flood-control projects, that will help make America stronger. We have gotten down to about $300 million a year on an annual basis on works of that type, which is entirely too low. We ought to have a minimum of at least a billion dollars a year first on projects like that. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will join with us on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I sure will, but after you get all this soil back into production, what are you going to do with the surplus?

Mr. PATMAN. We will not have any trouble if every person who needs the right kind of diet is placed in the position of obtaining the proper food for that diet and using it. We will not have any trouble getting rid of any surplus; in fact, we will not have any surplus at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have always understood, and my studies have convinced me, that one of the most valuable assets any country has is a strong

agriculture. That is dependent upon a good virile topsoil. So it would seem to me that the vitally important thing is to keep that gift that God has given us in good topsoil. I say that coming from a district where we have no farms.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his good statement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not also true that we are having an increase in our population in the United States of about 3 million a year?

Mr. PATMAN. Four million last year. The greatest challenge we have is providing the food and fiber for the expanding population 20 years from now. We should commence now, right now. We are not commencing now. We are sending too much abroad to bolster the economy of foreign countries. We should start helping out our own country some in that direction. I am not opposed to the foreign-aid program. It is out of balance now with our own needs. We should not overlook our own country.

MONEY TURNED ON AND OFF

Now, I have a very interesting article that I will put in the RECORD by Miss Sylvia Porter on Your Money's Worth. Miss Porter is outstanding in her field of reporting and writing. It discusses a question that Congress should be vitally concerned about at this time, and that is the money market.

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

INTEREST RATE RISE CONTINUES

The cost of borrowing money is now at the highest level since the spring of 1953. What's more, it's a virtual certainty that the price of a loan will go higher before it goes lower.

The trend toward higher interest rates which got under way toward the end of 1954 is continuing. The swing is gathering strength.

The movement is no accident. It is based on fundamental forces which actually are operating in most areas throughout the Western World, and in this country it is part of a deliberate program designed by our top monetary authorities.

The Federal Reserve Board is the key agency in America that controls the supply and cost of money and credit. By certain maneuvers in the basic money markets in New York, it can flood the banking and business streams with money—and thereby force interest rates down and make loans a cinch to get.

This was its policy from mid-1953 to the fall of 1954.

Or by certain other maneuvers in the basic New York markets, the Federal Reserve can cut down on the volume of money banks have available to lend—and thereby force interest rates up, make credit harder to get.

This is its policy now, in mid-April 1955.

The demand for loans today is truly massive. Giant corporations and small-businessmen are asking billions to finance expansion plans, new equipment, rising operations. Homebuilders and buyers all over the land are asking more billions to finance peak construction. Individuals are asking still more billions to finance purchase of cars, appliances, furniture, etc. States and cities are asking even more billions to finance new roads, schools, essential public works. And finally, the Government itself is asking additional billions to pay its immense week-to-week bills.

The Federal Reserve System simply has decided it will not supply all the billions needed or requested.

It has so decided not because it wants to cripple or halt the current upswing. It has so decided because it wants to restrain the boom a bit, keep it from taking off at a speed that could not be maintained and that could lead later to a sickening bust.

The trend is affecting every borrower from the best-known giant down to the young bridegroom asking for a loan for the first time.

The highest credit risk in the world—the Treasury—was paying only about ⅝ percent interest for a 90-day loan in 1954.

Today, it is paying over 1½ percent interest for an identical 90-day loan. This is the basic clue to the cost of money.

There won't be any real money squeeze, any near-panic resembling what we felt in early 1953.

But home-buying and installment terms won't get any easier than now; they well may get tougher in the near future and there are significant signs they already are toughening in some spots. Business loans won't get any cheaper. They could get more expensive soon.

You see in the newspapers that the interest rate had to be raised in order to be in line with other interest rates. Who made the other interest rates? The Federal Reserve System turns our money on and off just like water is turned on and off for an irrigated land area. If we want plenty of money, lots of money, the Federal Reserve System is in a position to provide it. If the Federal Reserve System wants to tighten up, it can tighten up, and that is exactly what they are doing today. You know our money system that the Federal Reserve and the commercial banking system is operating is not new.

GOLDSMITHS

It started back hundreds of years ago when they used to have goldsmiths in the old countries who would keep the gold on deposit for the people. A depositor would deposit so much gold, and the goldsmith would give him a receipt showing that he had that much gold on deposit with him, and he would take that receipt and he would use it and trade it for what he wanted. That was the money in those times. It was soon discovered that the people would leave their gold with the goldsmith and seldom ask for the return of the actual gold, but used the receipt for it instead. They did not need the actual gold. All they needed was the receipt, and they used that as money. So, they decided, well, since the people will not often come back and get the gold, let the goldsmith extend credit equal to 10 times as much as he has in gold and get interest on the loans equal to 10 times the gold. That was all right. It worked for hundreds of years. At one time in Amsterdam, I am told, they even passed a law to assess the death penalty against any person who put out a report that the goldsmith did not have the money to pay those receipts. And, for some unknown reason, they had a run on a goldsmith anyway; he did not have the gold, and they hung the goldsmith. Well, those things happen. The bankers do not have the money in the banks today to pay off in full if they were to have a run. They are not supposed to have the money. They can get it very quickly through the United States Government. Their deposits are guaranteed and there is no risk involved, for a depositor is protected. The banks only have a reserve.

They can do like the goldsmith of old. They can manufacture or create from $6 to $10 for every dollar of reserve, of money, and that is what they should be allowed to do. It helps the country. It helps to expand our economy. I defend it. It is all right. But we should use it for the benefit of the people, not for speculation, for gambling in the stock market. We should not create money for purposes like that, and that is what I object to. This great privilege should be used by a local bank primarily for local people. It should be used to help expand the local community and create prosperity.

This article discusses the creation of the money and how the Federal Reserve can turn it on or turn it off just the way they want to do. It is up to them. There is no such thing as a free money market in United States Government bonds.

SHOULD KEEP BONDS AT PAR

The Federal Reserve causes the bonds to go down, and the Federal Reserve causes the bonds to go up. This Congress should pass a law fixing all Government bonds at par and not let them go below par. They are running them away down right now. In 1953 the bonds were reduced in price; some of them went down to 89 cents on the dollar. Think of it, United States Government bonds down to 89 cents on the dollar. Of course, the big bankers bought up these bonds, and then they went back to 100 and they sold these bonds. They made enormous profits that way. They were windfalls. How much did they make? I do not know. It never has been looked into. Their annual reports disclosed large profits made in this way. And, the bonds are going down again. The people in the know or who have good reasons to believe what is going to happen will buy those bonds at the right time, and when the bonds go up, they will sell them. And, the Congress is permitting that. It is going on every day. It is not right. It is dishonest. It is not treating the people right, and it should be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will take action in the near future to take a step in the direction of stopping such conduct as that.

WEEKLY LETTERS

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith the last eight weekly letters prepared by me and sent to the newspapers in the district I have the honor to represent. The subjects discussed in most of the paragraphs concern our current economic situation and related subjects.

[1,131st weekly letter, April 28, 1955]

BANKING

Commercial banking represents an indispensable segment of a dynamic, prosperous economy. The local commercial bank is almost invariably operated by outstanding, public-spirited citizens, who are among the most influential people in the community. Our country would be helpless without a successful and efficient banking system.

It is my opinion that banking should always be privately owned and, in order to

serve the public properly, should be allowed to operate with a good profit. The Congress is charged with the duty, under the Constitution, of creating money and regulating its value. This great privilege has been properly farmed out to banking interests under restrictions and limitations. In order for a local bank to be able to properly serve the community it is allowed to manufacture or create money to the extent of six to ten dollars on every one dollar of reserve. When a loan is made of $100 to a local citizen by a bank $100 is created by the bank to make the loan. When the loan is paid the $100 debt is extinguished and that much money is canceled. This goes on all over the United States every day—creating and canceling money. It is in the public interest that banks be allowed the privilege of manufacturing money for the purpose of using it in the public interest.

In recent years, without authority of law, holding companies secured a strong foothold in the banking business. Even in States where branch banks are not allowed, an outside banking institution purchases a majority of stock in a local bank, places local dummy directors in charge, and operates the bank from a distance to serve the interest of the holding company officials. To my mind, this is repugnant to the true intentions of the private banking system and a violation of the obligations imposed upon the bank by the granting of the charter. These holding companies do not stop at banking; they own theaters, race tracks, liquor stores, investment houses, insurance companies, and all kinds of nonrelated businesses. They have not been allowed to get started in Texas, as our State constitution provides for independent banks without branches.

An effort is now being made through the passage of the Spence bill in the House to restrict banking to its original sphere of activity and require the great privileges given to a local bank to be used in the public interest and for the convenience, particularly, of local people and not be used as a vehicle to satisfy the greed and dictatorial ambitions of a few holding company executives in a distant city.

NATIONAL DEBT

The national debt is large and we should have a definite program for its liquidation by a payment of a certain amount each year.

It is not in the public interest to pay off the public debt too fast. Under our monetary system, our money is based on debt. If all debts were paid, we would not have any money with which to do business.

Our entire debt, including public and private, aggregates over $700 billion. There is no way under normal circumstances to lower the aggregate debt without retarding the progress of our country. Our debts must increase 3 percent to 4 percent each year to provide for a growing economy. Therefore, as the public debt is paid, the private debt must be expanded in order for the Nation to have sufficient money. We cannot escape the conclusion that oftentimes the public debt is in competition with the progress of the Nation. It can be in competition with every local community in the Nation. If we can only have so much debt and no more in order to prevent inflation, debts for the improvement of cities and States or for the expansion of businesses are necessarily restricted by the size of the national debt.

Last year—1954—we could have paid a sizable amount on our national debt by not reducing certain taxes. I voted against the tax reduction bill. The Congress reduced the excise profits taxes on large corporations, which saves the large corporations $2 billion a year. Last year, this $2 billion was paid to the corporations the same as if the taxes had not been repealed. Congress was told that prices would be reduced if the taxes were repealed, but prices were not reduced. The same prices are still paid by the consumer, and the $2 billion, instead of going to the Government and being paid on the national debt, is going to corporations that are not using it to pay dividends but are using it as expansion capital, which amounts to costless capital to them. This not only deprives savers, who are looking for investments, of an opportunity to invest, but places the small-business man, who is required to pay a high rate of interest, in a very hazardous business in competition with the unit of the large concern across the street from him that is getting its capital free in the form of high prices from the consumer.

No one knows how far the monopoly trend will continue. There is no denying the fact that monopoly has the green light in America today. We know that the little man and small business are the backbone of our Nation. Time only will tell how far we can permit them to be crushed without destroying the whole country.

[1,130th weekly letter, April 21, 1955]

PROGRESS IN CONGRESS

Many important bills have come up and others will be considered in the first session of the 84th Congress. The present sessions appear to be about half-way over. The House, which originates all money bills, has passed about half of the 1956 budget's appropriation requirements. Altogether, five of the big departmental bills have been passed by the House and sent to the Senate. In addition to appropriations bills, the House has passed H. R. 1, the reciprocal trade agreements bill, and Extension Act of 1955. The House has also moved to plug several costly tax loopholes that will save the Treasury much revenue. The House has acted on national defense, including granting the President discretion in the defense of Formosa and passing the draft extension bill. Still to be considered are bills relating to farm price supports, school building, the highway-aid bill, health reinsurance, aid to medical education, Armed Forces Reserve, postal and classified Federal employees' pay bills, and a minimum-wage bill. As usual, it appears that the House will be marking time waiting for the Senate to clear up its work prior to adjournment. At the present time, it looks like adjournment may not come before August.

Ways and means must be found for more effectively implementing the full employment pledge that is embodied in the Employment Act. Recent experience has convinced me that opponents of full employment have found ways of circumventing the clear intent of the act. This became clear to me when I tried in vain, during the recent hearings on monetary and debt-management policy, to secure from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve a statement that they regarded the full employment pledge underlying the Employment Act as the primary objective of government economic policy. Despite the fact that section 2 of the act makes this unequivocally plain and the added fact that this was the plain intent of Congress, these two officials of Government refuse to acknowledge that it is so. Moreover, the Federal Reserve Board in a third revised edition of its propaganda booklet on the Federal Reserve System, Its Purposes and Functions, now omits mention of the goal of "contributing to * * * the maintenance of a high level of employment," which did appear in an earlier edition. The new version now includes this aim: "Essentially people are primarily concerned with what the dollars they earn, are indebted for, or need to borrow for them. The ultimate test, in other words, is the purchasing power of the dollar."

If the bankers at the Federal Reserve persist in their policy of building up the purchasing power of the dollar at the expense of jobs, they will stabilize the country into a greater depression than in 1929.

WATER SCARCITY AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Water and soil conservation are going to be increasingly important in the years ahead. Many sections of the country already know how important an adequate water supply is for the land, our major resource. A fellow Texan, Representative GEORGE MAHON, has tried to focus attention on the water problem by introducing a bill to consider the feasibility of transporting surplus waters of the Missouri Basin for utilization in the Southwest where there is a great deficiency of water.

The National Association of Soil Conservation Districts is seeking nationwide observance of Soil Stewardship Sunday in churches throughout the country on May 15. More of the public should know about the importance of soil conservation, especially in view of the efforts of the opponents of the present national soil conservation program to undermine it.

BANK MERGERS

The current wave of bank mergers and the spread of bank holding companies are creating an unhealthy concentration of financial resources. More and more, locally owned and locally managed banks are being acquired by holding companies. Our independent unit banks are threatened by the growth of large branch banking through mergers and the spread of holding companies. Banking is becoming more and more a monopoly in the hands of a few large banking groups. Financial monopoly and political democracy do not coexist very long.

The growth of monopoly in banking is, in part, a result of the failure to include banks in the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. The reason given at the time was that the Federal Reserve would control it. The Federal Reserve has not been able to do so. The Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings on a bill that would curb the growth of bank holding companies. It is expected to have strong support from members, who want to see power, authority, and management of local financial resources retained by the local communities.

The national economy may set a record for producing goods and services in the spring of 1955. Gross national product for the first quarter of 1955 will be close to a $370 billion annual rate equaling or perhaps slightly exceeding the mid-1953 record. In the midst of this prosperity, however, times are getting harder for the farmer. Farm prices are continuing to fall and future markets are weak. While other people may be prospering, the farm recession is getting deeper and deeper. Farmers are not only getting less for their crops, but they are being forced to grow less while their costs are being kept high. Farm income is daily shrinking, but extended recession in farming will affect the other sectors of our economy. The history of the 1920's continued to suffer over a long period of time, other businessmen were affected sooner or later.

[1,129th weekly letter, April 14, 1955]

H. R. 12, REPEAL OF SLIDING-SCALE PRICE SUPPORTS

H. R. 12 is a bill reported by the House Agriculture Committee to repeal the sliding-scale price supports that go into effect this year. Even without sliding price supports, declining farm prices have exerted a disastrous squeeze on farmers. The agricultural parity ratio is now at its lowest point since 1941. Reduced farmers' income is hurting all business and contributing to unemployment. Further cuts in farm incomes as a result of the sliding-scale price supports will not help business and will not reduce unemployment. When H. R. 12 comes up for

action, which is expected soon, I am sure that Members on both sides of the aisle will be considering the harmful drag that falling farm income is having on our economy and will recognize, too, the need to increase the farmers' share of the national income from its present postwar low position.

REAL ESTATE CREDIT CURBS?

Many bankers are alarmed at the so-called easy credit housing boom. Proposals have been made and the Government agencies have been discussing tightening-up terms of VA and FHA underwritten home mortgages. Meanwhile, the annual rate of new housing starts after adjusting for seasonal variations actually has been declining since December, so the discussions may turn out to be academic. However, it is important not to lose sight of a number of facts about credit in housing. A revolution has taken place in the last 20 years in the housing field, which has been a boon to the home builder, the house buyer, and the construction industry. The role of Government credit agencies, such as FHA and VA, has been a major one in the revolution that has brought the mass market and mass production into the housing field. Before 1933 mass production was not possible when a down payment of at least 25 percent of appraised value was required. Interest costs on first mortgages limited to half of the appraised values, at rates from 6 to 8 percent and maturities of no more than 5 years, were extremely high. Families of moderate means were further burdened with a second mortgage. Interest was 8 percent or more. Discounts and commissions came to about 20 percent of the loan. If the mortgage matured when money was tight and the homeowner could not get a renewal, foreclosure would ensue. These are some of the facts that should be remembered by those who inveigh against "easy credit."

I frankly believe that if we are going to have an expanding economy, we have not come anywhere near the potential of our people to absorb more and better housing and the other goods that make for better living.

THE MONOPOLY QUESTION

A new impetus to monopoly growth has been loosed by the recommendations of the Attorney General's Commission To Study the Antitrust Laws. In a 385-page report, this group, operating with White House sanction on funds Congress appropriated to enforce the antitrust laws, recommends greater freedom for the big corporations to undermine the competitive enterprise system and, at the same time, would make cooperatives, farmers, small-business and working people open targets for abuse by the big corporations.

Once before in our history, in the 16 years following the Republican victory of 1896, giant monopolistic trusts manipulated by a small group of men, who constituted the eastern financial community, threatened to reduce the farmer, small-business man and workingman to economic peonage. The ever-increasing concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a small select oligarchy was the overriding issue of the Democratic campaign in 1912. In that campaign, President Woodrow Wilson gave the Democratic Party's answer to the trusts. The people voted for a free and open economic and political system, and repudiated the party and the men who, while paying lip-service to this principle, are always willing to place more and more power in the hands of a few giant corporate managers.

The monopoly issue has already resulted in some of the most intensive debates on economic and financial issues by more Members than has been the case since the early days of 1933. The people have a major stake in the debate. Involved are such things as jobs, prices, credit, interest rates, franchises, competition, and economic and political freedom.

[1,128th weekly letter, April 7, 1955]

THE OUTLOOK IS FOR PEACE

Although events in the Far East may appear to be touch and go insofar as peace or war is concerned, I am hopeful that the next month may see the easing of war pressures in that area. Everything depends upon the action that is taken in regard to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. Our policy is being determined by the President, and he gives every indication of pursuing a firm but nonprovocative policy line. I do not believe that the Chinese Communists will want to come into the Asian-African Conference, which opens at Bandung, Indonesia, next month, with the stigma of threatening the peace of the world on them. Therefore, I conclude that after a brief, nervous period, the danger of all-out war in the Far East will begin to recede.

The situation in Europe continues to improve and the war danger is diminishing there also. Of course, nobody can predict what the Soviets will do; but from the way they took up President Eisenhower's comments about the outlook for a meeting of the big powers, they appear to be anxious to talk.

If we can have peace, I am convinced that we will enter a period of prosperity and abundance and a general rise in living standards as the world has never before seen.

MONEY, CREDIT, AND INTEREST RATES

It is expected that consumers will spend about $1 billion more buying on credit this year than in 1954. Of the expected 4 percent increases in retail sales this year, bigger credit sales spurred by more liberal credit terms are expected to be the major factor. Consumer credit outstanding last year came to $30,125 million. Commercial banks, which used to take a cautious attitude toward installment lending, now are eagerly seeking this type of business. As business becomes more and more dependent upon costless capital, the banks are looking for new avenues to support their earnings. A survey of over 200 leading banks shows that consumer credit now accounts for 22 percent of total outstanding loans (United States underwritten home mortgages are another source of consumer lending for banks) and 36 cents out of every dollar of gross income from bank loans is earned on installment credit.

Money and credit are manufactured by the commercial banking system. For every one dollar in reserves that a commercial bank has, it can create six dollars of additional credit, which it can then loan and earn interest upon.

The availability of credit depends upon the policy of the Federal Reserve and especially the Open Market Committee. At present, there is some concern that the Federal Open Market Committee may be permitting credit to tighten and interest rates to go up. Pressure for higher interest rates on VA and FHA home mortgages is building up. Loans in many places are being sold at a discount for the first time this year. Real-estate mortgage debt and consumer credit are being watched very carefully.

The Treasury reports that interest costs on short-term government borrowing are rising. The economic picture at present is considered by the most astute observers as the most difficult to judge in many years. It is imperative that under such conditions nothing drastic should be done to upset the economic applecart.

TAX-BILL CONFUSION

Indications are that it may be necessary to have an exhaustive study of the 1954 tax revision law, in order to correct many technical defects. One of the most embarrassing errors in passing H. R. 8300 last year was that the penalties for certain narcotic violations were left out of the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The Treasury Department discovered the error and brought it to the attention of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee last October. But Congress was not in session then and there was nothing he could do about it. When Congress reconvened this January, quick action was taken to correct this error. However, for a period of 20 days—from January 1–20, 1955—there were no penalties for certain narcotic transactions.

In addition to the mistake made with respect to the omission of the narcotic violations penalties, the Treasury estimates that revenue losses from two sections would only be about $50 million turned out to be billions of dollars too small.

To date, the Treasury Department has already discovered 70 mistakes in the tax law passed last year.

In this highly technical field of tax law, Members are simply not equipped to legislate intelligently without depending upon the advice and aid of the Treasury experts and the committee staff aides. The 1954 tax law covers 1,000 pages and represented over 1,000 changes in the law. It was impossible to have given it the careful study needed in the short time that was permitted prior to its being called up for a vote.

[1,127th weekly letter, March 31, 1955]

TRICKLE-DOWNERS VERSUS DO-GOODERS

There are a group of men around the President led by Secretary Humphrey who know what they want. They are playing the game for keeps. This group belongs to the reactionary school of trickle-downers. They are willing to see the Government spend a lot and confer a great deal of privileges, provided the pouring in starts at the top. They will guarantee that it stays at the top. Then there is a school of liberal trickle-downers. They also follow the formula of providing incentives and tax relief for the well-to-do. Unlike the Humphrey group, they are willing for some of it to seep down and help the little fellows. I think it could be said that the President and his council of economic advisers belong to this latter group. However, it appears that Secretary Humphrey and the bankers in the bottleneck positions are running the show.

Opposed to any kind of trickle-down philosophy are those who want to do good for all the people. The Democratic Party has generally taken this position. We voted for the $20 per capita tax credit, because equity and justice in taxation demanded it. This relief was necessary to redress the extreme favoritism shown to the wealthy taxpayers in the 1954 tax-revision law. I voted for the measure for an additional reason. I feel we need to raise mass purchasing power. This will help the farmer get a fair price in the market for his products. It is needed to help our economy move forward. We have to provide more jobs quickly for workers who are being replaced by the new machines and for the young people who are getting out of school and expect to be able to earn their own way. Even though the tax cut was beaten by the Humphrey trickle-downers, I feel that the lesson in political philosophy will not soon be forgotten by our people.

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT ON GOVERNMENT LENDING

The RFC was organized under Mr. Hoover to carry out his version of the trickle-down theory. Under his direction, RFC bailed out banks, railroads, and insurance companies. Preferred stockholders were very grateful to Mr. Hoover for using the Government's credit to save their investments.

Later, when President Roosevelt expanded the RFC to help provide credit at reasonable interest rates for States, cities, political subdivisions, small business, etc., this did not please Mr. Hoover or his banker friends. When the Republicans temporarily took over

in 1953, they quickly abolished the RFC and handed out the most desirable RFC assets to the private banking groups. Following up the dissolution of the RFC, the trickle-downers want to abolish all the other Government lending and insuring agencies and turn the entire field of financing over to the private bankers. This is what the latest Hoover Commission report on Government lending agencies calls for. If followed out, the recommendations in this report would cripple the REA. It would place the CCC program for price support loans in the hands of the private banks at a higher cost to the farmers. The report seeks to undermine the lending and insuring activities enacted in the past 20 years in such fields as veterans' and agricultural loans, housing and small business credit. Interest rates in all these programs would be subject to the decisions of the New York bankers. In fact, this report by the Hoover Commission carries out the recommendations made 2 years ago by the New York Clearing House Association, composed of the largest New York City banks.

Although the Congress created the Hoover Commission to come up with recommendations for improving the management of the executive department and the various agencies, Mr. Hoover has used it as a vehicle to remake public policy along the lines he thinks it should be. The amount of wasted taxpayers' money on useless reports is a crime. A recent editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald commented that this latest report was just a wasteful exercise that might just as well have not been written.

MONOPOLY IN RUBBER

When the House in July 1953 voted for a bill requiring the Government's synthetic rubber plants to be disposed of in 1 year, I opposed the bill for a number of reasons, including the unknown requirements of the Korean situation. In addition, I was not assured that they would not be sacrificed to the four big companies that own and control 80 percent of the private rubber business in the country.

Recently, I sponsored a resolution before the Congress to stop the Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission's plan to sell the Government's synthetic rubber industry to a handful of rubber, oil and chemical companies. There are no safeguards to protect the public nor the small businessman against unfair and destructive practices that will likely occur, since the method of disposal of these plants creates an ironclad rubber monopoly. Under the so-called agreements in the contracts with the proposed purchasers, they are supposed to make available specified amounts of their product to small business. The truth is that this is a meaningless and unenforceable provision. No small fabricator could hold any rubber company to such an agreement, if the company refused to sell him supplies. In the House, 60 percent of the Democrats voted for my resolution, but 100 percent of the Republicans voted against it, causing its defeat. The same situation caused its defeat in the Senate.

[1,126th weekly letter, March 24, 1955]

PAY INCREASE FOR MEN IN UNIFORM

The loss of expensively trained, experienced personnel to private industry when their period of service is completed is an expensive problem confronting the military. By a vote of 399 to 1, the House of Representatives passed the bill known as the Career Incentive Act of 1955, which provides for pay raises designed to induce both enlisted men and officers to stay in the service. It costs anywhere from $3,200 for basic recruits to $275,000 for jet bomber pilots to train a single member of the Armed Forces. In 1953 and 1954 there was a total turnover of 4 million men to maintain a 3.1 million man Armed Force. This gives an idea of the size of costs involved. It is hoped that the House-approved pay raises, which the Senate is expected to pass, will help the services retain their trained experts.

LOCAL UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

I have been deeply disturbed by the high unemployment rate in Texarkana and have been trying to get the administration to do something to ease the situation. I am afraid that the executive branch agencies, who deal with the distressed unemployment area problem, have not shown sufficient vigor in their handling of this serious problem. In spite of the fact that there are 144 such distressed areas throughout the Nation, we do not have a central agency or a national policy to deal with the so-called spot unemployment problem. In the past 2 weeks I have written to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce about the situation in Texarkana. I am receiving replies from these agencies, assuring me of early consideration. I do know that this issue will get a very high priority from the Democratic leadership in both the Senate and House. The burdens of distress are not confined to the local unemployment area. Unemployment and low incomes in these areas reduce the market for goods produced elsewhere and thereby threaten employment and incomes throughout the entire economy.

REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OPPOSE INDIRECT FINANCING

A unanimous report of the Joint Congressional Committee on the President's Economic Report signed by all Republican and Democratic Members rebuked the administration for turning to indirect borrowing by so-called authorities for financing public works, such as schools, highways, hospitals, etc., instead of raising the funds by having the Treasury issue the bonds directly. The indirect way is more costly and is less efficient than having the Treasury do the borrowing directly. It also evades statutory debt limit and thereby limits or circumvents congressional authority over the purse strings. It is ironical that a movement to bypass Congress on spending should start in a Republican administration.

ATOMS FOR PEACE

Although the world is walking a very thin line between war and peace these days, plans for the peaceful use of the atom are going ahead. The first university for nuclear engineers has been opened under United States auspices. We will not only offer training to our own young scientists, but we also will help educate young people from other countries. It is all part of the President's "atoms for pease" proposal to the U. N. The conference on this proposal gets under way with public sessions at the U. N., beginning next June.

We shall be able to announce at this conference the delivery of the first commercial supply of electricity from an atomic reactor. Two large eastern utilities—Duquesne Light Co., and Consolidated Edison Co.—operating in Pennsylvania and New York, are planning to produce electric power from atomic reactors. Ten years from now, will petroleum, coal, and gas be replaced?

WHEN SECRETARY HUMPHREY MAKES A MISTAKE IT'S A "BEAUT"

One of the most colorful political figures of the 1930's was the late Fiorello H. La Guardia. He started out as a Republican Congressman and later became mayor of New York City. An official, who had been appointed by Mayor La Guardia, became involved in some wrongdoing. The mayor, who was an outspoken critic of political backsliders, said when asked about this appointee: "When I make a mistake, it's a beaut."

It seems that the same thing might be said about some of the fiscal mistakes that our Secretary of the Treasury has been making. The first big mistake he made shortly after coming to Washington involved a billion-dollar issue of 3¼ percent, 30-year bonds. Everyone agrees that the "Humphreys," as these bonds have come to be known, carried much too high an interest rate. Taxpayers will be paying for this "beaut" for 30 years.

Now it appears that the Secretary of the Treasury was caught napping in connection with an important provision of last year's revision of the Internal Revenue Code. This permits business firms to set aside reserves against future expenses and charge it off against the current year's income tax bill. Unless repealed, this provision will cost the Treasury at least $1 billion. It is suspected that there are about 75 hidden sleepers in the tax bill. This one is the biggest windfall and is jokingly called "Humphrey's Blooper" by the Members. The Secretary has already asked the House Ways and Means Committee to eliminate this provision from the tax law. Thus, the Secretary of the Treasury, who has called Members of the Senate "silly" and Members of the House "fiscally irresponsible," has committed two of the biggest fiscal "beauts" in recent Treasury history.

[1,125th weekly letter, March 17, 1955]

AUTOMATION

Automation is a term that you will hear a great deal about in coming months. It is a word that has been coined to describe the introduction of automatic machinery on a grand scale. In theory, technological progress should raise the standard of life for everyone and increase security of employment. This is true when workers and farmers benefit from the fruits of technological progress by no longer having to toil as excessively, and, at the same time, equitably sharing in the increased income that reduced production costs make possible. If farmers and city workers do not equitably share in the distribution of the income gains from the growth of automation, they will not be able to provide a market for greatly increased consumption of all types of products, which the new technological developments could make available for higher standards of living. If job opportunities are held back by recurring recessions due to deficiencies in purchasing power and a failure to promote economic expansion, then automation will merely add to the unemployed, as it displaces workers by reducing labor requirements. This must not be allowed to happen. I believe this problem is so important that Congress should try to see whether it can, through adequate study and hearings, develop a national policy that will insure that the potential benefit of automation to the American standard of living will be fully realized and equitably shared.

FINANCING ROADS

Fiscal experts are not happy about the proposal to set up special financing bodies to issue bonds and earmark taxes to pay for the roadbuilding program. Too much of our national debt is being hidden out of view of the people. It is also costing many times more in interest to finance projects outside the public debt. One disadvantage in the present proposal for roads is that it sets up an unrealistic and inflexible priority for roadbuilding. About 55 cents of every dollar borrowed to finance the interstate highway construction program would be matched by 55 cents in total interest payments, under the Clay proposal.

I wonder why the President doesn't consider raising funds for roadbuilding when, as and if needed, by issuing non-interest-bearing bonds to the Federal Reserve banks. These bonds can be retired whenever there is a surplus and economic conditions warrant a retirement of part of our debt. Billions of dollars in interest will be saved this way.

The money could be used for help to the unemployed or to make up for some of the gap in schools.

DEFICIT IN TAXES VERSUS DEFICIT IN JOBS

The administration is more concerned about a possible deficit in tax collections than they seem to be about the family deficit that results from unemployment. The proposed $20 tax credit per dependent, which the administration is fighting so hard, would not only correct an injustice to the lower income groups who received less than 25 cents of every dollar of tax saving voted last year, but it would help reduce unemployment. Today, there are 144 so-called distressed unemployment areas throughout the country. Texarkana is one of the serious unemployment areas. Not only does the administration not have a national policy for helping these areas, but they oppose tax relief that will lighten the burden of those families whose incomes have been cut because of the depressed conditions in the distressed areas. Since January 1953, the number of jobs in nonfarm establishments has declined by one million. This deficit in jobs has not received as much attention by the administration as the tax and budget deficit, although it is much more important, because there is an unbalanced family budget for everyone of those missing jobs.

THE FARMER UNDER EISENHOWER

Prices received: Prices by farmers for their production have declined each year since the Eisenhower administration assumed office. The decline from January 1953 to January 1954, was 3.3 percent. The decline from January 1954, to January 1955, was much larger, the drop amounting to 5.4 percent.

Realized net-farm income: Farmers' realized net income totaled $12 billion in 1954. This was about $3 billion below the amount farmers could have realized under full employment conditions. It was 10 percent less than farmers actually realized in 1953. It was 15.5 percent below 1952.

Farmers retained only a little over one-third (35 percent) of their gross farm income in 1954, as farm production costs stayed high. Farm property taxes and farm mortgage interest charges accounted for the high level of costs, as they continued to rise while other items of expense dropped a bit. The percentage of gross farm income retained after expenses was the lowest in 22 years.

Farm purchasing power: In 1954, the purchasing power of farmers' realized net income fell by 11 percent from 1953, and was lower than in any previous year since 1940. According to the administration, 1954 was the year of the honest dollar. For the farmer, it was the year of the vanishing dollar.

The farmers' share of national income is now at a postwar low.

[1,124th weekly letter, March 10, 1955]

DEMOCRATS WILL FULFILL TAX-RELIEF PLEDGE

Secretary Humphrey of the Treasury has acknowledged that 75 cents out of every dollar of the $7.4 billion of tax relief voted last year went to big business or individuals earning $5,000 and over. Our party vainly fought for tax relief for the little fellow. In the campaign last fall, we pledged to enact such relief. The action of the House, attaching to the President's tax proposal a $20 per capita tax credit, represents a redemption of the 1954 tax-relief pledge. I feel sure that this tax relief will help to increase the buying power of the lower-income families and thereby increase the demand for goods. This will mean more investment and more jobs will be needed.

GOVERNMENT BONDS DOWN

The prices of Government bonds are going up and down daily because of the crap-shooting that is allowed by the Federal Reserve System. It is very profitable to the larger banks, particularly the New York banks, but such speculation in the Government bond market is harmful to the people and should be stopped, at least to the extent that Government bonds should not be allowed to sink below par. Then any speculation would be above par and it would not be so harmful to the people.

SCHOOL CRISIS

In 1954, we had a record crop of 4 million new babies. It is only a short time until the age when they will be entering nursery and kindergarten. Our schools are already in a critical state. We need many more classrooms and we need them soon. The President's school-financing proposal has been sharply criticized as inadequate to meet the schoolroom shortage. It bears more of the earmarks of concern for sound finance and more long-term, tax-exempt debt paper than for sound education.

ANOTHER INTERNATIONAL RFC?

One proposal made by the President is bound to get a cold reception by Members, who feel we already have too big an international RFC. This is the recommendation that Congress authorize at the proper time a contribution by the United States to the capital of the proposed International Finance Corporation. We already have the Export-Import Bank of Washington, with capital and full authority to do the same job the proposed agency would presumably be doing. I am personally viewing more critically than ever before expenditures abroad by our country. We have many fine projects involving water and soil conservation and flood control that should have priority over foreign aid.

ROAD TO FASCISM

I wonder if we have not been led, unknowingly, down the path to a fork where some Fascist clique could push us off the main highway of democratic government. The other day at the Washington University in St. Louis, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court delivered an address on the Blessings of Liberty. He called the erosion of our traditional liberties a greater threat than the danger of direct attack by an enemy from abroad or willful subversion from within. Our fundamental liberties are embraced in the Constitution and reinforced by the Bill of Rights. In Germany and Italy, people were taught to hate and fear socialism and communism to such an extent that first they gave up some of their fundamental constitutional freedoms and then accepted fascism when it was presented to them as an alternative. When we approve of dictatorship techniques by people, who say they are defending our freedoms, we are undermining our free democracy and opening the way for some Fascist group to present the full-fledged Fascist alternative.

CONGRESS AND THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Some Members feel the Hoover Commission is encroaching on the Congress. When it was originally set up, the Commission was supposed to suggest ways and means, whereby the efficiency and cost of running the Government could be improved to the benefit of all. Thus far, the Hoover Commission has been conspicuously marked by its apparent failure, insofar as achieving substantial savings are concerned. But it has gone beyond its original purpose and is now in the policy-recommending business. The Hoover Commission is armed with vast powers. It has the subpena power and can hold public hearings. It has changed from its original bipartisan nature to a body that employs former Members of Congress, whose views on policy have been contrary to those held by their former constituents. It has a well-organized national lobby that operates at the local level. Members, who encountered this lobby during the recent election, were not happy about the pressure it exerted. Most important of all, some Members feel that the Hoover group is doing work that is properly the work of Congress; and the feeling is that continued delegations of congressional responsibility may reduce the Congress to a rubber-stamp body.

THE CASE OF CORPORAL KULICH—IS THIS AMERICAN JUSTICE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, as an American citizen, I always have believed—proudly—that justice is one of the greatest benefits of our form of government.

But an uneasy conviction has been growing upon me that our proud system of American justice is being undermined, corroded and taken away by our Federal security system.

I have read published accounts of cases in which an individual's reputation and even his chances of earning a livelihood have been destroyed by vague charges, implying disloyalty, based on what often appears to be the most tenuous evidence, charges which lead to dismissal from Government service under the cloud of being a security risk. As a Congressman, I have received a number of letters from individuals pleading for my help in piercing the dread walls of silence which envelop security proceedings.

The reports I have received have disturbed me greatly for a long time now. But a case in my own State of Washington, just brought to my attention through an appeal for aid, so reeks with injustice that I am moved to inform my colleagues in the House about it.

The appeal is from a reputable attorney of Aberdeen, Wash., Mr. Paul O. Manley, who enclosed a copy of a letter which he had written to President Eisenhower, asking justice for a young man of Aberdeen.

The young man, Walter William Kulich, served 2 years in the Army and was a corporal when he received his honorable discharge a couple of months ago, after which he became a member of the Army Reserve.

Suddenly, out of the blue, he has been advised officially that the Army now possesses charges that his father is a Communist. The youth is bewildered by this charge, knows of nothing to support it, and has his father's word that it is not true.

Yet this young man is given these incredible alternative courses of action:

First. He may appear before a field board of the Army and—in effect—prove his father's innocence of the accusations.

Second. He may agree to an undesirable discharge.

Is this American justice?

I should like to ask: Since when does an American citizen have to prove his innocence? I had thought it was up to the accuser to prove guilt.

I should like to ask: Since when do we condemn a man because of what his father or any other relative or any other person has done? I had thought that in our free land guilt was individual and innocence was individual, and that we did not punish a man or tarnish his

reputation because of what an ancestor might have said or done.

I should like to ask: Since when do we convict a man without advising him of the basis of the accusation? I had thought that our Constitution guaranteed to every person the right to be informed of the nature and the cause of the accusation and to be confronted with the witnesses against him.

I should like to call for a thoroughgoing investigation, not only of this individual case but of the security system which made this case possible. I think such an investigation should be made by the executive branch, but I think it also should be made by the Congress.

I hope that such an investigation will be demanded by the American people.

So that the full story may be known, I am going to read Mr. Manley's letter to the President into the RECORD. I am sure others will be outraged, as I was, by this account.

APRIL 14, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is written to call your attention to a great injustice being done a boy who is now a member of the United States Army Reserve. His name is Walter William Kulich and his residence is Aberdeen, Wash. He was inducted into the United States Army at Fort Lewis, Wash., on January 6, 1953, and received his certificate of honorable separation from the active service on January 6, 1955. He served in the 271st Engineer Battalion, Combat, at Fort Lewis, Wash., and his Army service number is US56123130. He is 22 years of age.

I have a photostatic copy of his separation certificate before me. Its character is listed as honorable and there is nothing therein to indicate that his active service was anything but satisfactory. He attained the grade of corporal prior to being released from active service and transferred to the Army Reserve.

The month following his transfer to the Army Reserve, he received a letter from the Commanding General, 6th Army, through official channels. The basic letter was dated January 20, 1955, and was forwarded from headquarters, Washington Military District, Fort Lawton, Wash., on February 8, 1955. The letter advised him that allegations were on file in the Department of the Army that his father is listed as a Communist Party member and leader, has associated with known Communist Party Members and has attended Communist Party meetings and has affiliated with the Communist Party and is alleged to have received money from Communist sources used to defray the expense of trips made to the United Nations in New York. The letter further stated that under the provisions of special regulations 600-220-1, subject, military personnel security program, dated June 18, 1954, the boy was required to elect in writing to the chief of his military district, one or more of the following choices:

(a) Submit a request within 5 days for a personal appearance hearing before a field board with or without counsel, the appearance to be at his own expense.

(b) In lieu of such appearance to submit a letter of rebuttal together with supporting documents within 15 days of receipt of this letter. However, he was warned that in case he did not elect the personal appearance hearing, subsequent action could result in his separation from the service under other than honorable conditions.

(c) That he could request discharge and agree to accept an undesirable discharge. A mimeographed sample form of consent to accept an undesirable discharge was enclosed for his convenience.

Corporal Kulich consulted me on receipt of these letters and I prepared a letter for him to sign and send to the Washington Military District Headquarters on February 10, 1955. In this letter, Corporal Kulich denied the allegations concerning his father and demanded a personal appearance before a field board for a hearing. Inasmuch as he had no information concerning the dates, places, or other particulars concerning his father's alleged Communist activities, he demanded this information and the names of the witnesses who made the allegations so that he would be in a position to rebut them. This letter was mailed on February 10, 1955, and no answer has yet been received. Several weeks ago, he received a letter from an officer at Fort Lewis, Wash., who stated that he had been assigned to represent Corporal Kulich in connection with the proposed hearing. At my suggestion, Corporal Kulich made the trip to Fort Lewis and conferred with the officer. He was informed that no particulars or names of witnesses could be obtained from the Army and that the only possible procedure would be for him to attend the hearing armed only with character witnesses who had known his father for some time and who could testify that he had never been a Communist. He was informed that it was not up to the Army to prove his father's guilt, but that he, the boy, must prove his father innocent. All this, without knowing any of the particulars of the misconduct with which his father was charged.

Just as an honorable discharge is a certificate of merit, proudly carried by millions of American veterans, an undesirable discharge or one other than honorable is a smear and a mark of shame on the man receiving it. If one holding such a discharge seeks political office, it is a potent weapon in the hands of his opponents. In his efforts to seek profitable employment, it is an almost insurmountable obstacle. It bars him from veterans' benefits and even disqualifies him from membership in the great veterans' organizations. To force a boy to take such a discharge after 2 years of loyal service without a mark on his service record is certainly a cruel injustice. If it is desired to discharge him from the Army for matters which are no fault of his own, the least that common decency would require would be to give him the type of discharge that his own conduct would entitle him to.

I have agreed to represent this young man at any hearing that may be called. However, I feel that any hearing based on the premise that a son can be punished for his father's alleged misconduct and on the theory that it is up to the son to prove his father's innocence rather than for the prosecuting authorities to prove his guilt cannot be relied upon to reach an equitable result. I have not yet been able to procure a copy of the regulations upon which these proceedings are based, but I assume that the Commanding General of the Sixth Army would not be proceeding in this fashion unless there are regulations sustaining his procedure. If there are such regulations, I insist that they are vicious and unfair and are calculated to cause great and irreparable harm to young men who are innocent of any wrongdoing and who are not in any position to threaten the security of the United States. I am calling this to your attention not only for the benefit of Corporal Kulich but to help other young soldiers who are in the same position. Corporal Kulich has a brother, aged 19, who will soon be inducted into the Armed Forces. Unless something is done to remedy the existing regulations, he will be exposed to the same type of undemocratic and unfair treatment as Corporal Kulich is now undergoing.

Corporal Kulich tells me that he believes the allegations concerning his father are false. I have talked to the father and he denies them in toto. No charges have been filed against the father by way of criminal proceedings or otherwise. In view of the fact that we have stringent laws concerning individuals engaging in subversive activities, it seems almost incredible that the authorities are concentrating their energy in efforts to smear the son with an undesirable discharge rather than to attempt to substantiate their charges against the father. In this connection, it is interesting to note that were the father to be charged in a criminal proceeding with subversive activities, he would be entitled under the Constitution to all of the safeguards of the Bill of Rights, including the right to meet his accusers face to face and to be furnished with the particulars of his alleged offenses.

Before writing this letter to you, I have discussed the case with a number of representative people, many of them veterans of the United States armed services. Without exception these people have vigorously condemned any method whereby a boy can be punished for the supposed sins of his father and without even the semblance of a trial after having been apprised of the exact charges against the father. I feel that the only way that the system can be cleaned up is from the top, and I am writing you in your capacity as Commander in Chief. I am also sending copies of this letter, with requests for cooperation, to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the Secretary of Defense, and two United States Senators from the State of Washington, the Congressman at Large from the State of Washington, and the Congressman from the Third Washington Congressional District in which this boy makes his home.

I respectfully urge you to use the powers of your great office to protect the rights of this young soldier and to see to it that necessary reforms are made in the system which has made his present predicament possible.

Yours very respectfully,

PAUL O. MANLEY.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to my colleague from the State of Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I had a similar letter from Mr. Manley, the Aberdeen attorney, on this subject. Mr. Manley is a Republican, a former prosecuting attorney of Grays Harbor County. He is a very reliable man and is regarded as one of the best members of the legal profession in the community. I think the statements he makes concerning this boy must have a great deal of truth in them. Mr. Manley is not the kind of attorney who makes unsubstantiated charges. I agree completely with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that a thorough investigation of this case should be made. Immediately upon receipt of Mr. Manley's letter, which has been read here, I contacted the Defense Establishment, Mr. Wilson's office, and asked for an immediate investigation. I have not had a reply other than that they would investigate the matter up to this time. That request was filed Saturday with the Defense Establishment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very happy to have this comment from my colleague from the State of Washington, who represents the Third Congressional District in the State of Washington in which Corporal Kulich resides.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. After listening to this case, and I have heard of others like it, is this not an attainder which is being put on this boy because of his father's sins? Is it not an attainder where a person is prosecuted—or persecuted is the proper word in this case—for the sins of another?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it is in the nature of a bill of attainder where one person is punished for the sins of another.

Mr. MILLER of California. If I read my history rightly, one of the things that we founded this country for, one of the things that Jefferson stood for and one of the great contributions that he made to this country was wiping out bills of attainder.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, and let us not forget the immortal words of the preamble to the Constitution:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Note that the establishment of justice is given a high priority in this declaration of the purposes of our Constitution.

I hesitate to think what Jefferson and the other framers of that great document would have thought of the case of Corporal Kulich.

I know they would have denounced it as violating in every way the avowed purpose of the Constitution to establish justice.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not think the gentleman from California should use the words "sins of the father" because, so far, this is just an allegation against the father.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am very happy to accept the correction. In this case, it is an attempt, however, to punish the boy for the alleged sins of his father.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct, and they are further, according to the attorney's letter, trying to require that the boy prove his father is not a Communist rather than that the Federal Government prove that the father is a Communist.

Mr. MILLER of California. I know that the gentleman who has the floor, and the other distinguished gentleman, from Washington, hate communism in all its implications as much as any of us, but if things like this just do not play into the hands of the Communists, I would like to know what does. This is the kind of thing that they can go to Bandung and other places with and make the argument that our democracy is a farce and a fraud. I congratulate the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for calling it to the attention of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I certainly think the gentleman is doing a service when he calls the Members' attention to this particular case. I think it all comes down to a matter of guilt by association even if the association happens to be one's father, even if there is not any guilt. The gentleman may have heard of another case in the State of Washington, in my particular district, where there is an employee of the General Services Administration who was suspended without pay 90 days ago because his brother-in-law, an alleged Communist, moved into his home. It seems to me that if gentlemen, like the gentleman from Washington, will interest themselves in cases like this, that we will finally bring about a system where the innocent are protected and will not be held guilty because of an association.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. MACK and Mr. PELLY] and also the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for their comments.

I might comment at this point that one of the most disturbing things about the case of Corporal Kulich, which I am now discussing—perhaps even more disturbing than the fact that an attempt will be made to punish him for something which authorities believe his father did—even more disturbing are the terms under which he must defend that charge. It has been pointed out by his appointed Army counsel that it will not be up to the Army to establish the truth of the charges; that the Army will decline to furnish the details of the basis of the charge or the names of the persons responsible for the accusation. I think we can all appreciate that a boy going before a field board hearing under those conditions, however able his counsel may be, is going to have a very small chance of coming out on top.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the old soldier in the White House will take a personal interest in the young soldier whose unhappy plight I have outlined here today.

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, some 9,000 school administrators attended the recent regional convention in Cleveland, Ohio, of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association.

At this meeting the United States Office of Education was charged with being overrun with partisan politics. The New York Times of April 2, 1955, reported that Dr. Jordan L. Larsen, president of the American Association of School Administrators, declared that there was evidence of greater political domination in the Office of Education now than ever before.

This domination is the most unfortunate thing that we have in this country today—

Dr. Larsen said, and continued:

We can no longer rely upon the accuracy or the impartiality of the statistics that we get from the Education Office. Many of us in education no longer have confidence in the education department.

The following resolution was adopted at the convention:

We reaffirm our position that education should remain free from the controls of partisan politics. We view with concern indications of continuing partisan domination of the United States Office of Education. Such domination conflicts directly with American tradition which for more than a century has been consistently separating education from political influences. We therefore urge the Congress to establish the United States Office of Education as an independent agency.

The Office should be under the general control of a national board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms. Such a board should have the authority to appoint the Commissioner of Education who would serve as the board's executive officer. This is in accord with the best tradition of American education as it has developed at both the State and local levels of government.

We pledge our continued support and cooperation to the Commissioner of Education.

I include here news articles from the New York Times and the Cleveland Plain Dealer, dated April 2, 1955, on this great regional convention of school administrators; as well as the text of a letter I have received from the National Education Association giving the resolutions adopted by the NEA and the National Council of Chief State School Officers calling for the establishment of an independent national board and/or office of education in the Federal Government.

Also included is an extremely interesting letter which I have received from Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, setting forth in detail the history of the effort of American educators, educational organizations, and those interested in advancing education in general to establish such an independent office of education.

Dr. Fuller pointed out in an article which appeared in The Nation's Schools in November 1949 entitled a "National Board Would Be the Best Type of Protection Against Federal Control," that—

Federal organization for education has long been notoriously inadequate. Most school people have at one time or another supposed that a Federal Department of Education would be an improvement. In recent years, however, large numbers have become convinced that a cabinet post is neither necessary or desirable. They believe it would put education into partisan politics and probably would lead to a larger Federal educational establishment than we want.

Dr. Fuller goes on to say, in support of an independent Office of Education:

Under a national board, the sober judgment of a group of laymen would be brought

to bear on education programs proposed in the Office of Education. Under such a nonpartisan board of laymen, looking to its professional executive officer to suggest programs for evaluation, amendment and approval, such controls would not exist.

A national board would make educational policies only in the sense that it would approve or disapprove the programs of the Office of Education. The purpose, scope, and content of these programs would be more clearly defined, and the Office would be more efficient professionally than it can be while under the control of political officers. Such efficiency should be recognized by everyone as desirable and is itself insurance against extension of the special aids and splintered educational controls now exercised by noneducational Federal agencies.

The national board would, of course, have no jurisdiction to determine State or local curriculum or other educational policies in any way. The functions of the Office of Education would remain exactly as now defined in the statutes, but they could be performed more economically and effectively.

American experience proves that public education is best governed in local school districts by the lay board of education operating with the professional administrator as its executive officer. Over a period of years, the same pattern has been more successful in the States than has any other, and the trend is clearly toward its increased use. Local boards have not abused their extensive delegated powers. State boards also have exercised their powers appropriately, without abuse of the broad authority which results naturally from the constitutional concept that the government of education is a State function. A national board of laymen, serving without pay and meeting perhaps 6 or 8 days a year, is surely more to be trusted than political officials to guide professional operation of the Federal educational programs within the limited scope of the Federal educational authority.

This excellent article by Dr. Fuller is included here in its entirety, because of its informational value.

With the broad support for an independent Office of Education in mind, I have developed and am introducing today a bill to provide for the establishment of such an office in the Federal Government which will be nonpartisan and free of political control and domination.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 6, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We are enclosing copies of resolutions by educational organizations supporting the establishment of an independent national board and/or office of education.

1. National Education Association (1954 platform, sec. IV)—National Board of Education: "The development of education, whether at the local, State, or National level, should be placed above all temporary and partisan political issues and provided with appropriate administrative arrangements to safeguard the integrity of the educational process. The association urges Congress to create a National Board of Education as an independent agency to administer the United States Office of Education. The members of the national board should be appointed for long overlapping terms by the President with the consent of the Senate.

"The association further recommends that the national board should select a professionally qualified commissioner of education, responsible to the board for the conduct of his office and the performance of his duties, to serve as its executive officer."

2. American Association of School Administrators (1955 resolutions, No. 15)—United States Office of Education: "We reaffirm our position that education should remain free from the controls of partisan politics. We view with concern indications of continuing partisan domination of the United States Office of Education. Such domination conflicts directly with American tradition which for more than a century has been consistently separating education from political influences. We, therefore, urge the Congress to establish the United States Office of Education as an independent agency.

"The office should be under the general control of a national board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms. Such a board should have the authority to appoint the Commissioner of Education who would serve as the board's executive officer. This is in accord with the best tradition of American education as it has developed at both the State and local levels of government.

"We pledge our continued support and cooperation to the Commissioner of Education."

3. Council of Chief State School Officers (continuing resolution):

"The safety and security of our Nation, as well as the perpetuation of the American way of life, is dependent upon the education of the young people in our schools and colleges. Public schools and colleges enroll one-fifth of our entire population and expend billions of dollars annually. The continued development of this system of education is dependent upon lay and professional leadership that will be helpful in improving the work in our schools and colleges. The traditional pattern of such leadership is to place public education under the control of nonpartisan lay local and State boards of education that are responsible for the planning and improvement of public education and the employment of competent professional personnel.

"In harmony with these principles, the National Council of Chief State School Officers believes that the Federal responsibility for education should be discharged through a national board of education composed of laymen. This board should be appointed on a nonpartisan basis for long overlapping terms by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate. It should be empowered to select a qualified professional educator as the United States Commissioner of Education to serve as the executive officer of the board and to be responsible to the board for organizing and directing the staff.

"A national board of education has been recommended by such other organizations as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National School Boards Association, the American Association of University Women, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National Education Association of the United States.

"The National Council of Chief State School Officers hereby authorizes a committee appointed by the president of the council to proceed to implement this resolution."

We would also at this time like to express NEA's appreciation of your attendance at the House Education and Labor Committee hearings on school construction, and your interest in the testimony being presented. We are sure you will join other members of the committee in working to report out a good school-construction bill as soon as practicable.

Cordially yours,
J. L. MCCASKILL,
Director, Division of Legislation and Federal Relations.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Conversations with members of your staff have led me to look back to the history of the issue concerning the establishment of an independent agency for education in the Federal Government, with particular attention to the support given to this idea by citizens and education groups through the years.

The first matter of record is a resolution of the National Council of Chief State School Officers at its annual meeting in Chattanooga, Tenn., on February 7–10, 1936, in which a separate and distinct agency was urged. The earliest definitive statement of the proposed structure itself is found in NEA Research Bulletin, volume 22, No. 2, April 1944, page 78. Here is the statement:

"Make the United States Office of Education an independent Federal agency under the general direction and control of a national lay board of education. Have this national board of education appointed by the President, with approval by the Senate, in such a way as to secure a high level of competence and minimize the danger of partisan political influence in the Office of Education activities. Authorize the national board to appoint the United States Commissioner of Education and let it determine, within the framework of Federal law, the basic policies and plans which the Commissioner is to administer as head of the Office of Education."

The Chief State School Officers reaffirmed their 1936 position through the years and decided to frame legislation and have it introduced in 1946. This was done through Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, in 1947, and such legislation has been pending in the Congress ever since. The Chief State School Officers have reconsidered it from time to time and have made changes from one Congress to another, but the basic idea has remained the same.

Resolutions supporting an independent agency for education in the Federal Government have been passed by the National Education Association, by the Educational Policies Commission, by the American Association of School Administrators, by the County and Rural Area School Superintendents, by the Hoover Commission's Task Force Report on Functions and Activities of the National Government, by the National School Boards Association, the American Association of University Women, and others.

It is highly significant that although the campaign to include education in a Department of Health, Education, and Wefare has been conducted by both major political parties, that such organizations as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Education Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the County and Rural Areas School Superintendents and the National School Boards Association have never altered their resolutions favoring an independent agency for education.

Educators assisted in the defeat of the Hoover Commission Plan No. 1 in 1949, the Hoover Commission Plan No. 27 in 1950, both of which sought to place education in a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Upon the change of administrations in 1953, a compromise was made by President Eisenhower with the American Medical Association whereby a special assistant was promised to be be assigned to the staff of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. After the American Medical Association had agreed to the new Department on behalf of the health services, educators continued to argue the case. They were finally overruled in conferences in February 1953 and were

offered a National Advisory Committee on Education. This committee has never been established, and the 84th Congress has refused funds for it.

This background makes it perfectly clear that educators generally and citizens most closely connected with education favor an independent agency for education in the Federal Government. The bill which you propose, therefore, is timely and appropriate. I am attaching a few comments on its details on a separate page but they should not be read as critical of the general idea in any respect. For your initiative in introducing the bill we congratulate you and offer our complete support in achieving an independent agency for education in the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR FULLER,
Executive Secretary.

NATIONAL BOARD WOULD BE THE BEST TYPE OF PROTECTION AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROL

(By Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers)

Federal organization for education has long been notoriously inadequate. Most school people have at one time or another supposed that a Federal Department of Education would be an improvement. In recent years, however, large numbers have become convinced that a Cabinet post is neither necessary nor desirable. They believe it would put education into partisan politics and probably would lead to a larger Federal educational establishment than we want.

The recent defeat of Reorganization Plan No. 1 by a Senate vote of 60 to 32 narrowly saved the United States Office of Education from absorption into a completely centralized Department of Welfare. Education was the incidental beneficiary of the influence of the medical and dental professions, which had other reasons for wanting to defeat plan No. 1. The place of education in the Federal Government was not seriously considered.

An amended plan No. 1 probably will be presented to Congress in January 1950. The medical and dental professions will have been appeased. Educators must decide whether they will stand quietly by while education becomes an integral part of welfare in the organization of the Federal Government. If it should, we may get similar organization in the States in the near future, and eventually in local schools districts.

AFFIRMATIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

The directors of the National Council of Chief State School Officers have voted that the Federal structure for education is regarded by them as a most crucial issue during the months immediately ahead. They have asked the President to preserve the present autonomy of the United States Office of Education in any new reorganization plan to be submitted to Congress. They will exert every effort to induce Congress to defeat any plan that does not leave at least the existing degree of professional independence in the Federal education agency.

Since the place of the Office of Education in the Federal Government has been made an issue, the time has come for the profession to express itself. Opposition to absorption by welfare is not enough. Neither is maintenance of an unsatisfactory status quo. An affirmative program is necessary to prevent such a development.

General opinion favors a National Board of Education, composed of laymen appointed by the President on a nonpartisan basis.[1]

Senate bill 656, introduced by Senator MORSE at the request of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, provides for 11 members appointed for overlapping terms of 11 years and subject to confirmation by the Senate. The measure deserves the full support of the profession.

A national board of this type would be the best possible protection against Federal control of education. Without such an advisory body, the decisions are now made by political officers who are not professional educators. As it is now, the United States Commissioner of Education may or may not be consulted, and if he is consulted his advice may or may not be heeded. Budgets and programs of the Office of Education are made uncertain by official redtape. The most important policies may be decided for other than educational reasons. Even the Commissioner may never know what the real reasons are, or which officials in the overhead line of authority really made them. Professional frustration is the rule rather than the exception under such conditions. A national board would eliminate this type of bureaucratic control.

Let me illustrate specifically. Whether compulsory health insurance is desirable or not, it is clear that the Office of Education should not campaign for it.[2] Had Reorganization Plan No. 1 succeeded, the Office of Education program could have included education for compulsory health insurance because of direct orders from high political officers or through their use of subtler methods.

In the present situation, the Federal Security Administrator can exercise his authority of direction and supervision in similar ways, with only the slight protection of the specific statutory assignments of functions to the Office of Education and the tradition of partial independence in professional matters as limiting factors. These are inadequate protections against controls by crusading officials with superior authority.

Under a national board, the sober judgment of a group of laymen would be brought to bear on education programs proposed in the Office of Education. Under such a nonpartisan board of laymen, looking to its professional executive officer to suggest programs for evaluation, amendment and approval, such controls would not exist.

NO OTHER JURISDICTION

A national board would make educational policies only in the sense that it would approve or disapprove the programs of the Office of Education. The purpose, scope, and content of these programs would be more clearly defined, and the Office would be more efficient professionally than it can be while under the control of political officers. Such efficiency should be recognized by everyone as desirable and is itself insurance against extension of the special aids and splintered educational controls now exericsed by noneducational Federal agencies.

The national board would, of course, have no jurisdiction to determine State or local curriculum or other educational policies in any way. The functions of the Office of Education would remain exactly as now defined in the statutes, but they could be performed more economically and effectively.

American experience proves that public education is best governed in local school districts by the lay board of education operating with the professional administrator as its executive officer. Over a period of years, the same pattern has been more successful in the States than has any other, and the trend is clearly toward its increased use. Local boards have not abused their extensive delegated powers. State boards also have exercised their powers appropriately, without abuse of the broad authority which results naturally from the constitutional concept that the government of education is a State function. A national board of laymen, serving without pay and meeting perhaps six or eight days a year, is surely more to be trusted than political officials to guide professional operation of the Federal educational programs within the limited scope of the Federal educational authority.

The individual members of the board would have only vague and broadly defined responsibilities to the President as presidential appointees. The board itself would be responsible to the President in the sense that it would deal with the Bureau of the Budget through its executive officer, the commissioner of education. Practically, this means that the commissioner would first present the Office of Education budget to the board. The board would officially adopt it, typically with amendments. The commissioner would next present it directly to the Bureau of the Budget, acting in behalf of the board.

We could be certain no political officer had told him what to say. The commissioner, rather than a hierarchy of noneducational political officers, would state the case for education. As the executive officer of the board he would speak similarly for education in presenting to congressional committees the legislative programs approved by the board. Both the board and its executive officer, obviously, would be subject to Congress in the field of educational policies and to all the limitations imposed by the Bureau of the Budget and Congress in respect to appropriations.

Congress will, no doubt, leave statutory responsibilities for certain Federal educational programs in the education agency of the Federal Government. For instance, it probably would hold the national board responsible for the Federal aspects of administration of vocational education and for the collection and dissemination of statistical information concerning education.

Congress might also assign new responsibilities to the board, such as the Federal aspects of administration of the school-lunch program or the Federal administration of funds granted to the States to be used by them for current school costs or construction.

Consider the history of the United States Office of Education since it was established in 1867. Consider our experience with special Federal educational programs administered and controlled all the way to the pupil by noneducational Federal agencies. Do we know any better or safer way to do these things than the lay board and professional executive system which works best in local and State educational governments?

FEDERAL ORGANIZATION FOR EDUCATION UNDER S. 656, A BILL BY SENATOR WAYNE B. MORSE SPONSORED BE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

The President appoints 11 members of the national board of education for overlapping 11-year terms, subject to confirmation by the Senate, and routes to Congress the fiscal recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget for the United States Office of Education.

Congress, after receiving the executive budget and holding hearings of its own, ap-

---

[1] Part III, Federal Policy and Organization for Education, pp. 277–378, a section of Task Force Report on Public Welfare (appendix P): Functions and Activities of the National Government in the Field of Welfare, a report with recommendations prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government by the Brookings Institution, January 1949. On sale by U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., $1.25. In the report Dr. Hollis P. Allen explains why he recommends a National Board of Education, just as the National Council of Chief State School Officers, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association, and numerous other organizations recommend such a board.

[2] There is no implication that it has; the illustration is entirely hypothetical.

propriates funds to the Board for operation of the United States Office of Education. The Senate confirms appointments to the Board.

The Bureau of the Budget receives budget estimates from the Board, holds hearings and recommends to Congress a budget for the operation of the United States Office of Education.

The National Board of Education (1) exercises general control and supervision of the policies and program of the United States Office of Education, acting through the Commissioner of Education, who is its executive officer; (2) appoints the Commissioner of Education, and (3) appoints other professional personnel on nomination of the Commissioner of Education.

The Commissioner of Education serves as executive officer of the Board and administrative head of the United States Office of Education.

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

EDUCATION OFFICE CALLED POLITICAL—TWO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS CHARGE SECRETARY HOBBY JUGGLES BUILDING NEEDS—SEPARATE UNIT IS URGED—MOUNT VERNON SUPERINTENDENT SAYS COMMISSIONER "CAN'T CALL HIS SOUL HIS OWN"

(By Benjamin Fine)

CLEVELAND, April 1.—The United States Office of Education is overrun with partisan politics, two top school officials charged today.

They declared that the Commissioner, Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, was nothing but a figurehead who "can't call his soul his own." They accused Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of conveniently juggling school building figures for political purposes.

The charges were made by Dr. Jordan L. Larsen, president, and Dr. Worth McClure of the American Association of School Administrators. The association, a department of the National Education Association, opens its regional convention tomorrow when 9,000 school executives are scheduled to arrive here.

Dr. Larsen, who is superintendent of schools at Mount Vernon, N. Y., denounced the political interference he said had just about destroyed the effectiveness of the Education Office in Washington.

CRITICS FRAME RESOLUTION

A resolution will be presented to the delegates dealing with the need for independent education departments.

"We view with concern indications of continuing partisan domination of the United States Office of Education," the resolution reads. "Such domination conflicts directly with American tradition which for more than a century has been consistently separating education from political influences. We therefore urge Congress to establish the United States Office of Education as an independent agency."

The educators were particularly disturbed by the statement of Mrs. Hobby that by 1959–60 the classroom shortage would be 176,000 instead of an estimated 407,000. This figure was challenged by both Dr. Larsen and Dr. McClure.

"Not long ago the United States Education Office announced, after a thorough study," Dr. Larsen said, "that 720,000 classrooms would be needed—350,000 to eliminate obsolete buildings and 370,000 to take care of new enrollments. Later that figure was cut to 600,000 and then still later to 407,000, and now it is down to 176,000.

"This is surely an amazing way to solve our school crisis. If we give Mrs. Hobby a couple more weeks, we may even have a surplus of classrooms."

Dr. Larsen suggested that the Secretary might learn more about the facts of life. He said those in the field who know the educational problems did not have her wishful thinking or her ability to rationalize. He estimated that at least 3,500,000 school children were receiving inadequate education because of poor school facilities.

"At the very least we must say that Mrs. Hobby is confused," he asserted.

DOMINATION BY SECRETARY

Dr. Larsen declared that the Education Office was dominated by her to such an extent that Dr. Brownell could not speak out unless he got her permission. He added that there was evidence now of greater political domination in the Office than ever before.

"This domination is the most unfortunate thing that we have in this country today," Dr. Larsen declared. "It may be true that Mrs. Hobby is a very charming woman, but she knows next to nothing about education.

"We can no longer rely upon the accuracy or the impartiality of the statistics that we get from the Education Office.

"Many of us in education no longer have confidence in the Education Department," he asserted.

Among the educators already here it was generally accepted that the Office of Education and its Commissioner were dominated by Mrs. Hobby. They call the Department the political stepchild of the present administration.

Many sectional meetings are scheduled for the next 5 days. The delegates will consider ways to improve teaching, especially in reading, writing, and arithmetic. They will give attention to the recruitment of capable teachers and to the factors involved in juvenile delinquency.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of Saturday, April 2, 1955]

CHARGES POLITICS HITS EDUCATION—SCHOOLMASTERS' CHIEF TALKS OF CONVENTION ISSUE

(By J. A. Wadovick)

Charges of political domination of the United States Office of Education flew thick and fast here yesterday on the eve of a 5-day regional conference of the American Association of School Administrators.

"As presently constituted, there is a complete domination of the Commissioner of Education," asserted Jordan L. Larson, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., president of AASA, in an interview in Hotel Statler. "This political domination is one of the most unfortunate things in our country."

URGES FEDERAL AID

Larson, superintendent of public schools in Mount Vernon, was equally outspoken in underscoring the need for Federal aid to schools.

"We ought to have at least $1 billion in Federal assistance for schoolhouse construction to meet current needs and to catch up with obsolescence," he said.

If Federal aid is available for building, he reasoned, "perhaps there might be left greater local resources for teachers," and schools would be able to meet current expenses.

Larson saw little hope for additional help from local tax funds. Many communities, even if taxed to the legal limit, cannot undertake to build under present costs, he contended.

APPOINTED BOARD PROPOSED

Some 9,500 administrators are expected to be convened here by this morning. The delegates will vote on a resolution stipulating that the Office of Education should be under the general control of a national board of education composed of distinguished citizens appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate for long overlapping terms.

"Such a board should have the authority to appoint the commissioner of education," the resolution says, "who would serve as the board's executive officer.

"This is in accord with the best tradition of American education as it has developed at both the State and local levels of government."

INDEPENDENT AGENCY IS AIM

The administrators will be asked to reaffirm their position that "education should remain free from the controls of partisan politics."

If the resolution is approved, the administrators of American schools will be on record as favoring the establishment by Congress of the Office of Education as an independent agency.

Larson criticized figures released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the number of schoolrooms currently needed throughout the country. The Department's original estimate of 720,000 was whittled down to 600,000 and finally, according to the latest report just released, to 176,000, he said.

"This figure probably represents wishful thinking," said Larson, commenting on the inference from the office of Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department, that no Federal assistance to schools was needed.

The original 720,000-room estimate had been made by her department, he pointed out. The figure was based on a $5 million survey by the Government.

EXHIBITS OPENING

Jordan will preside at 2 this afternoon in public hall at the ceremonial opening of the exhibits, said to be the largest of their kind anywhere, and will open the first general session, a vesper service at 4 p. m. tomorrow. Mark C. Schinnerer, superintendent of Cleveland public schools, will welcome the delegates. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON will speak at a general session at 8:30 tomorrow night.

A number of professional groups are meeting here concurrently with the AASA. The National Association of Educational Secretaries held open house last night in Hotel Cleveland.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) in two instances.

Mr. ABERNETHY.

Mr. CRUMPACKER.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 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:

724. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a quarterly report of the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive

element of the Air Force at the seat of the Government as of the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 1955 (March 31, 1955), pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951 (Public Law 150, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

725. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on food and clothing in the Government, pursuant to Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

726. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Atlantic Area Command, east coast and Caribbean operations, Military Sea Transportation Service, Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

727. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide permanent authority for the relief of certain disbursing officers"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

728. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue regulations regarding the charges, handling, and disposition of short-paid (postal due) mail matter and dead letters, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

729. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the Chinese emergency aid program, pursuant to Public Laws 327 and 535, 81st Congress, and Public Law 165, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

730. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $263,475 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (H. Doc. 147); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

731. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $827,815,000 for the Department of Defense—military functions, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 145); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

732. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting the first semiannual report as of December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the War Claims Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1240; 50 U. S. C. App. 2001–2016) and section 3 (c) of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 12; 22 U. S. C. App. 1621–1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

733. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report on Educational Exchange Operations for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 148); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

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. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1602. A bill to enable the State of Arizona and the town of Tempe, Ariz., to convey to the Salt River Agricultural Improvement and Power District, for use by such district, a portion of certain property heretofore transferred under certain restrictions to such State and town by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2679. A bill to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3948. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOSS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 4936. A bill to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 5817. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 5818. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 5819. A bill to modify the Waukegan Harbor, Ill., project by eliminating certain requirements; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5820. A bill to change the name of Hulah Dam and Hulah Reservoir, located on Caney River, a tributary of Verdigris River, to Lake O' the Osages Dam and Lake O' the Osages, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 5821. A bill to amend the Federal Records Act of 1950 to improve the microfilming services available to Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 5822. A bill to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 5823. A bill to modify the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5824. A bill to assist the States in providing for the construction of municipal lakes, ponds, and reservoirs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 5825. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions in the classified (competitive) civil service may retire at age 55, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5826. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain officers and employees of the Federal Government involuntarily separated from their positions shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE (by request):

H. R. 5827. A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, and the conservation and development of urban communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 5828. A bill to establish an independent Office of Education in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim Sunday, June 26, 1955, and the fourth Sunday in June of each year thereafter, as a day of prayer for the "Man and Woman in White"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution relative to a definition of the phrase, "Peace-loving state", in the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the House of Representatives, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation enabling construction of the highway known as the Navaho Trail; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate the State Department of the United States concerning its method of administering the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging enactment of H. R. 5255, a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the construction of the New Hampshire Marine Memorial, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in behalf of a study of the Federal liquor tax policy and the enactment of legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to harbor improvements, island of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii the title to the remaining public lands and other public property in Hawaii, and to enact new provisions as to the authority of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of such property and other lands under the jurisdiction and control of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 5829. A bill for the relief of Fahmi Mickel Mansy and Mrs. Taman Chartouni Mansy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 5830. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Carey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5831. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 5832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Takeda) Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 5833. A bill for the relief of Filomena and Emil Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5834. A bill for the relief of Libero Ridolfi and Mrs. Luigia Belardi Ridolfi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 5835. A bill for the relief of Mr. Ramiro Liera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

210. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of 95 railroad employees of Williamsport, Pa., area urging every Member of Congress to support any bill that contains the following provisions: "To provide retirement at age of 60 after 30 years of service or after 35 years of service regardless of age, annuities to be based on one or more of one's highest year's earnings. Rail retirement annuities and pensions to be increased by 15 percent"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

211. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Local No. 568, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, Mason City, Iowa, urging enactment of legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

212. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging passage of legislation giving suffrage to the residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

213. Also, petition of the grand knight, Hempstead Council No. 1241, Knights of Columbus, Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. Also, petition of the grand knight, LaSalle Council No. 454, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

215. Also, petition of the executive vice president, Chamber of Commerce, Tulsa, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging immediate resumption of the construction of the Oologah Dam and Reservoir project and asking the Congress of the United States to reappropriate the necessary funds to the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to allow the early completion of the project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

216. Also, petition of the secretary, the Citizens-Taxpayers Association of Westerly, Westerly, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the monthly benefit for old-age and survivors' insurance be increased to $100 per month across the board for worthy elderly American citizens who retired under provision of the old-age and survivors' insurance, social-security law previous to 1950 amendment thereof, until the last surviving member thereof has passed on; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

217. Also, petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce, Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of either H. R. 4560 or H. R. 3902 in their original form, pertaining to natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

218. Also, petition of the deputy county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relative to Resolution No. 142, relating to a request to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, to provide for an annual session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Opinion-Poll Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been conducting an opinion poll among citizens of the Third Congressional District of Indiana on eight questions dealing with President Eisenhower's 1955 legislative program and other issues of vital concern to the Nation.

I have been conducting these polls among my constituents annually for the past 4 years with several objectives in view. My primary purpose has been to determine, in broad terms, for my own benefit, the attitudes and opinions of the people of northern Indiana on major legislative issues. These surveys, however, also serve to stimulate public discussion and interest in these issues, which is a healthy thing, and they enable me to present to Congress, as I am now doing, the views of an important segment of the voting population.

Questionnaires were mailed early in March to a substantial cross section of voters in the four urban and rural counties I represent: St. Joseph, South Bend; Elkhart, Elkhart and Goshen; La Porte, La Porte and Michigan City; and Marshall, Plymouth.

Ballots also were printed in several district newspapers and readers were asked to fill them out and send them to me with their answers.

The response this year, as in past years, was well above the average for similar mail polls. Approximately 18,000 questionnaires have been returned to date, and they are still coming in. This compares with a response of approximately 12,000 in 1952, 15,000 in 1953, and 21,000 in 1954.

The results of my 1955 poll, as tabulated by the IBM service bureau, an impartial private concern, are listed below. Within the limitations of any survey of this nature, they reflect the current opinions of a substantial cross section of Indiana voters.

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you believe that Congress should:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Continue to support the President in his determination to defend Formosa against attack by the Chinese Reds?	82	9	9
2. Reduce the minimum voting age below 21 years?	34	61	5
3. Approve a $25 billion increase in the national debt to finance an expanded highway program?	44	46	10
4. Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	76	11	13
5. Approve construction of 35,000 public housing units per year for 2 more years?	39	46	15
6. Raise the Federal minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents per hour?	70	23	7
7. Approve the cuts in the Army Ground Forces proposed by President Eisenhower?	55	33	12
8. Make the Post Office Department self-supporting by increasing postal rates?	67	26	7

POLL OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

In order to stimulate interest in public affairs among future citizens of my district I again conducted a separate poll among high-school students. More than 3,000 students took part this year, voting on the issues in class under the supervision of instructors after a thorough discussion of the pros-and-cons. Here are the results of the 1955 high-school poll, based on returns from 25 high schools in northern Indiana:

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you believe that Congress should:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Continue to support the President in his determination to defend Formosa against attack by the Chinese Reds?	84	7	9
2. Reduce the minimum voting age below 21 years?	50	43	7
3. Approve a $25 billion increase in the national debt to finance an expanded highway program?	41	39	20
4. Grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska?	73	15	12
5. Approve construction of 35,000 public housing units per year for 2 more years?	50	22	28
6. Raise the Federal minimum wage from 75 to 90 cents per hour?	65	22	13
7. Approve the cuts in the Army Ground Forces proposed by President Eisenhower?	34	44	22
8. Make the Post Office Department self-supporting by increasing postal rates?	54	28	18

Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my remarks in the RECORD recently, the recommendations of the Attorney General's committee to study the antitrust laws are receiving wide attention.

Some of the recommendations strike at the very heart of the Robinson-Patman law. My service on the House Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over all monopoly and antitrust legislation, has afforded me an opportunity to keep in close touch with the operations of the Robinson-Patman law, the court decisions interpreting it, and the efforts constantly made to weaken it. This law was passed by Congress in the interest of the small independent businessman. It is intended to give the small man an opportunity to stay in business and it has demonstrated its usefulness over the years.

We frequently hear loose statements to the effect or at least implying that the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, requires the selling of commodities of like grade and quality at the same price, under all circumstances. This is simply not true. The act specifically permits the manufacturer or supplier to sell commodities of like grade and quality to different customers at different prices, where the difference is due to normal discount for cash, quantity buying, freight savings, and other varieties of customary and acceptable business practices. Cash discounts, savings in freight based on quantity buying, differentials which make due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from differing methods or quantities in which commodities are sold to the purchaser—all such advantages have always been available to operators. Such fair business practices were customary prior to the adoption of the Robinson-Patman Act and they have not been changed by that law.

What the act prohibits is purely arbitrary price discrimination, not remotely connected with economic reasons, so that the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly or to endanger, destroy or prevent competition. Such price discriminations mean that a manufacturer or supplier has two prices, a secret and very low price for a few favored customers such as chain stores, and a so-called public high price for the independent little-business man in the community, such as the corner grocery store, hardware store, drug store, and filling station. It prohibits under-the-counter concessions to the favored few under such guises as excessive free goods, brokerage commissions, rebates, and so on.

One of the favored devices to crush the small-business man was the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. A majority of the Attorney General's committee proposes to amend the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. Beware of this proposal. In that connection, I want to make a part of the RECORD the letter I received from California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., dated April 21, 1955. It tells the story so very clearly that I cannot possibly improve on it, and I commend it to all the friends of the small-business man in Congress. The letter follows:

CALIFORNIA & HAWAIIAN
SUGAR REFINING CORP.,
San Francisco, Calif., April 21, 1955.

The Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIS: I am writing to state this company's strong opposition to the position of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws regarding the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act.

As the law now stands, section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act forbids payment of brokerage to any person who is acting for or is under the control of a buyer. This provision was aimed at an abuse widely practiced before adoption of the act—the maintenance of so-called brokerage departments by large buyers. Such buyers were in the practice of demanding brokerage for these departments in amounts completely unrelated to the value of any services received by the seller. The brokerage was of course nothing but a price concession given color of validity by the brokerage department device.

A majority of the Attorney General's Committee proposes to amend section 2 (c) of the act so as to permit payment of brokerage to buyers to the extent of services rendered the seller by the buyer. In our opinion this seemingly innocent exception would make the section entirely unenforceable. It would make every complaint under the section depend on difficult questions of cost accounting. In practical effect, the section would be a dead letter.

The consequences would be extremely serious, both to sellers and all but the largest buyers. It is only relatively large buyers that are in a position to establish brokerage departments and take advantage of the loophole proposed by the Attorney General's Committee. In our judgment the committee's proposal is inconsistent with the basic purpose of the act, to preserve equality of economic opportunity.

The payment of brokerage to a buyer is a merchandising absurdity. A bona fide broker is the seller's sales representative; his function is to give sales service. In the nature of things a "broker" employed by a buyer cannot and will not do this job. A more honest and descriptive name for a broker acting for a buyer is purchasing agent. His interests are essentially adverse to those of the seller, and no seller would ever voluntarily agree to pay him. This practical inability of such a broker to give any service of value to a seller justifies the present outright prohibition of brokerage in such a case. Any payment to such a broker is in practical effect a payment to a buyer's purchasing department and results in unfair discrimination as between competing buyers.

Please forgive the length of this letter. This company well remembers the brokerage practices that existed before the adoption of section 2 (c) of the Robinson-Patman Act. They were costly and unfair, and should never be permitted again.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD MACLEAN.

Brotherhood and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., of Detroit, Mich., on Dr. Tomlinson D. Todd's ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, on March 27, 1955.

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

BROTHERHOOD AND DEMOCRACY

(Address delivered by Representative CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Democrat, from Detroit, Mich., on Dr. Tomlinson D. Todd's ninth anniversary of the Americans All radio program, Sunday, March 27, 1955, Station WOOK, 1:30 p. m. to 2:30 p. m.)

I deeply appreciate the privilege I have received in your invitation to share in the ninth anniversary broadcast of Americans All. The esteem in which your listening audience holds this program reflects the quality of your leadership and direction, Dr. Todd.

There is, of course, a great service to the public inherent in the enjoyment that a radio broadcast furnishes through its programs in either a sense of pleasure or stimulation of thinking. The greatest service,

however, is that which is performed by a program of this kind which in its essence fulfills the foremost of American principles—those ideals of brotherhood and democracy.

The fostering and upholding of these principles have always been for Americans a civic, moral, and a Christian responsibility. They are the centermost part of our American way of life through which all the parts of the total can be balanced. They hold within themselves the first laws of our land, the first laws of morality and ethical conduct, and the first laws under God.

It has been precisely stated that the democratic idea upon which our Nation was founded and for which Americans have given their lives through two wars and an international conflict, is founded in human nature and comes from God who makes human nature.

The fact that ours is a government of the people, in which supreme power is retained by the people and exercised directly or indirectly through a system of representation—presents to the world our esteem of man as a human being whose stature arises from intellectual and creative powers and his practice of right or ethical conduct.

Our profession of faith in such a principle of government also expresses our faith in the brotherhood or kinship of all the people who make up our common family—a kinship that lies in the common pursuit of the objectives of such a form of government—life, liberty, and happiness.

Unless we have brotherhood among all men of our Nation, we cannot have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, because brotherhood implies an equality between all men which makes them capable of self-discipline and thus self-government. Brotherhood also implies an unlimited personal liability for the pursuit of the objectives of democracy for all men—life, the right to equal opportunities for work as embodied in the FEPC bill cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota and guest today, the Honorable WILLIAM F. LANGER, to worship freely and to live sociably with fellow man; liberty, the right to impartial laws by all men may be secured in their equal rights; and the pursuit of happiness, the state of well-being and pleasurable satisfaction arising from personal accomplishments and personal acceptance in the common family.

Brotherhood and the principles of democracy have been the subject of discussion for generations by orators, poets, governmental officials, and religious leaders, but never before has the fate of the world hung more upon the relationship of man within his own sphere of activity and the effects of the relationship as it is intensified and as it reaches out into the outer spheres of the lands of other men. America, the leader of the free world, is faced with its moral and Christian liability for the welfare of fellowmen within and without its sphere. Only so can it give demonstration of its faith in the principles of democracy and brotherhood.

The tensions which are abroad in the world today and give rise to our fears for civilization are evidences of the lack of a strong sense of kinship between and liability for other men—the doubt of one man's belief in the equality and worthiness of others. Events have proved we cannot remove an iota or a dot, from the law of brotherhood and still accomplish democracy. So long as there exists in America men who are without equal rights under the law, men who are without equal opportunty for self expression and development or men who are unprotected, we have not fulfilled our democratic ideals. As it affects the outer world, we can ease tensions by showing others a better way of life or even our faith in such a life.

Men of all the free world and, we are sure from the testimony of those who have escaped the snare, men of the enslaved world look to America—world leader, foremost advocator of democracy—with the prayer that she will demonstrate her faith in the destiny of man.

Sports Ambassadors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Congress is well aware of my interest in our State Department's international, educational, and cultural exchange program. As a cosponsor of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act, I have been gratified to note from time to time the effectiveness this program has had in winning friends abroad and gaining respect for our country.

While it is generally well known that this program includes an exchange of students, professors, teachers, and research scholars it is not so well known that the program has also been garnering much good will for our country through nonacademic exchange of persons. The interchange of leaders of national prominence between our country and some seventy countries around the world has been a very fruitful interchange in obtaining a better understanding of our life, our attitudes, and our peaceful intentions in today's world. Top level Government officials, mayors, civic leaders, and so forth from other lands have returned home to tell the American story with convincing credibility. The selected American leaders who have gone abroad on this program from as diverse fields as law, labor, management, the arts, and athletics have been equally effective in providing living refutation to Communist lies about our life and our people.

Surprising, to some observers, has been the tremendous success of the goodwill tours of our top athletes who have gone abroad on this program. On February 7, 1955, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable CARL HINSHAW, of California, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reprint of a newspaper article which appeared in the Pasadena Star-News which described the tremendous exploits and friend-winning activities abroad of our great two-time Olympic diving champion, Major Sammy Lee. I have been told of the voluminous reports which have come in from our Foreign Service posts describing the abundant goodwill won for our country by our four great Olympic champions, Sammy Lee, Mal Whitfield, Rob Richards, and Harrison Dillard. Bob Considine, outstanding American sports writer, recently quoted an on-the-spot observer from India as saying that Bob Richards, the Vaulting Vicar, reached and favorably impressed at least 3 million Indians while he was in India on this educational exchange program.

The Cleveland Press on February 16, 1955, carried an article on Harrison Dillard which displays so much admiration for their home-town product and which expresses so well the value of this kind of exchange that I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

DILLARD WINS PRAISE AS UNITED STATES "AMBASSADOR"

(By Jack Clowser)

For a long time, I've felt it was impossible to be more proud of Harrison Dillard than the day I saw him ascend the victory stand at London and accept his first Olympic victory wreath.

For a close second, perhaps, it was the time his old coach, Eddie Finnigan, and I watched him enter Buckingham Palace—the only member of his race invited to a reception by the British King and Queen. I remember Eddie, his chest swelling with pride, muttering "What a long way to come—a kid from a poor East Side neighborhood, all the way to the Palace."

Now I'm not sure that either was Dillard's finest achievement. After reading letters that have been coming to Mayor Celebrezze and to Hank Greenberg, Harrison's boss, it seems the famous Cleveland track star has just turned in his most praiseworthy performance.

The letters are from the United States State Department, under whose auspices Dillard recently made a 3-month good-will tour of South and Central America. His selection was, in the first place, a high honor indicative of his type of citizenship.

In this global struggle for the minds of men, with democracy arrayed against communism, the State Department sought to impress our pan-American neighbors by sending them a young man who was representative of the highest type of sportsman. A gifted extemporaneous speaker and world-famous athlete, Dillard filled the bill so well that United States Embassies in the countries he visited have been deluging the State Department with praise for his work.

Here are some examples, as cited by the department in letters to Greenberg and the mayor:

From Haiti: "The Department is to be congratulated for its selection of Dillard. His effectiveness is not limited to demonstrations of sports techniques; in addition he represents his country, on all occasions, with poise, intelligence, cordiality, and a genuine interest in his hosts."

From Bolivia: "The story of Dillard's visit can be described by saying that in almost every instance when he was scheduled to make a speech, show a film, or attend a reception indoors, the demand to see him was such that we had to move outside. He was one of the most successful of American leaders who have visited here in years."

From Argentina: "His visit to Buenos Aires was a great success * * * his engaging personality, his modesty and sincerity made a highly favorable impression on all who met him. President Peron himself expressed his satisfaction at Dillard's visit, and his wish that the visit might have been longer."

From Cuba: "Just imagine what it means, in the affirmation of the principles of the good neighbor and democracy, to see this young Negro, of humble background but lifted to the pinnacle of success and admiration by his own efforts, widely honored, as he well deserves. Dillard has rendered Cuba a work worthy of gratitude."

From Panama: "Dillard's visit is considered by this Embassy to have been the most effective short-time exchange of persons project ever experienced in Panama."

In his reply to the State Department, Greenberg wrote, "We are proud of his association with the Cleveland Baseball Club, and delighted to learn that his appearances in Latin America provoked such complimentary responses."

It must give all good Americans a warm glow to know that the skinny little guy at East Tech High has grown up to represent his country, not only as a wonder athlete, but much more important, as an instrument for international good will.

After all, isn't that the logical sequence for the sterling sportsmanship he has unswervingly practiced?

Surplus Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the laws passed by Congress, including the most recent Public Law 480, in substance and essence constitute directives to the Department of Agriculture to find outlets for surplus farm commodities in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices.

I am willing to concede that these directives of necessity present administrative difficulties. On the other hand, many of us in Congress honestly feel that the program outlined by Congress has been pursued by the Secretary of Agriculture with something less than vigor and enthusiasm. This could be due to the fact that because of alleged international considerations the State Department has put a damper on or at least has been cool to the program. But whatever the reason for it the cold fact is that our surplus farm commodities have not moved in the channels of foreign trade, as contemplated and directed by Congress.

Rice is a typical case in point as brought out recently by our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Representative E. C. GATHINGS, one of the farmer's best friends in Congress. Following a discussion with Mr. GATHINGS, I addressed the following telegram, dated April 12, 1955, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State:

APRIL 12, 1955.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that as conditions to the proposed transfer of 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice by our Government to Japan, the State Department is seeking to have Agriculture Department to agree first that in the future no rice will be offered on the world markets at less than current domestic prices and, second, that no rice will be exported into the Southeast Asian markets. The first condition would, in my opinion, be in direct violation of the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 480 and the second would constitute a trade barrier which neither State nor Agriculture can impose. Further, such restrictions would no doubt result in further reduction of domestic rice acreage which has already been cut too deeply. I strongly protest any action of this nature and would appreciate your advising that these or any other similar restrictive conditions have been or will be removed and that program of disposal of rice will be pursued vigorously as contemplated by Congress.

EDWIN E. WILLIS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert in the RECORD the reply of the Department of State, dated April 18, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1955.

The Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILLIS: Reference is made to your telegram of April 12 concerning the question of rice sales in Asian markets.

We recognize the desirability of finding outlets for United States surplus rice in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices, as the Congress has stipulated. We support such an objective. We have not taken a position to embargo sales of rice in Southeast Asia.

Your attention is called to the fact that title I, section 101 of Public Law 480 provides that in negotiating agreements "the President shall (a) take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities."

On September 9, 1954 the President issued an Executive order and a general policy statement for the implementation of Public Law 480, which outlined the basic problems as well as certain of the responsibilities in connection with the administration of this act. Two paragraphs of the policy statement are hereinafter quoted in full.

"Today, the magnitude of the United States' holdings of many commodities is such as to be capable of demoralizing world commodity markets should a policy of reckless selling abroad be pursued. This potential greatly alarms other countries despite the fact that past behavior of the United States has shown no intention of pursuing a harmful policy."

* * * * *

"The United States cannot be satisfied with the position of holding its own supplies off the market and accumulating surpluses while other countries dispose of their entire production. Accordingly, the United States will offer its products at competitive prices. At the same time, the United States will not use its agricultural surpluses to impair the traditional competitive position of friendly countries by disrupting world prices of agricultural commodites."

The State Department, from the very outset of the problem of surplus agricultural commodities, has been intent upon opening up possible permanent foreign markets for American commodities, and particularly in the areas where consumption may be increased. Our primary concern has been to widen the markets and to create a situation which will permit a continuation of sales abroad on an expanding basis. The Department has been concerned that we do not enter into potential price wars which can only harm the American farmers and defeat the basic foreign policy concept clearly set forth in the introduction of Public Law 480.

A decision to dispose of United States surplus rice stocks in Asian markets under Public Law 480 or at subsidized prices under existing uneasy political conditions in that area is one which should involve consideration of the important questions of foreign policy which are concerned. In particular, disposal in a manner which would have the effect either of depriving Burma and Thailand of their traditional markets or of depressing export prices, or of threatening to do so, may seriously jeopardize the enthusiasm of those countries to resist Communist overtures. Few actions on our part could be more suitable to Communist propaganda which is already pounding into Asian ears the charge that the United States surplus disposal program disregards the economic interests of Asian countries.

The specific question of rice disposals in Asia is now being considered at the highest levels of the administration to determine the manner in which our surplus disposal program and our critically important foreign policy interests in Asia can be reconciled.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. Speaker, I was, of course, very pleased with the second paragraph of the letter, which I repeat:

We recognize the desirability of finding outlets for United States surplus rice in ways which promote an expansion of markets and do not depress prices, as the Congress has stipulated. We support such an objective. We have not taken a position to embargo sales of rice in Southeast Asia.

And while the succeeding paragraphs in the letter were perhaps necessarily general, I was nevertheless pleased with the assurance of the last statement to the effect that "the specific question of rice disposals in Asia is now being considered at the highest levels of the administration," and so forth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, 3 days later, on April 21, 1955, I received the following letter from the Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 21, 1955.

Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILLIS: We have your telegram of April 12 to Secretary Benson regarding the proposed transfer of 2,250,000 hundredweight of rice by our Government to Japan.

The Department of Agriculture has been discussing this transfer thoroughly with the Department of State and other interested parties. We are now in the process of going ahead on negotiations for the transfer.

As you may know, the Department of State is properly interested in making sure that relations with friendly nations are not jeopardized by any transfer of foodstuffs involving substantial subsidy that might interfere with normal marketings by other friendly nations.

However, I am glad to inform you that in this case satisfactory arrangements were worked out to proceed with negotiations.

Assuring you of our desire to pursue every possible avenue to move rice into the export markets, I am

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, evidently the considerations at highest level of the administration referred to by the State Department bore fruit because in the letter of the Department of Agriculture I find this significant sentence:

I am glad to inform you that in this case satisfactory arrangements were worked out to proceed with negotiations.

I sincerely hope the negotiations, when completed, will continue to be satisfactory not only in this case but in connection with the general administration of the directives of Congress.

Anniversary of the Evacuation of Boston by the British

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include with pleasure an excellent and appropriate address made by United States Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, on March 13, 1955, in South Boston, Mass., a part of my congressional district, on the occasion of the patriotic exercises conducted under the auspices of the South Boston Citizens Association in connection with the 179th anniversary of the evacuation of Boston by the British:

When the patriots looked from Dorchester Heights and saw the British Fleet set sail out of Boston Harbor—that was a great day. I don't suppose the time will ever come in these parts when the evacuation anniversary is not celebrated. I am sure that day will never come so long as there are Americans with Irish blood here—because this was the symbol of the dawn of freedom in this great land. And if there is one thing the Irish prize above all others—above prosperity, above security, it is freedom. In that cause they have bled and died through the centuries.

Of course they knew well enough that the departure of the oppressor did not mean that all their problems were solved. But here was a real start on the road to independence and to a chance to build a land of liberty and plenty.

The climb upward from the days of oppression has been a long one. There have been setbacks. But as time goes on the ideals of the colonial patriots have been increasingly achieved. Even the most reactionary people today would not accept manners and laws and customs that were considered all right in the days of the American Revolution.

Let us not forget that the freedom for which the patriots fought was not achieved in a battle or in a campaign or in the whole War of the Revolution. After the war was won, the only people allowed to vote were male property owners. It was many years before all white men had the right to vote. It was many more years before it was conceded that all men who were not felons should have the right to vote—and this is still not fully accepted in some parts of these United States. It was many years before women were given their political freedom and the right to vote.

Those were the days in which the institution of human slavery was commonly accepted as a proper condition, not only for the black men, but also in effect for the white bondsman.

Those were the days in which the very idea that workingmen might band together to gain their economic ends was looked on as a crime and indeed, as flying in the face of providence.

What I am getting at here today is that the pursuit of liberty and of happiness is a never-ending affair. We climb one hill, we achieve another freedom or another good, and still another unsolved problem of social justice lies ahead.

Some of us close our eyes to the hills ahead. It is more comfortable that way. We can just pretend that they don't exist. Some of us look backward, to the good old days when the jobless workingman had the right to starve but not the right to beg; to the good old days when the suspicion of hard times coming meant wholesale slashing of wages; to the good old days when there was no income tax and it wouldn't have mattered to us much if there had been—because who but the rich had a dollar in those good days?

Well, I for one am not wasting my time on the good old days. It is my idea that we should try for better days, not for a few, but for all the people. It is my idea that the dignity of the individual is a value worth keeping. It is my idea that while this great Nation has done much, we still have seen but a little of the great things that are to come. That is to say, the great things to come if we keep conquering the hills ahead. I mean to make my small contribution to that end.

We are coming close to St. Patrick's Day, and I should like to say just a few words about where that sainted man would have stood had he been here on this day in 1955. I am pretty sure that he would have been looking ahead too. He had to look ahead in his day in Ireland. There he was amid a hundred pagan tribes, trying to bring the faith and education and tolerance of each other to people who must have been pretty hard to convince. He did a fine job for all the people, and we carry him in our hearts for it. It seems to me that we could do worse than get in step with St. Patrick and make this city and this State and this Nation—yes, and this world, a bit better for those who shall come to inherit what we have left.

Atomic Powerplants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission has given out the information it is now making arrangements with a number of private power companies and, in one case, with a public utility district, for the planning and construction of atomic powerplants. This is good news, not only for our own country, but for the free world.

We have recently learned of the extensive plans of Great Britain in this field. I do not feel that it is necessary to get into a race with our friendly ally in this matter. Neither do I believe that the United States should lag behind in the development of such important peacetime uses of atomic energy.

The concern of the Atomic Energy Commission for the development and improvement of weapons is natural in this age of anxiety, yet atomic energy in its many peacetime uses can be one of the great boons of mankind. I do not think that we can for one moment forget that fact.

The development of efficient and economical atomic powerplants offers much to the world. In countries such as Sweden, Finland, and Austria which are dependent for much of their power production on coal imported from behind the Iron Curtain, atomic powerplants offer an end to an economic stranglehold.

If we succeed, as the Department of the Interior is endeavoring, in finding an economical way to make vast quantities of fresh water from sea water, atomic plants to power-pumping stations can make deserts bloom in many arid lands, and provide food and a better life for millions of people.

Every time mankind has discovered a great new source of power, the ability of the world to sustain a growing population has been advanced. We have made such advances through the use of coal, falling water, oil, and gas. We are standing now at the threshold of what may be mankind's greatest era if we can avoid war and put atomic energy to peaceful uses.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Dinner of the Amen Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by our colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the William Penn Hotel, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on Saturday evening, April 23, 1955.

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

THE ROMANCE OF ROADS

(Address by Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, at the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, in the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Saturday evening, April 23, 1955)

One of the most spectacular developments in the United States has been the surprising increase in our population. According to the latest Census Bureau estimates, we are now a Nation of almost 165 million people.

That figure represents an increase of more than 13 million, or nearly 9 percent, above the total for the last general census of 1950. Compared with the 1940 census we have had an increase of 25 percent.

Translated into terms of human needs and the American way of life, this population increase has imposed upon us many great problems.

We need more schools to educate the growing army of young people. We need more hospitals. We must build more churches of every denomination. We must have more, better, and safer roads to accommodate the vastly increased volume of motor traffic that crowds upon our inadequate and hazardous highway systems.

I refer to these problems because they offer a challenge of such great importance to the future of our country. They should be the concern of every public-spirited American.

This evening I want to center my remarks on the urgent need for the expansion and modernization of our roads in all parts of the United States. As ranking Republican member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I have given a

great deal of study to the highway legislation now under discussion. I am confident that substantial progress will be made from the standpoint of economic growth, national defense, civil defense, the safety and convenience of the traveling public and the general welfare.

This history of transportation in America is a fascinating story. It is filled with the romance of an expanding empire of freedom and opportunity. It is the story of resolute, courageous men and women who pushed westward over the mountains and plains to open new lands, to clear the forests, and to create new communities that have become great centers of industry and enterprise. From the earliest settlements along the Atlantic seaboard, the development and use of our waterways, highways, railways, pipelines, and air transportation has been one of the most important factors in our material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

In the early days the streams and Indian trails provided the only means of communication and travel. The first roads that connected scattered communities were built to accommodate horse-drawn vehicles in the unhurried pace of that day.

Military necessity was another strong influence in road development. General Braddock's road through the mountain wilderness from Cumberland, over a course now followed by the historic Route 40, and the Forbes Road from Bedford to Ohio Forks, were outstanding examples. They rank with the world's great military operations. The mission of these military campaigns was to secure the "point" where the Allegheny and the Monongahela join to form the Ohio. The prize at stake in this great struggle was the control of a continent. The British finally won after years of hard fighting. Here in the wildnerness, 200 years ago, the future of the New World was decided and the geography of Europe was shaped.

It is not necessary to recount the battles, campaigns, and individual exploits before a western Pennsylvania audience such as this. The thrilling story has been told many times by students of history. It has been brought home to us in song, folk-lore, and on the motion-picture screen.

The westward migration through the Point resulted in the settlement of the plains, the prairies, and the Pacific slope of North America. It brings to mind the great fleet of Conestoga wagons, which had their origin in Pennsylvania, and other covered wagons, ever moving westward. This is an inspiring picture. It is typically American. It embodies the American spirit of self-reliance and individual responsibility. It meant hardship, privation and often death, but it developed the greatest Nation the world has ever known.

Yes, my fellow Americans, there is romance in our roads, yet they are today, as always, the basic means of transportation. The other avenues of transportation—waterways, railroads and the air—aid and supplement the roads just as the auxiliary branches of the armed services help the "doughboy" gain and hold his objective.

Turning now to the present and the future, there is widespread agreement that bold, new steps must be taken to correct the deficiencies that have accumulated on our highway system during and since World War II.

The Nation has not kept pace with highway needs. The time has come when obsolete and dangerous roads must be replaced or rebuilt to modern standards of safety and efficiency. Larger, faster, and increased numbers of motor vehicles have added to our problem and will continue to do so. The American people now own 58 million motor vehicles and that figure is expected to rise beyond 81 million in the next 10 years. The number of vehicles using the original Pennsylvania Turnpike has multiplied by 4 in the last 5 years.

For many years roads were built where there was the strongest political pressure. There was no comprehensive plan.

Today we have a program and a plan. It was placed before Congress by President Eisenhower after an exhaustive study by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in cooperation with the Governors' conference. It calls for the expenditure in the next 10-year period of $101 billion.

To reach a better understanding of what that figure means—$101 billion—let me tell you that it is more than the cost of all wars in which we have been engaged, with the exception of World War II.

Under the President's plan, the total cost will be apportioned approximately one-third to the Federal Government and two-thirds to State and local governments.

The Federal Government will assume primary responsibility for developing the National System of Interstate Highways. This is a specially designated network of 37,600 miles connecting 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all the cities over 50,000 population. It will have controlled access and will bypass large centers of population.

The system has been carefully laid out to take care of the military and industrial needs of the country. When completed it will also be one of our greatest cultural and spiritual assets, providing easy and safe highways that will bring our people closer together and provide the means for a better understanding of our great country.

On the other systems, primary, secondary and urban, Federal contributions are to be continued on a matching basis at the rate of about $600 million a year, as provided by the Highway Act of 1954. This, incidentally, was the largest highway program ever authorized by the United States.

I have discussed the proposed program in broad outline, but there are many difficult problems involved. The most serious, of course, is how it is to be financed.

I am sure most of you are aware that I have always been a strong advocate of the pay-as-you-go plan in Government at all levels.

I have always favored the pay-as-you-go plan because it means greater economy. It avoids the danger of burdensome debt and keeps taxes at the lowest possible level.

I would prefer to have the proposed highway program carried out on that basis. But we have been told by qualified experts that even with a substantial tax increase it would take 30 years to do the job that is needed right now—and can be completed in 10 years under the plan proposed by the President.

That plan recommends the creation of a Federal Highway Corporation authorized to issue bonds to finance construction of the interstate system. The bonds will be supported by Federal gasoline tax revenues above the $622½ million now contributed to the States for all road construction other than the interstate system. It is anticipated that the 2-cent gasoline tax now levied by the Federal Government will liquidate the $23 billion in bonds in 30 years while the roads will be completed in 10 years. It will not require an increase in the tax.

There is some opposition to this financing plan. It has been argued that it is not legal to appropriate for such a long period. To my mind this objection is not valid. The same argument could be made against the bonds for the public debt and the payment of pensions because each Congress must make the appropriations.

Others contend that it is not good Government practice to earmark revenues for specific purposes. Against this is the fact that 24 States already have constitutional provisions segregating all gas tax receipts for roadbuilding purposes.

We need the roads. There is no disagreement on that score. We must have them if we are to have an expanding economy. We need them for our industrial, cultural, and spiritual advancement. We need them for national and civilian defense. We need them to reduce the frightful toll of lives taken each year by accidents on our highways. The big decision we must make is how they shall be financed. It's up to the American people to decide, for they must pay the bills.

Personally I feel the President's plan is sound. I do believe, however, that serious consideration should be given to the question of tolls. I believe that the collection of tolls, wherever feasible, on sections of roads, bridges and tunnels, would be advantageous to our country and fair to the traveling public. Or perhaps it might be wise to require the payment of a license fee for vehicles traveling on the interstate system.

In the past the romance of traveling in covered wagons, stage coaches, and packet lines were adventures pictured in the famous prints of Currier & Ives and other artists. The tying together of the Atlantic and the Pacific by steel rails was acclaimed all over the world.

The first plane across the continent was hailed as an event unparalleled in transportation.

The completion of the highway plan now under consideration will be another romantic story in American progress.

It means the mobilization of the best in engineering skill and construction ability; the assembling of material and equipment in quantities never before equalled and all coordinated with American know-how in the American way.

Address by Hon. Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin, at Testimonial Dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Shultz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] at a testimonial dinner for Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, held in New York City on April 20, 1955.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR MCCARTHY AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR RABBI BENJAMIN SCHULTZ, NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 20, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, our meeting tonight is long overdue. The gallant warrior we are honoring has been covering himself with glory for so many years, it's a wonder we have never stopped, until now, to say thanks.

That's the trouble, Ben, with being a solid, unwavering bastion of strength—like the Rock of Gibraltar, people tend to take you for granted. I regret this is not the 10th or 20th time we have gathered to honor you; but I thank God we have always been able to take you for granted.

Someone recently observed that no man is indispensable. As regards some matters, I emphatically agree. But in other fields, I

would be more cautious. How, for example, would the anti-Communist fight have fared over the past decade without Rabbi Schultz? And how should we bear the loss if ever he were to leave his post? Some men in some jobs, let's face it, are indispensable.

What is it that can make a man indispensable in this struggle? Is it the possession of keen insights—an understanding of the fallacies of the Communist doctrine, an appreciation of the moral evil it contains? Or is it practical shrewdness in the day-to-day battles? Is it an ability to joust with the dialecticians at the intellectual level? Or is it stubborness and grit at the street level? Is it unflagging courage? Is it single-mindedness of purpose—an unswerving determination to defeat the enemy absolutely?

Each of these qualities is a scarce commodity; the possession of any one of them makes a man valuable to the anti-Communist cause. But when you find them all in one individual, you have found a rare man, indeed; and you can afford to talk about indispensability. The good Lord put in all the ingredients when he made Ben Schultz.

Ben Schultz' contributions to the anti-Communist cause are innumerable, and many of them have been cited here tonight. We have heard, and we might well hear a great deal more, of his distinguished accomplishments—as an arresting orator, as a skillful writer, as an organizer. But it is in this latter capacity—as the founder and the guiding star of the American Jewish League against communism—that Ben Schultz has performed what is perhaps his most distinguished service.

Ben Schultz, ably seconded by Roy Cohn, Benjamin Gitlow, Frank Chodorov, Judge Irving Kaufman, Eugene Lyons, George Sokolsky, Walter Winchell, Alfred Kohlberg, Ben Mandell, and countless other leaders who share his religious beliefs, has managed to expose the malicious myth that persons of the Jewish faith and Communists have something in common. This wicked falsehood has been ruthlessly exploited by the Communists for their own ends.

The Communists sow this particular seed of discord by two methods: First, they emphasize the religion of traitors or security risks in those instances where it so happens that they are of the Jewish faith. This type of propaganda, as the Communists well know, catalyzes latent prejudices and creates race hatred. Why don't the Communists comment on Alger Hiss' or William Remington's religion? The reason is obvious: There is no profit here, no conspicuous prejudice to exploit, no promise of creating division or suspicion.

The second Communist method of exploiting the race issue is more subtle. Rabbi Schultz shrewdly diagnosed it in an article for the American Mercury last summer. The Communists energetically peddle the line that anticommunism and antisemitism go hand in hand—specifically that all hard anti-Communists are ipso facto antisemitic. This slur is, of course, pure invention; but it commonly results, as Ben Schultz suggests, in 1 of 2 things—both of which give aid and comfort to the Communist. Some non-Jewish Americans are angered by the accusation, and in reaction to it, turn their resentment against Jewish people. Others are intimidated by it, and with an eye to their political fortunes, decline to take an active role in the anti-Communist fight. Either way—whether race dissension is created, or people are frightened off from joining the anti-Communist fight—either way, the Communists win.

Let's make no mistake about this: the Communists are waging a diabolically clever campaign. But its effectiveness has, to a great extent, been blunted by the work of Rabbi Schultz and the American Jewish League against communism. The very existence of this hard-hitting anti-Communist group gives the lie to a vitally important item of Communist propaganda. And I say to you that I frankly doubt there is a single organization in this country that the Communists are more anxious to destroy.

There are two reasons why I am confident that the Communists will not be successful in this. First, Ben Schultz, and his indomitable crew of heroes will not be beaten down by anybody. Second, and perhaps of even greater importance, is the fact that Jewish people are congenital enemies of communism. Those of the Jewish faith are, historically, champions of liberty. They are, traditionally, jealous guardians of the individual's freedom—political, economic, social. These things communism is determined to destroy.

And remember too that persons of the Jewish faith have, by force of circumstances, a vested interest in tolerance. It is not an interest in tolerance of moral evil such as communism embodies. But within the framework of belief in the dignity of the individual they insist on tolerance of diverse political and religious beliefs. This is a position the Communists cannot abide. Jewish people know this—they are keenly aware that in a Communist society it is only the Communist and the Communist dogma that is tolerated.

Far and away the most valuable contribution of Ben Schultz and his organization is that they dramatically symbolize the eternal hostility between Judaism and communism.

It's a personal honor to me, Ben, to be able to join in paying tribute to you. But I don't speak just for myself. I think I speak for all of your debtors—all of the American people. You have served your country well. Thank you, good luck, and Godspeed.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George W. Healy, Jr., editor of the highly respected and influential New Orleans Times-Picayune, has rendered a public service in having reproduced a series of editorials on the subject of the explosively controversial tidelands issue. I hope I will render a service in having these illuminating editorials reproduced here and spread on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune has never faltered in its stalwart support of the individual States in their fight to retain title to that which they lawfully possess. Now that it has been determined by the Congress that the States do have the right of possession to their tidelands, the new issue of just what do the tidelands consist has been raised by those diehards who refuse to accept the decision of the Congress in its full meaning and embrace. While one part of the fight has been won, much remains before a full and complete victory becomes final.

The consistent fight of the New Orleans Times-Picayune has been one of the brightest spots in the unfaltering battle to retain for the individual States that which belongs to them. The position of the New Orleans Times-Picayune in this instance only reflects the position which it has consistently taken whenever the rights of the individual States have been challenged or involved. Its editorials have always spoken out against violation in any form of the fundamental principle that each State of the United States is a sovereign State.

Any comment on the long and hard fight to restore the tidelands to the States would be incomplete without mention and full recognition of the role played in the fight by Judge Leander H. Perez, of Louisiana. True, there were many who contributed their full ability to the fight to restore the tidelands. The roll will be long when called but at the head of the list will be the name of Judge Perez.

When others grew faint of heart and others were tempted to compromise, and still others were frustrated to the point of surrender, it was Judge Perez who never even momentarily faltered or hesitated. Even today when there are those who would settle for less than what rightfully belongs to them, Judge Perez stands as the uncompromising foe who of any individual or any group who would take an infinitesimal part of that which rightfully belongs to the individual States.

Fighters like Judge Perez are necessarily positive and determined men. Their objective is the success of their cause and not the niceties and subtleties of the suave compromiser or the clever manipulator. These kind of men and these kind of leaders fight to the death for that in which they believe. So it is with Judge Perez, and better is his State and his Nation for such a fighter. There are those who will disagree with him but there are none who will challenge his courage and his determination nor his resourcefulness in battle. I again salute him.

Here are the series of the New Orleans Times-Picayune editorials to which I have referred:

ALL WANT MINERALS MONEY; FLOW SHOULD BE INCREASED

Three recent developments in the situation affecting revenues received by the State of Louisiana from offshore minerals, it seems to us, merit extended comment.

First of these was the repeated statement by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay that Louisiana's tidelands claim is one based on a 3-league, rather than a 3-mile limit. Although, after prompting, the Secretary said that he had intended to testify before the House Appropriations Committee that the Federal Government claims title to submerged lands beyond a line 3 miles from the Louisiana coast, his actual testimony to the contrary appears to us to have been significant.

The second of the developments was the issuance of a statement by Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general of Louisiana, that the State will go to court relatively soon to sustain Louisiana's boundaries. It is and should be the State's contention, in our opinion, that the Louisiana boundary is 3 leagues, slightly more than 10 miles, beyond the coastline.

Third of the developments was a continuing action by State and city agencies to find ways to spend the money which Louisiana

is receiving from offshore minerals. Most recent of the spending suggestions was a recommendation by city officials of New Orleans that tidelands oil revenues be used to pay part of the cost of a new incinerator here.

For many months this newspaper has contended that first call on money received through the sale of the State's mineral wealth should be conceded to elimination or reduction of the staggering State debt.

To exhaust the mineral resources of Louisiana without reducing the debt of Louisiana, we submit, would be worse than folly.

The joint committee of the Louisiana Legislature which is headed by Senator W. M. Rainach has accepted suggestions that tidelands money be used to retire the public debt, with amendments.

This committee believes that the money should be used three ways: One-third to retire the State debt, one-third to improve the State school system, and one-third to build and maintain highways.

A firm dedication of the minerals revenue to the purposes recommended by this committee, it seems to us, would be wise. Certainly it would prevent dissipation of the windfall which won't last forever to pay inflated current expenses.

In the first quarter of 1955, royalties, bonuses and rentals received by the State from its mineral lands aggregated $33,908,-707. These figures were obtained from the office of Mrs. Ellen Bryan Moore, register of the State land office.

Of this income, slightly more than $14,-800,000 was from offshore minerals and more than $19 million was from inshore royalties, bonuses and rentals.

If the rate of the first quarter is continued throughout 1955, the State's income from its minerals—exclusive of severance taxes—will exceed $130 million.

This income, of course, is tremendous; but in the opinion of students of the situation, Louisiana still is not receiving its just returns from minerals being severed from submerged lands off its shores.

One of these students, Leander H. Perez, is convinced that a positive stand by the State to protect its claim to all lands within its historic boundaries should substantially increase the revenue realized by the State from its minerals.

An elaboration of this thesis will be presented in succeeding editorials in this series.

DOES STATE GET JUST SHARE?

As interpreted by laymen, including President Eisenhower, the Tidelands Act of 1953 was intended to restore to the coastal States their offshore lands whose title was placed in question by a United States Supreme Court decision. This decision held that the Federal Government had "paramount rights" in these lands.

To a large degree, the desired result has been achieved. Enactment of the legislation which had support of the Eisenhower administration opened up development of offshore oil and gas fields which had been halted by the efforts of the Truman administration to take over the tidelands for the Central Government.

In the first quarter of 1955 the State of Louisiana received approximately $15 million as its share of royalties, rentals, and bonuses from offshore mineral leases.

The greater number of these leases, if not all of them, were within 3 miles of the State's coastal line—that is the coastline established by the United States Coast Guard as marking the end of inland waters and the beginning of the open sea.

Despite the language of the Tidelands Act referring to the State's coast, lessees holding mineral leases within this coastline established by the United States Coast Guard paid oil royalties to the Federal Government, instead of to the State on approximately 20 million barrels of petroleum produced under 42 State leases up to December 1954.

Collection of this revenue by the Federal Government, as we see the situation, reflects an attitude in Washington which is not justified by existing or past circumstances.

We believe that the State is entitled to revenues from all lands between its shores and a line 3 leagues beyond its coastline. Certainly, as we understand the situation, Louisiana is entitled to all revenues from lands within its coastline.

The Federal position, it seems to us, is founded on a contention that there is something indefinite or obscure about the phrase "coastline."

Under an act of February 1807, Congress authorized the President to cause a survey to be taken "of the coast of the United States, in which shall be designated the islands and shoals, with the roads or places of anchorage, within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

This act, obviously, emphasized the difference between "shores" and "coast or coastline."

Under a later act of Congress the United States Coast Guard was authorized to, and did, establish the coastline of Louisiana—as well as of other States. This line is the same line as that redefined under Louisiana law. It extends from Chandeleuer Lighthouse in a curved line following established aids to navigation, including Pass-a-Loutre lighted whistle buoy 4, South Pass lighted whistle buoy 2, Southwest Pass entrance channel lighted whistle buoy, Ship Shoal lighthouse, Calcasieu Pass lighted whistle buoy 1, and Sabine Pass lighted whistle buoy 1.

Some of the revenues going to the Federal Government instead of to the State government are from leases on submerged lands within this well-defined coast line.

When Attorney General Fred S. LeBlanc goes to court to "sustain Louisiana's boundaries," it seems to us he should seek to establish the State's claim to this particular mineral revenue.

LOUISIANA'S CLAIM TO LAND 3 LEAGUES FROM COAST

Under the Tidelands Act of 1953 "title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters" were "vested in and assigned to" the respective States.

A section of the Tidelands Act provided further that the "seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline." This section provided also, however, States admitted to the Union after its original formation might establish such boundaries but that "nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by the Constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore approved by Congress."

The latter provision apparently was intended particularly for the benefit of Texas, which was a republic before it became a State—under a treaty establishing its boundary 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, beyond its coast line.

This provision appears to us to apply also to Louisiana, giving this State title to submerged lands 3 leagues beyond its coast line.

Reason for this interpretation is the language of the act of Congress of April 8, 1812, under which Louisiana became a State of the Union.

This act of admission established the seaward boundary of the new State at "three leagues of the coast."

That the Congress acknowledged that it could neither take away from nor add to a State's territory was manifested a few days later, on April 14, 1812. On this date the Congress added to Louisiana lands which had been claimed by Spain, which are known today as the Florida parishes, "in case the Legislature of the State of Louisiana shall consent thereto."

The Louisiana Legislature subsequently did "consent to" the Florida parishes being added to the State.

In view of the language of the act which admitted Louisiana as a State and of Congress' acknowledgment that it lacked the power to take from or add to a State's territory, without its consent, it seems to us clear that Louisiana had a boundary more than three miles beyond its coastline "at the time such State became a member of the Union."

During prohibition it was generally understood that the Federal Government had no jurisdiction "beyond the 3-mile limit." This understanding was shaken, of course, by the "I'm Alone" case—in which the rum-running boat I'm Alone was captured far beyond this "3-mile" limit.

Whatever the origin of this popular conception or misconception, it has no support in the language of the 1783 Treaty of Independence, which settled the Revolutionary War and fixed the boundaries of States then bordering the Atlantic Ocean and the Great Lakes.

Probably because the Atlantic coast States had substantial interest in fishing, the boundaries of the original States touching that coast were fixed by the treaty at "20 leagues from shore" into the Atlantic Ocean.

The Continental Congress on August 4, 1779, had instructed the treaty commissioners of the Continental Congress to insist on the 20-league boundary as an ultimatum.

Before Louisiana was admitted as a State, with a boundary three leagues from its coast, the area of the Louisiana territory—as shown by early maps—extended even farther into the Gulf of Mexico, to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

It seems to us that State officials are obligated to maintain Louisiana's right to the submerged lands three leagues beyond its coastline.

SHOULD RESIST BUREAUCRAT ATTEMPTS TO FIX BOUNDARIES

Several years ago, during the Truman administration, an agent of the United States Department of the Interior prepared a map of the coast showing where the Department believed Louisiana State jurisdiction ended and Federal jurisdiction began.

This newspaper published that map, with the comment that—by strange coincidence—the line drawn by the agent to divide State lands from Federal lands cut across the entrances of bays in which there was no oil production but drove deep into bays and coves where there were producing oil wells.

Judging by dispatches from Washington, there still are employees in the Interior Department who think that they have the power to determine where Louisiana's lands stop and where Federal lands begin.

As a matter of record, the Federal Government had little, if any, interest in the so-called tidelands until oil was discovered in submerged lands off the shores of California and Louisiana.

Also as a matter of record, the Federal Congress never has given to the Department of the Interior the power to establish State boundaries or, for that matter, to fix coastlines. Congress first made the President responsible for establishing coastlines. Later the responsibility was shifted, by law, to the Secretary of the Treasury and then to

the Secretary of Commerce and, finally, in 1946, to the commandant of the Coast Guard.

An attempt was made to legally authorize the Secretary of the Interior to "define and publish lines" marking areas of State jurisdiction, but this authority was taken out of the Tidelands Act of 1953 before its final passage.

Nevertheless, Washington correspondents, including this newspaper's Paul Wooton, have been informed that the Department of the Interior is having its agents make aerial pictures, draw maps, and perform other work to "establish State boundaries." This apparently is being done on the theory that the Department of the Interior has authority to decide what oil belongs to the States and what oil belongs to the Federal Government when petroleum is produced from offshore lands.

This theory, we contend, has no basis in law and should be discarded, in addition, on the basis of practical considerations. The record of the department of the interior in handling Federal oil lands, before the adoption of the Tidelands Act of 1953 and of the companion statute which provided for the department's leasing of mineral lands in the outer continental shelf, was far from brilliant. Federal oil lands were leased for 50 cents per acre when adjoining State and private lands were leased for many dollars per acre.

Just because the Federal department received a surprising $250 million when it opened its first bids for leases on the Outer Continental Shelf—after adopting bidding procedures formerly used only by the States—is no justification for it to follow bureaucratic precedent and try to take in more territory than the law allows.

The only authority which the interior department has to justify its recent actions is an interim agreement reached with Gov. Robert F. Kennon and members of the State mineral board.

This "interim agreement" was reached, dispatches reported, "in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation" on September 28, 1954, to prevent State and Interior Department officials from seeking bids for leases on the same tracts of land.

At that time Governor Kennon said that the State government and the Federal Government should seek some agreement on what is the shoreline of Louisiana. Since the Tidelands Act is concerned with the State's coastline, rather than its shoreline, and since the Coast Guard definitely has established the State's coastline, it is difficult for us to comprehend why officials of either the Federal Government or the State government should be bothering about a shoreline.

The Tidelands Act itself defines coastline as the seaward limit of inland waters. This is the line as defined and established by the Coast Guard and, obviously, is a definite line. In most places the Louisiana shoreline is an indefinite, shifting line—depending on tides, wave wash, accretion and other factors.

The full definition of coastline contained in the Tidelands Act is: "The term 'coastline' means the line of ordinary low water along the portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters."

As we view the situation, there is nothing vague or complicated about this definition.

Since the act of Congress which admitted Louisiana as a State in 1812 fixed its seaward boundary within 3 leagues of coast, since the Coast Guard established the State's coast line, and since the Tidelands Act restored to the States lands within their historic boundaries, there seems to us no justification for discussion of shore lines or other factors which should have no bearing on the matter.

The "interim agreement" reached by the State and Federal officials, we believe, should be discarded in favor of a permanent agreement, in which the Department of the Interior should recognize the realities of both the letter and spirit of the Tidelands Act of 1953.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, in an appearance before the House Appropriations Committee, recently said that 3 leagues, instead of 3 miles, applied to Louisiana as well as to Texas—in the determination of off-coast State boundaries.

The printed report of the executive hearing contained the following:

"Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask you further about the drilling off the coast of Louisiana. This is, of course, outside the limit of 3½ miles.

"Secretary MCKAY. It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. I was under the impression that the 3 leagues only applied in the case of Texas.

"Secretary MCKAY. It applies both in the case of Texas and Louisiana.

"Mr. MAGNUSON. It applies in both States?

"SECRETARY MCKAY. Yes, sir.

An attorney for the Interior Department immediately expressed belief that Secretary McKay had made a "slip of the tongue." Next day Secretary McKay wrote the committee chairman saying that the Department supports the contention that the Federal Government owns lands "3 geographical miles off the coast of Louisiana."

Secretary McKay, it seems to us, was correct when he said, "It is 3 leagues down there, Congressman MAGNUSON."

A Congressman's Periodical Report to the People of Cleveland and Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert my address delivered over radio station WHK, Cleveland, on April 24, titled "A Congressman's Periodical Report to the People of Cleveland and Ohio":

During the past week there have been many interesting and indeed important events on the Washington scene. There have been developments in the international field, with which we are very much concerned, because they have a direct bearing on the security and well-being of each and every American.

Last week was highlighted by a dinner honoring SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, which brought together some 3,500 leaders of the Democratic Party from all 48 States. Former President Truman was among the speakers and he gave every evidence that he had lost none of his old fire and persuasiveness as a campaigner. There was an atmosphere which gave every indication that the rank and file membership of the Democratic Party is looking forward to a new and inspired leadership within the ranks of the party. The inspiration of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and Woodrow Wilson was in abundant evidence at this national Democratic dinner and I have every reason to believe that the party will present to the people in 1956 a program based upon the great ideals expressed by Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson. The Democratic Party, by its tradition, has offered the best leadership toward the goal of world peace with freedom and justice for all.

Congress debated the appropriation bill for the United States Information Agency. During the debate, I made one basic criticism. My criticism was that we have failed to fully understand the tremendous power for good inherent in the United States information programs and the relationship they have to the urgent question of peace or war. I believe that most Americans are agreed that the crisis which now grips the world is best described as a struggle for the hearts, the minds, and the allegiance of all the people of the world. On the one hand, the forces of human freedom of which we are a leading part, seek to show all the people of the world that they can attain their aspirations more quickly and more surely by their association with us. On the other hand, the evil forces of despotism as represented by Communist imperialism, seek to lull mankind into a deep slumber during which time the chains of slavery will be thrown over the entire world. In this struggle, I brought to the attention of the Members of the House that the Russians spent somewhere between $1 billion and $1½ billion a year on their false propaganda programs as compared with $77 million appropriated last year for all our information programs.

As a practical example of the way Russian propaganda works, I pointed out that in 1953 alone, the Russian Communists published over 1 billion propaganda books in 40 different languages which were used to penetrate every nation on the face of the globe. These publications put out in pamphlet and book form, sold for a price of from 5 cents to 50 cents—books which obviously would cost several dollars to reproduce—but which the Russians subsidize in order to promote their propaganda line.

I reminded Members that it did not take Congress long to recognize that there was great power for good or for evil in the new force called nuclear energy, which caused Congress to establish a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make certain that this great force would be kept in the hands of the American people. I, therefore, urged that Congress establish a joint committee on international information programs in order that they might be placed on a level and scope commensurate with their importance to the urgent question of peace or war. There is no doubt in my mind that ideals such as we Americans cherish and their transmission to the multitudes of people throughout the free world, form a weapon in the struggle between the forces of human freedom and those of Russian slavery, which ideals may, in the end, be more powerful and conclusive than nuclear energy. I intend to push this measure in Congress until there is created such a joint committee, because I believe we have a lot to learn in the field of propaganda if we are to make rapid progress toward our national goal of peace with freedom.

On January 24 I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to testify on H. R. 1. H. R. 1 is the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, a bill to extend the trade agreements authority of the President for another 3 years, and among other things, to permit him to negotiate tariff reductions up to 5 percent during that period. At the time this bill was first under consideration there was strong indication on the Washington scene that Harold Stassen, who has just been relieved of his duties in connection with the Foreign Operations Administration, was advocating either the giving or selling of our surplus food stocks to the Russian despots. He was advocating this ill-advised maneuver under the slogan—"Barter Butter for Manganese." From my long-time study of the Russian Communist empire and the struggles of the enslaved people against their rulers, I felt compelled to appear before the House Ways and Means Committee to impress upon them that if we were to give or sell any of our surplus food

stocks to the Russian despots, we would be doing a great disservice to the enslaved people who are struggling to defeat communism and to regain their freedom and independence. I also pointed out that one of the greatest weapons the people have against the despotic regime is that of withholding food from the state which would bring about a crisis within the empire because food shortages bring about grave and sweeping discontent and further opposition. Several days ago Moscow admitted to the world in an editorial appearing in Pravda, leading Communist mouthpiece in Moscow, that the farmers within the Red colonial empire had wrecked the planned agricultural economy and appeared bent upon forcing a crisis within the Communist empire. Pravda revealed that the farmers are withholding more food stocks than they turn over to the state, and that these food stocks are consumed by the farmers, given to their friends, or destroyed. While Pravda called for grave punishment of all the farmers because of their wrecking the production program, by the same token it was forced to admit that the farmers of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Turkestan, and the other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union were engaged in a constant struggle against the tyrants of Moscow, and that they were doing so at grave risk to their own lives. How anyone, including Harold Stassen or others within the Eisenhower administration, could possibly think of selling or giving our surplus food stocks to the Soviet Government in light of these established facts, is beyond me. The Eisenhower administration is supposed to stand up for a program of liberating the captive non-Russian nations from communism, and it had better not be tempted by the lush profits held out by the Russians as a reward for trading or exchanging our surplus foods for their low-grade manganese.

On the international scene, a great deal of attention was focused on the Afro-Asian Conference taking place this week at Bandung, Indonesia. This is the first time in history that the nations of Asia and Africa have ever come together for the purpose of discussing common problems or common aspirations. Before this conference opened, there were some misgivings that this conference could do little more than criticize Western civilization for its past implication in colonialism and imperialism. Much of this apprehension was due to the fact that Chou En-lai, the notorious Chinese Communist conspirator, along with Nehru of India, were among the sponsors of this conference. There was no doubt in any one's mind concerning Chou En-lai and his and his evil deeds of the past, but Premier Nehru has been a big question mark in the minds of statesmen who earnestly seek peace and freedom, because of Nehru's truculence and his unquenchable thirst to become spokesman for a large segment of mankind. These misgivings have, in large measure, been dissipated, because of the courageous and foresighted stand taken by the statesmen of Egypt, Iraq, the Philippines, Pakistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Turkey, Afghanistan, and others. The leading spokesman for the people of Asia and Africa did not hesitate to identify Russian communism as a new type of colonialism—a type of colonialism far more dangerous and more tyrannical than any form of colonialism or imperialism yet visited upon the human race. Many of the great Moslem leaders spoke out with spirit, condemning communism because it denied God in the affairs of man. Still others made it clear that the new and inspiring era of national independence which has finally come to South Asia and Africa must defend itself against the new Russian colonialism—and that to preserve their national independence, these nations must develop common programs of security and economic advancement. In my opinion, the Bandung Conference boomeranged against the Russian despots and isolated the Russian stooge, Chou En-lai. Moreover, it should serve as a practical object lesson for the vacillating Nehru, whom we hope will now give up his precarious fence-sitting of neutralism and join the forces of human freedom and progress.

In my judgment, the Bandung Conference did much to break up the Communist propaganda that there is a wave of the future, namely, that Russian communism will eventually triumph and for that reason, it is smart to aline yourself and your nation with Russian communism. Russian propaganda boasts its great conquests over 800 million people covering one-third of the world's surface. This so-called wave of the future has been stopped by United States aid to Greece and Turkey, its assistance to Iran, our Berlin airlift, and our fight in Korea. The efforts of the Bandung Conference to break up the Communist free ride on the wave of the future may very well have set a new course which will, in the end, upset Moscow's timetable, for enslavement of these newly independent nations.

The House passed a bill to increase salaries of post-office employees. The administration recommended an average salary increase of 7.6 percent. However, an amendment by Congressman Moss, Democrat of California, was adopted, raising the average salary increase of 8.278 percent. The major difference created by the Moss amendment is that before the amendment was adopted the bill carried an average of only 6.7 percent increase for the majority of the employees. The Moss amendment brings the increase up to where all of the employees in the lower grades will receive approximately the same percentage of increase in their annual salaries.

The Senate Labor Subcommittee conducted hearings to increase the minimum hourly wage in interstate commerce which is now a penurious 75 cents. The administration advocates 90 cents per hour. Others more realistic to the needs of workers and heads of families and the increased cost of living advocate $1.25 per hour to which I subscribe.

The House authorized the construction of 24 combatant ships, including a new *Forrestal* type carrier, about 60,000 tons, which will be the fifth of its type. Also authorized were 3 atomic submarines, 10 auxiliary ships, and the conversion and modernizing of 28 ships, some into guided missile ships, the total cost is estimated at $1,317,000,000.

Freedom of Information as Related to the Legislative Branch of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of appearing on a panel of the American Society of Newspaper Editors to discuss the freedom of information as related to the legislative branch of the Government. I was the moderator of the panel.

Participating were William R. Matthews, publisher and editor of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., and V. M. Newton, Jr., managing editor of the Tampa Tribune of Tampa, Fla.

Little could be added to the discussion in this area which was not reflected in the papers read by the participants and myself. I believe, however, that the diversified points of view should prove of interest and benefit, especially in these particular times when there is every indication that censorship is the signpost on the road from the Pentagon.

I am presenting the statements by the participants and myself in the order which they were delivered and without comment. Each speaks for itself.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OF LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS ON A DISCUSSION PANEL OF THE RIGHT OF THE PRESS TO KNOW ABOUT LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Members of the panel, I appreciate this opportunity of participating in this discussion. As you know, I have been for many years identified with legislative inquiries. For the last 5 years, consecutively, I have been either chairman or ranking member of an investigating subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. I should like to state to you, therefore, my view of the right of the press to have access to the information obtained in these inquiries.

I stand flatly upon the proposition that the legislative business must be conducted in the open; and for dissemination of information to the public so that, in our democratic system, the weight of an informed public opinon will support and sustain legislative action.

That is a declaration of the principle and a practice which I have followed in Congress. I am supported by the long standing and historical rules of the House of Representatives. The House rules provide that "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except when the committee is marking up bills (and that, of course, means actually agreeing on the text of legislation as distinguished from legislating) or for voting (and, of course, that provision is obvious) or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session."

Thus, the House has by established usage limited executive (or closed) sessions to these three classes of matters.

The House has lately added an additional rule relating to the circumstances under which an executive session may be called, in the first instance, as follows:

"If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall (1) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and (3) receive and dispose of requests from such persons to subpena such additional witnesses."

These rules are almost identical with the rules of our subcommittee.

I have referred to these rules to indicate our tradition in the Congress for open hearings. I support that usage in a democracy for the reason that the objective of any inquiry in the Congress must be the improvement of the legislative process or the need for legislative action, corrective or otherwise.

That purpose can only be served, in my opinion, when the weight of public opinion fortifies the findings of a legislative body. Obviously no such opinion can be formed unless the public has access to information. It is upon the public and to the public that the legislature must look for its support.

Bear in mind that the Congress cannot and is not charged under the Constitution with the enforcement of laws. It has neither the facility nor the continuity to provide

for enforcement. In the case of the House, its tenure is marked by the constitutional limit of a 2-year term. Thus, the House especially must depend, as the whole of the Congress must depend, upon a clear and adequate understanding by the public of its legislative concerns, facts, and recommendations. Anything short of that norm is self-defeating.

However, there are some other very plain constitutional principles involved. While we demand unity for the public good, we respect and intend to protect the right to diversity of thought.

The right to differ within the framework of the law is as American as the soil on which we walk and the flag under which we live. The application of that principle is entitled to a full constitutional protection and must be respected in every forum, be it legislative, executive, or judicial.

The American right to differ is expressed and protected in the principle that a person because of diversity of view, or misfortune, ought not to be intimidated, defamed, or degraded in a public forum against his will. So the whole of it, in my very simple view, gets down not to a question of the right of the public to know, but to the duty of the public to protect all of its citizens, great and small, uniformly and effectively.

On the other hand, I believe we must be sparing, judicious, and conscientious in the application of the rule of secrecy; and that there are times when even this personal privilege must be subordinated when the good to be accomplished outweighs the strictly personal consideration.

For example, an individual having a contract with the Government certainly must expect that everything in relation to the contract is and ought to be a public matter.

If in the process of investigating such a relationship an individual is concerned, certainly the public interest in the enforcement of the laws of the contract between the Government and its citizens or the need for reformation of laws or regulations as disclosed by such ventures is a legitimate subject for public consideration.

Thus stated, in my very simple view, every argument stands for the disclosure of the legislative investigations. Yet I think no one would disagree with what we placed in our rules.

There have been, however, certain practices which, in my view, are to be condemned. I do not believe it is the contribution to the public good to turn a hearing of the Congress into a stage performance with the actors preening themselves before the camera; and with the viewers taking over the conduct of the proceedings. The information elicited at these hearings is for other purposes than entertainment. That type of hearing gets itself into the position where the reproduction of the hearing becomes more important than the subject under inquiry.

In our subcommittee we do not deny any member of the press the right of access to the hearings nor to any member of the pictorial media the right to reproduce what is to be seen at the hearings. On the other hand, it makes a mockery of a legislative process to have a hearing interrupted during its course by the taking of pictures or television cameras or other unseemly interruptions. In my opinion, it serves no legitimate legislative purpose. There are many hours in a day during which actors can perform outside the legislative halls.

Now, a word about release of information in executive sessions. We have provided by rule that no one member and no group of members, only a majority of our subcommittee may release the text of any such information.

Finally, I think I must say in complete candor that the dignity and decorum, the dispatch and the demeanor of persons at a hearing, are in every instance but the length and shadow of the judgment and discretion, the restraint and the capacity of the chairman and the committee conducting the inquiry. No law and few rules can cope with every human quirk. But the healthy and wholesome use of the gavel by the chairman can enforce the rules and can keep hearings within the bounds of propriety, good conduct, and public decency. And that can be done without doing violence either to the principle of open and fair dealings or full and frank discussion.

Mr. Matthews followed me with this statement:

Let me reassure you that I am an ardent worker for freedom of information. For nearly a lifetime I have been battling in its behalf as a fighter on the firing line. Some of the battles I have won; some I have lost. Most of them could have been evaded had I followed an easy-going, disinterested policy. They have cost me money and they have cost me heartaches. As long as I have a breath to breathe I will continue this same vigorous policy.

From this experience I have learned some lessons, some of them painful and some disillusioning. That is why I challenged Russ Wiggins' report a year ago. My experience has taught me that there are limits to where news media can go; limits to what they can demand in the way of freedom of information.

For instance, as a newspaper editor I insist that no news media has a right to invade the privacy of any American home or family life. That goes for the lowliest, and it reaches up to the Roosevelts and the Eisenhowers. I insist there is a right of privacy on personal and family matters that is a precious and indispensable part of the right of freedom.

These limits apply to legislative and administrative processes, from school boards up through Congress. There was a time, when I was a young crusader, that I denounced executive sessions of our city council. When such a demand worked to the advantage of articulate demagogs, while hindering rather than helping good government, I modified my stand.

Reporters of Tucson newspapers sit in on the executive sessions now but they scrupulously refrain from writing any comment on what goes on. We maintain always the fundamental policy that the public is entitled to know what is done at official meetings of any public body.

Legislatures and our Congress are entitled to a varying amount of privacy in the work done by their committees. If committees are to function in a way that will command respect for democratic government, they must be able to do much of their work in privacy.

Important committees, such as the Committee on Appropriations, have an enormous job to do. To insist that the press and the public have a right to sit in on all such meetings ignores the give and take, the compromises that must be made, and the massive amount of detail work that must be done. Members have to be able to think aloud without the fear that some speculative question might make them look ludicrous to the public. They must be able to bargain with their fellow members. Bargains and compromises cannot be made unless much of this speculative thinking goes on. Compromises require all committee members to give in, in order to reach a conclusion. Able and sincere committee members could easily be made to look foolish by making concessions to expedite the work of the committee.

On the other hand, demagogs, of which every legislative body has a surplus, would thrive on seeing their sensational charges, their eloquent pleadings, and their irresponsible chatter, publicized. The committee is one place where they can be shut off. The floor of a legislative body is the place where they have ample opportunity to glorify themselves with their loose talk.

After all, the work of a committee is a necessary administrative procedure designed to formulate what is a proposition, a resolution, for debate upon the floor of the legislative body. With a bicameral legislature the records will show these resolutions are subject to debate and most of them are amended in some form before they become law. From what I have seen of legislative work, democratic government will be harmed, not bettered, by any requirements that all committee meetings be open and the votes of the members recorded. Members may vote one way on a committee in order to facilitate a report, and vote another way on the floor of the legislative body.

The fact is that any mandatory requirements on open meetings can be dodged by unofficial meetings in homes, clubs, hotel rooms, and private offices. No law can prohibit them. This process is used from time to time, even now, by leading members of some committees who want to thrash out their differences by frank discussion.

Much as I insist on this right of privacy of committees, I insist with equal emphasis that it is not an absolute right. There are many times when committee meetings should be open. There are times when responsible parties like the press have the right to appear and to ask questions, to demand reports, in behalf of the public welfare. Those are the times when a newspaper should take the initiative in performing a public duty, instead of begging for some law to prevent what it wants on a platter. Those are the times when editorial judgment has to be used.

As my time grows short, let me sum up:

1. I am a vigorous exponent of freedom of information, but I have learned from long experience that there are limits to what can be demanded. I am unqualifiedly opposed to this doctrine of absolute rights. A tendency of so many of us Americans to think in terms of absolutes is one of our big weaknesses.

2. The limits on freedom of information cannot be defined with a rigid line because situations vary. Editors should be expected to put their abilities, their spirit of fair play and public interest to work. Committees must have privacy to perform their routine work.

3. The decisions and the minutes of all legislative and administrative bodies should be made public or available to responsible parties.

4. Meetings of legislative committees and administrative boards should be open on demand by any responsible party where specific information on questions of high public importance should be made available.

5. Public documents, excluding the errata of informal office memoranda, should be made available to the public, when publication does not impair national security.

6. At this time, when we are doing so much shouting about freedom of information, I cannot help remarking how some of those who have done the loudest shouting boiled over in indignation at the publication of the Yalta papers.

In my opinion, the Potsdam and Cairo documents should be produced. They are historical records. National security is not involved. Unless we are now starting to write our histories so as to protect some and glorify others, the way the totalitarian powers do, these documents should be published. Some of us who took part in these great events of the past generation would like to know, before we die, what really went on.

Is this too hot a question for our own Freedom of Information Committee to handle Or must hot issues be avoided?

I think our committee ought to get busy on it, and so should those responsible for Washington news coverage, instead of waiting for a New York newspaper to crack the barrier.

Mr. Newton closed with the following remarks:

Fifteen minutes, the time allotted me here, is hardly time enough to penetrate the secrecy which enshrouds Federal Government, as any Washington correspondent will tell you today.

During 1953, congressional committees held 3,105 meetings and a survey shows that 1,357, or 44 percent, were secret meetings held behind locked doors with press and public barred.

During 1954, congressional committees held 3,002 meetings and 1,231, or 41 percent, were held behind locked doors.

Few of these secret meetings dealt with defense or security affairs. Instead, they dealt with virtually every matter before Congress. Nearly every one of the Appropriations Committee meetings, in which our public servants decided how to spend the citizen's tax funds, was held in secrecy.

Much of this legislation conceived and congealed behind the locked doors of these secret congressional committee meetings was railroaded through Congress with a minimum of debate and with little opportunity for the restraint of public opinion to be exerted. Actually, some of it did not see the light of public print until it became law.

In my correspondence with Members of the United States Senate over this matter, Senator JENNER, of Indiana, at that time chairman of the Senate Rules Committee, wrote me last April as follows:

"Another reason for the railroading of legislation through Congress is the very large role played in legislation by the bureaucracy of the executive branch. They frequently draft the bills. They write the arguments for the bills. They fill the record of hearings on bills. They have supporting groups which come in and testify to the approved line. Ordinary citizens cannot meet such well-financed, well-organized competition. It may appear as if the sentiment is all in one direction on a bill and Congress hears little or no objection, and so moves quickly to pass it."

Now when you add Senator JENNER's damning statement to the fact that nearly half of all congressional committee meetings are held secretly behind locked doors, you can reach only the conclusion that the ordinary American citizen has very little to say about our legislation. Under such a system, the ordinary American citizen is deprived by his elected representatives of his inherent right to exert constantly the pressure of public opinion upon his free Government. And any student of history soon learns that free government cannot long last in such secrecy.

Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, wrote me that the secret committee meetings were necessary to mark up bills and to prevent the Congressmen from being self-conscious and from dropping into oratory. Yet it is in the same peace and quiet of these secret meetings that amendments are tacked onto the bills and other changes made that the American people should know about at the time and not after the fact, when too often it has been too late.

Senators Holland, of my Florida, Smith of Maine, Payne, Dirksen, Gillette, Welker, Ellender, and Hendrickson expressed great and tender concern over the danger of needlessly ruining the reputations of witnesses and appointees before public meetings of the committees. But what about the case of Harry Dexter White, the Communist spy? His appointment was considered and confirmed in a secret meeting of a Senate committee and then railroaded through Congress. How in the world can the interests of the American people be properly protected unless all the facts are made public at the time and not after the fact, as in the case of White?

Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, wrote me that he felt the American people would be more informed if their legislators are allowed to work in the privacy of their own arguments. Isn't this the modern philosophy in Federal Government today, that Government belongs to our public servants, and that the American people are entitled only to that information which our public servants think they should have?

Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, wrote me that the secret meetings were necessary to protect our Congressmen from the bureaucrats and the lobbyists. But what about the protection of the American people from those same bureaucrats and lobbyists? What about giving the people a look at the bureaucrats and lobbyists in action?

Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, wrote me that the publicizing of the committee's work prior to final decision, and I use his exact words, "might lead the citizen into actions harmful to himself." In reply, I asked the Senator if he could name just one case in all history where free, open government, under the constant restraint of an alert and informed public, has "led the citizen into actions harmful to himself." On the other hand, any student can dig out of the pages of history thousands of cases wherein the politician, acting behind the locked doors of secret government, really dealt the citizen a knockout punch.

Senator BENNETT, of Utah, wrote that it would be impossible for our Congressmen to reach a compromise in a public committee meeting. This poses an interesting question. Does free American government today consist of nothing more than a secret compromise between two political parties without the restraint of the people's opinion? Isn't this a sad commentary on free government, anyway you look at it?

Later in our correspondence, Senator BENNETT wrote that if the congressional committee meetings were opened to the public, it would force the committees to adjourn to secret meetings in so-called smoke-filled rooms. In reply, I wrote that a group of Congressmen meeting unofficially in a smoke-filled room would have no official power whatsoever. They could not draw a bill; they could not vote on a bill; they could reach no official decision. And if the American people ever tumbled to the fact that our legislation was being cooked up in a smoke-filled room, I am sure that we would have a new set of public servants in Congress after the next election.

Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, suggested that I propose the plan of open meeting to the board of directors of my newspaper and invite the reporters of competitive newspapers to sit in on all meetings of our board of directors. In reply, I reminded the Senator that American citizens, through considerable taxation, are stockholders in their Government and had the right to check on the actions of their public servants just as the stockholders of a newspaper have the right to check on the actions of their board of directors.

Senator IVES, of New York, wrote me that the quiet atmosphere, divorced from the temptation of public expression or political maneuver to gain advantage in the eyes of the public was much more efficient than a public sounding board. In reply, I asked this question: Which is better for the people, the harmony of the secret communistic government in Russia, or the turbulence of free, open democratic government in America? I think the answer to this question also would answer all of the questions involved in the quiet atmosphere of any secret meeting in government. We cannot afford to sacrifice the basic freedom of our country for expediency or because another way is speedier, easier, or more efficient. The world's history shows that once you sacrifice freedom, you regain it only through bloodshed.

Of the 62 Senators with whom I corresponded on this matter, only 25 stated they were for open committee meetings. And only 11 had the courage to state outright that they were opposed to the open meetings. The others hemmed about this qualification or hawed about that reservation. Thirty did not even condescend to answer my original letter.

Now, 25 Senators are not a very high percentage of the free world's greatest legislative body in favor of the free people's inherent right to know about their Government. And it is with great sadness that I tell you, after a number of years struggling with this national problem, that many other people, including some within our profession, think that a little secret government is all right.

Yet we can no more have a little secret government than we can have a little freedom, a little justice, or a little morality. Of course, we do not have absolute freedom, absolute justice, or absolute morality today. Yet our adherence to these great absolute principles, even though we yield a little here or compromise a little there in actual practices, has given the world the greatest free civilization of all time.

And I tell you with great personal conviction that should we ever veer away from our absolute principles of freedom, justice and morality, even though we occasionally compromise them in practice and in deference to human frailties, we will consign the great American experiment to that limbo of fallen civilizations.

So I tell you also, with equal conviction, that we in the newspaper profession are deeply obligated, under the precepts of free government, to fight with all our might for the absolute principle of freedom of information; for it is only through upholding that absolute principle, in the face of human frailties, that a free people can be guaranteed the maximum of information of government, so necessary to retention of freedom.

Speaking of human frailties, I am reminded of a school board in South Georgia, which closed its doors to both press and public last year. In defending the board's action, its chairman announced to the press, and I use his exact words:

"You are crazy if you think we are going to wash our dirty linen in public."

It is a great pity that we do not have such unadulterated honesty in our Federal Government today. There is, for instance, the question of our national security. No editor of the free American press will question the right of the free American Government to withhold that news which would endanger national security and give aid and comfort to the enemy. But every editor will question the right of the Federal politician to abuse this privilege by the withholding of legitimate news in the name of national security but which has nothing to do with national security.

Last May the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee locked its doors and held secret deliberations on the bill for a separate Air Academy. I wrote Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, then the chairman of the committee, about the matter of these locked doors. He replied that this was a classified matter and then he arrogantly demanded to know what right I had even in writing him. Yet as an American citizen who pays taxes, I could not help but wonder what political pressures were being exerted back of those locked doors, first by rival armed services, and second, over the matter of a site for the new academy. And certainly the complete revelation of all the facts and discussions on this important matter would not have given aid and comfort to the enemy.

I could go on for hours and hours citing similar cases wherein our Federal politicians have abused their privileges in the regulations to protect our national security. But

my time is limited and before I close, I would like to dwell for a moment upon what the precedent of secret Government in our Congress has done to the rest of American Government.

Our Congressmen may think a little secret Government in their committees is all right, yet this precedent has so spread in Washington today that we have developed a new philosophy of government. In most of our 2,000 Federal executive agencies and bureaus, Government largely is conducted behind the locked doors of the secret executive session; legitimate facts and records of Government are withheld; and the people are spoon-fed information only in the form of handout releases from Government press agents, which often are propaganda carefully devised to promote and prolong the political life and interests of the officeholder. More and more, our public servants, once elected or appointed, assume that the people's business is their private domain and that any critical voice raised against this philosophy is that of a deadly enemy.

Sixteen months ago President Eisenhower revised President Truman's Executive order giving the right to certain Federal officials to withhold facts of Government in behalf of national security. He eliminated the classification "restricted" but retained the three classifications of "confidential," "secret," and "top secret."

This should have released a mass of information, particularly from the Department of Defense, but it didn't work out this way. On June 1, 1954, a Department of Defense directive created a new classification for official use only, and it set forth the purpose to assure the proper custody, preservation and use of official information which requires protection in the public interest.

The Department of State a short time later adopted this same new classification of for official use only, and then stamped it upon even its press clippings.

But, in view of the precedent of congressional committee secrecy on matters of the people's business not concerned with national security, why shouldn't our other Federal governmental agencies protect the public by barring the people from even looking at the press clippings they save?

Why shouldn't the appointed public servants of the executive branch of our Government lock out the people from their procedures if the elected public servants of the legislative branch can get away with it? Where shall we draw the line on a little secret government?

Furthermore, the congressional precedent of secrecy is spreading to the lower levels of American Government. And, when a Georgia school board and North Carolina legislators rise up and announce that they are going to deliberate their people's business in secrecy just so long as Congress deliberates the American people's business in committee secrecy, then I say in all sincerity that the time has come for our Congressmen to examine their consciences over the matter of freedom of information, or the American people's right to know about their Government.

Thank you.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 25, 1955)

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

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

Gracious God, our Father, whose still, small voice invites us to turn aside from the feverish ways of the world and whose tender love bids us find our strength in Thee: We are conscious as we bow at this altar of Thy grace that if we live a life of prayer Thou art present everywhere. Amid the draining duties of these demanding days, by the spiritual resources that are found in Thee alone may our jaded spirits be refreshed and our souls restored.

Endow and enrich Thy servants in this national body with wisdom and purity of motive in the ministry of public affairs. Make them worthy of the Nation's trust in these days so fraught with destiny.

"We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives,
That freedom shall not die;
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace:
Almighty God on high."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 25, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. REES of Kansas, and Mr. CORBETT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

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

H. R. 2839. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4356. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE—POSTAL PAY RAISE BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from tomorrow until the evening of May 3, 1955, the reason being that I am going to New Mexico, Arizona, and California on hearings regarding juvenile delinquency among the Navaho, Hopi, and other tribes of Indians, and it is necessary that I be absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, a while ago I heard the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] make a request for leave of absence from tomorrow until May 3. I wish to call this request to the attention of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to ask him if he has any plans for calling the committee together to consider the question of a conference on the post office pay raise bill, which has passed both the House and the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas, may I say that it is hoped we will be holding conference meetings.

Mr. CARLSON. If that is the situation, I urge the chairman of the committee to consider the appointment of a Senator to take the place of the Senator from North Dakota, in order that some action may be obtained on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to assure the Senator from Kansas that I shall expedite the matter as much as possible. If the House agrees to go to conference before the time the Senator from North Dakota is due to return, I shall appoint another Senator to take the place of the Senator from North Dakota.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee, the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEATH OF HON. H. H. SCHWARTZ, FORMER SENATOR FROM WYOMING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to announce to the Senate the death on last Sunday at Casper, Wyo., of a former Member of this body, the Honorable H. H. Schwartz, United States Senator from the State of Wyoming during the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses. Prior to his election to this body in 1936 he was a member of the State Senate of the State of Wyoming. Earlier in his career before he began the practice of law he was in public service in the Department of Interior as a member of the field service of the General Land Office. In every office which he ever filled he was a distinguished public servant, a man of public spirit, and one who made friends in every circle to which life called him. His death last Sunday will be noted with great