The Digest, in the Leslie Miller-Holman Harvey article, has picked up a long list of old, widely disseminated, but quite answerable statements made by California propagandists in an effort to frustrate use of Colorado river water by Arizona. The facts concerning these things were available to Mr. Harvey and presumably also to Mr. Miller. Certainly, in any publication office as large and as important as the Digest's some research checking should be performed to avoid carelessly reproducing outright misstatements of fact.

I have written Dewitt Wallace, editor of the Digest, suggesting to him that if the Digest has an honest intention of thoroughly discussing reclamation, there are several outstanding writers capable of handling the stories factually. I wish every person who knows reclamation's true story of benefits would also write him.

The Digest has done a disservice to the entire nation, and particularly to the business of reputable gathering, checking, and publishing of factual information.

[From the Arizona Daily Star of April 11, 1955]

A DISTORTED STORY

The Reader's Digest, with its multimillion circulation, wields powerful editorial influence in the United States. When this power is used to promote a special-interest group it can become a telling weapon.

In the May issue, we see the unfortunate spectacle of the Digest not only promoting a special-interest group, but doing so with a disregard for facts which is surprising in a publication with the reputation the Digest enjoys.

In an article entitled "Dollars Into Dust" the Digest launches an attack on reclamation in the United States, and therein devotes several paragraphs to the Central Arizona project.

The article is carried under the bylines of Lselie A. Miller and Holman Harvey. Mr. Miller is a former Governor of Wyoming, and Chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Group on Reclamation and Water Supply, and as such his name will carry great weight with those who read the article.

Unfortunately, it was Mr. Harvey, and not Mr. Miller, who visited Arizona gathering data for this report.

At the time he was here, Mr. Harvey was supplied with the facts about the Central Arizona project. None of these appeared in the article.

To the contrary, the paragraphs devoted to the Central Arizona project are based almost completely on distortions created by California interests who are battling the Arizona project with every means at their disposal.

And it is to the credit of these California interests, as propagandists, that they have been able to sell their distortions to a magazine with the circulation, influence, and reputation of the Digest. The article will mean much to the campaign they are waging.

The Central Arizona Project Association realizes how much this article can hurt Arizona, and answered the allegations in an article carried in yesterday's Star quoting David Brinegar, its executive secretary.

Unfortunately, such an article published in Arizona can do almost nothing to remedy the damage done by the Digest article, and with that realization, the association has written the Digest asking whether it is interested in publishing a fair appraisal of reclamation, and the Central Arizona project, or whether this biased and inaccurate report is to go unanswered in its pages.

Whether through careless reporting and editing, or through intentional distortion, the Digest stands now in the position of pulling southern California's chestnuts out of the fire, and using the half-truths and untruths from California's own battle guide.

Whether the Digest is going to remedy the damage it has unfairly done to Arizona, and at the same time to its own reputation for accuracy and fairness, remains to be seen.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1955

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

O God our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, from whom no secrets are hid: Help us in this opening moment of a new week's council to draw near to Thee in tranquillity, in humility, and sincerity. With Thy benediction may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and truth.

In this dear land of our love and prayer, may we close our national ranks in a new unity, as sinister powers without pity or conscience plot to destroy the birthright of our liberty of worship and speech and the sanctity of the individual. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 2, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN STENNIS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4904) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Minimum Wages of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. I have cleared the matter with the minority leader.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the following nominations for appointments in the Army and in the Navy, all of which were received on April 25, 1955, and which were favorably reported by Mr. STENNIS and ordered to be placed on the Vice President's desk, for the information of the Senate:

Donald Arthur Andrews and 325 other cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army as second lieutenants, effective June 3, 1955, upon their graduation.

Jerry L. Hoover and 134 other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army.

Paul I. Abernathy, Jr., and 1,559 other nominations for appointment as ensign in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, coming from this year's Naval Academy graduates, as well as from a group of ROTC and Reserve appointments in the Navy and Marine Corps.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be subject to the usual limitation of 2 minutes on statements made in connection therewith.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 41)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the fiscal year 1956, in the amount of $350,000, for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, covering the period July-December 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TOTAQUINE

A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 7,818,272 ounces of totaquine now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS OF PYRETHRUM

A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 60,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stock pile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN NONIMMIGRANT ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on temporary admission into the United States of certain nonimmigrant aliens under section 212 (a) (28) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Carlos Aravantinos from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on August 2, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, with drawing the name of Fu-Huan Fang from a report relating to the temporary admission of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PUEBLO OF SAN LORENZO, N. MEX.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris) in New Mexico, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for the construction and improvement of highways necessary for civil defense purposes

"Whereas the rapid development of more efficient atomic weapons capable of a tremendous destructive force over a wide area, and of both piloted and guided aircraft to deliver these deadly missiles to any spot on the globe, has rendered every population and industrial center in this country susceptible to sudden attack by enemy forces with the catastrophic results; and

"Whereas it is obvious that if any of the great population or industrial centers of our country is the victim of an enemy bombing attack, the roads and highways leading out of such center will assume tremendous importance, since they will be used before the attack, if there is any warning thereof, to evacuate as many persons as possible, and will be used after the immediate devastation subsides to evacuate the wounded and homeless, to move in needed medical personnel and equipment, and for movement of military troops and equipment; and

"Whereas it is essential that as many such roads and highways as possible be constructed and improved to standards which will enable them to be put to the most effective use for the purposes described above in the event of enemy attack and thereby minimize to a great extent the loss of life and disruption of transportation and communication which will result from such an attack; and

"Whereas the present program of Federal aid for construction and improvement of highways is an important step toward the ultimate completion of an integrated system of adequate roads and highways throughout the Nation, but is limited, to a great extent, to the major roads and highways only; and

"Whereas there are many roads and highways which, while not presently considered major roads or highways for the purpose of Federal aid, are vitally essential when considered in the light of civil defense needs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a program for the extension of Federal aid for the construction of roads and highways necessary for civil defense purposes and to ap-

propriate funds to carry out this program; and be it further

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

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 10

"Resolution commending the select committee appointed by the 33d legislation session of the house of representatives, and directing the legislative research committee to study the laws of North Dakota relating to mill storage of grain, and to confer with surrounding States on the problems of mill storage

"Whereas the 1953 session of the house of representatives deemed it advisable to appoint an interim committee to investigate the practices of mill storage grain and to report their findings to the 34th session of said house of representatives; and

"Whereas the said committee, at great sacrifice of their time and convenience, have made exhaustive and minute study of said charged practices, the result of which have revealed flagrant violations and misuse of mill storage grain: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the 34th session of the house of representatives directs that a copy of the select committee's report be forwarded to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, to the Attorney General of the United States, to the Governor of North Dakota, and to the Public Service Commission of North Dakota, and that a copy of this resolution accompany each report as directed above.

"Whereas such select committee found that the practice of mill storage of grain was widespread throughout North Dakota, and that such practice depresses the market of small grains grown in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives,* That the legislative research committee is hereby authorized and directed to study the laws of the State of North Dakota relating to mill storage practices, and to recommend improvements in such laws and the enforcement thereof; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the legislative research committee confer with similar bodies in the States of Montana, South Dakota, and Minnesota for the purpose of developing sound laws to prevent the practice of mill storage, thereby improving the market price of durum, hard spring wheat, flax, and other small grains grown in this area, and that the legislative research committee make its report and recommendations to the 35th legislative assembly in such form as it may deem expedient; be it further

"*Resolved,* That this house of representatives, as a body, commend the efforts of Representatives Snortland; Erickson, of Burke-Divide; and Rolfsrud; members of said select committee.

"K. A. FITCH,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"KENNETH L. MORGAN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution adopted by the executive board, Holy Name Society of St. Francis of Assisi, R. C., Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Woodhaven Council, No. 1866, Knights of Columbus, of Woodhaven; St. Kilian's Council, No. 2204, Knights of Columbus, of Farmingdale; Bishop McDonald Council, No. 2324, Knights of Columbus, of Babylon; and Patchogue Council, No. 725, Knights of Columbus, of Patchogue, all in the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Zita Bakowski, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Hawaiian Government Employees' Association, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the appointment of Calvin C. Mcgregor for the position of judge of the United States District Court of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Resolutions of the House of Representatives 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 bicyles 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."

Resolutions of the House of Representatives 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."

TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OVER ELLIS ISLAND TO STATE OR CITY OF NEW YORK — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the State Legislature of New York recently adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to cede to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over Ellis Island so that local authorities might use the facilities there as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island to be used as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics

Whereas the Federal Government has recently abandoned the use of the lands, properties, and facilities located at Ellis Island, in the harbor of the city of New York, which it has operated for many years as a center for the reception, care, custody and processing of persons immigrating into this country; and

Whereas the said lands, properties, and facilities are no longer being operated or maintained by the Federal Government for any purpose whatsoever and unless properly and continuously maintained they will inevitably deteriorate through nonuse and will ultimately become obsolete, uninhabitable, and valueless for any purpose; and

Whereas the State of New York and the city of New York are in dire need of additional facilities for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and

Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York as manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the legislature that the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island are ideally suitable for and can be readily converted into a well-equipped clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics to be operated and maintained by the State or the city of New York or jointly by both the State and the city of New York: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the Senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to cede and grant to the State of New York and/or the city of New York jurisdiction over and/or the title to all of the lands, properties, and facilities at Ellis Island, formerly used by the Federal Government as a reception center for immigrants, for use by the State and/or the city of New York as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; and be it further

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

urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the Assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In the senate April 1, 1955; concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF INDIGENT PEOPLE—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation granting Federal aid to States and cities for medical care of indigent people.

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 a bill filed in Congress by Congressman REED would grant Federal aid to States and cities for medical care for medically indigent people and the welfare program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board favor this bill and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman LANE and Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY.

EXEMPTION OF PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM FEDERAL REGULATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park, Minn., the fourth largest city in the State of Minnesota. The resolution protests against the enactment of the so-called Harris bill, to exclude the producers of natural gas from Federal control.

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 memorializing the Congress of the United States in opposition to the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560)

Whereas the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park has given consideration to the provisions of the so-called Harris bill (H. R. 4560); and

Whereas the city of St. Louis Park is a rapidly growing suburb of the city of Minneapolis, having a population in excess of 35,000 inhabitants residing for the most part in residences which have been constructed in the last 10 years and which are heated by natural gas, the cost of such heating in this climate being a substantial item in the budget of every householder; and

Whereas it appears to the city council that there is not a truly competitive market in the producing gas fields which constitute the supply of natural gas for this area, and that effective control of rates by the Federal Power Commission must necessarily include control of the prices paid to producers and owners of sources of supply; and

Whereas the city council concludes that it may be assumed that the Federal Power Commission will properly take into account the risks involved in exploration for oil and natural gas in determining the prices of natural gas under its jurisdiction: Therefore be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park, That the Congress of the United States be hereby memorialized in opposition to the passage of the so-called Harris bill or any legislation having as its object the limitation of jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission with respect to prices and rates paid for natural gas to producers and owners of sources of supply; and be it further

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of St. Louis Park requests the members of Congress from Minnesota to exert their efforts in opposition to this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be directed to submit forthwith a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 266. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain property of the United States Government (in the Wyoming National Guard Camp Guernsey target and maneuver area, Platte County, Wyo.) to the State of Wyoming; with amendments (Rept. No. 260).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 5085. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 261).

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

S. 1488. A bill relating to the payment of money orders; with amendments (Rept. No. 262).

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of March 1955 and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, together with a statement prepared by me.

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

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

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

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,355,810	2,353,908	+1,902	$754,426	$779,256	−$24,830
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,174,295	1,171,482	+2,813	383,073	392,765	−9,692
Department of Defense	1,181,515	1,182,426	−911	371,353	386,491	−15,138
Inside continental United States	2,134,994	2,129,235	+5,759			
Outside continental United States	220,816	224,673	−3,857			
Industrial employment	719,556	720,169	−613			
Foreign nationals	341,342	340,182	+1,160	25,139	25,780	−641

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands of dollars)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	73,318	71,330	1,988		$20,652	$21,967		$1,315
Commerce [1]	44,502	43,816	686		16,173	16,886		713
Health, Education, and Welfare	38,901	[2] 38,449	452		13,370	13,439		69
Interior	50,546	49,992	554		17,102	18,105		1,003
Justice	30,225	30,256		31	11,835	12,684		849
Labor	4,923	4,913	10		1,954	2,024		70
Post Office	504,434	506,090		1,656	165,419	164,164	$1,255	
State	20,758	20,740	18		6,349	6,713		364
Treasury	82,826	82,182	644		29,127	30,095		968
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	279	270	9		131	140		9
Bureau of the Budget	427	425	2		243	260		17
Council of Economic Advisers	31	32		1	20	26		6
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	68	1		23	21	2	
National Security Council [3]	26	27		1	15	15		
Office of Defense Mobilization	288	296		8	146	145	1	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5			3	3		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions [4]	8		8					
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	16	11	5		3	5		2
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	4	4			1		1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	797	795	2		90	99		9
Atomic Energy Commission	6,036	6,040		4	2,693	2,861		168
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	590	586	4		235	243		8
Civil Aeronautics Board	537	534	3		254	272		18
Civil Service Commission	3,879	3,938		59	1,526	1,617		91
Commission of Fine Arts	10	[2] 10			1	1		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	61		2	23	26		3
Defense Transport Administration	17	16	1		8	8		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	143	137	6		71	74		3
Farm Credit Administration	1,096	1,088	8		481	497		16
Federal Civil Defense Administration	713	700	13		310	319		9
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8			4	7		3
Federal Communications Commission	1,080	1,079	1		494	522		28
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,097	1,084	13		417	450		33
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	352	354		2	208	215		7
Federal Power Commission	620	626		6	288	303		15
Federal Trade Commission	581	587		6	300	306		6
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	173	176		3	67	77		10
Foreign Operations Administration	6,395	[2] 6,292	103		2,719	2,871		152
General Accounting Office	5,734	5,773		39	2,201	2,313		112
General Services Administration	25,756	25,786		30	7,564	8,000		436
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4		4	4		
Government Printing Office	6,834	6,785	49		2,525	2,678		153
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,815	10,504	311		4,047	4,340		293
Indian Claims Commission	14	14			9	9		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,802	1,810		8	783	838		55
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3			1	1		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,294	7,238	56		2,910	3,049		139
National Capital Housing Authority	278	283		5	87	92		5
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21			10	9	1	
National Gallery of Art	316	311	5		89	90		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,150	1,149	1		538	575		37
National Mediation Board	110	111		1	70	72		2
National Science Foundation	257	175	82		85	81	4	
National Security Training Commission	6	8		2	4	4		
Panama Canal	15,401	15,618		217	3,378	3,398		20
Railroad Retirement Board	2,401	2,438		37	784	829		45
Renegotiation Board	536	584		48	316	335		19
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	21			11	13		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	28	20	8		11	11		
Securities and Exchange Commission	687	689		2	342	359		17
Selective Service System	7,113	7,136		23	1,492	1,564		72
Small Business Administration	745	749		4	366	368		2
Smithsonian Institution	635	640		5	202	209		7
Soldiers' Home	988	973	15		179	183		4
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	36		3	20	20		
Tariff Commission	198	197	1		99	102		3
Tax Court of the United States	142	141	1		69	71		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,007	21,379		372	8,463	9,599		1,136
United States Information Agency	9,809	9,811		2	2,243	2,267		24
Veterans' Administration	178,378	178,052	326		51,416	53,822		2,406
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,174,295	1,171,482	5,390	2,577	383,073	392,765	1,264	10,956
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			2,813				9,692	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,950	1,906	44		920	953		33
Department of the Army	463,070	463,105		35	137,058	142,993		5,935
Department of the Navy	409,839	409,211	628		138,118	143,605		5,487
Department of the Air Force	306,656	308,204		1,548	95,257	98,940		3,683
Total, Department of Defense	1,181,515	1,182,426	672	1,583	371,353	386,491		15,138
Net decrease, Department of Defense			911				15,138	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,355,810	2,353,908	6,062	4,160	754,426	779,256	1,264	26,094
Net change, including Department of Defense			1,902				24,830	

[1] March figure includes 527 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 10588 dated Jan. 14, 1955.

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

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	72,135	70,178	1,957	
Commerce [1]	41,572	40,927	645	
Health, Education, and Welfare	38,359	[2] 37,908	451	
Interior	44,621	44,227	394	
Justice	29,709	29,749		40
Labor	4,815	4,810	5	
Post Office	502,090	503,746		1,656
State	5,850	5,854		4
Treasury	81,829	81,182	647	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	279	270	9	
Bureau of the Budget	427	425	2	
Council of Economic Advisors	31	32		1
Executive Mansion and Grounds	69	68	1	
National Security Council [3]	26	27		1
Office of Defense Mobilization	288	296		8
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	5	5		
President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions [4]	8		8	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Committee on Weather Control	16	11	5	
Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission	4	4		
American Battle Monuments Commission	18	16	2	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,019	6,023		4
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	590	586	4	
Civil Aeronautics Board	533	530	3	
Civil Service Commission	3,868	3,928		60
Commission of Fine Arts	10	[2] 10		
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	59	61		2
Defense Transport Administration	17	16	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	143	137	6	
Farm Credit Administration	1,084	1,076	8	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	713	700	13	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	1,051	1,052		1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,096	1,083	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	352	354		2
Federal Power Commission	620	626		6
Federal Trade Commission	581	587		6
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	173	176		3
Foreign Operations Administration	1,662	1,660	2	
General Accounting Office	5,683	5,724		41
General Services Administration	25,647	25,681		34
Government Contract Committee	14	10	4	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Government Printing Office	6,834	6,785	49	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,680	10,372	308	
Indian Claims Commission	14	14		
Interstate Commerce Commission	1,802	1,810		8
Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission	3	3		
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,294	7,238	56	
National Capital Housing Authority	278	283		5
National Capital Planning Commission	21	21		
National Galley of Art	316	311	5	
National Labor Relations Board	1,128	1,127	1	
National Mediation Board	110	111		1
National Science Foundation	257	175	82	
National Security Training Commission	6	8		2
Panama Canal	472	542		70
Railroad Retirement Board	2,401	2,438		37
Renegotiation Board	536	584		48
Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission	21	21		
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	28	20	8	
Securities and Exchange Commission	687	689		2
Selective Service System	6,914	6,935		21
Small Business Administration	745	749		4
Smithsonian Institution	633	638		5
Soldiers' Home	988	973	15	
Subversive Activities Control Board	33	36		3
Tariff Commission	198	197	1	
Tax Court of the United States	142	141	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	21,007	21,379		372
United States Information Agency	2,299	2,267	32	
Veterans' Administration	177,108	176,748	360	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,115,029	1,112,378	5,098	2,447
Net increase excluding Department of Defense			2,651	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,896	1,852	44	
Department of the Army	375,417	373,550	1,867	
Department of the Navy	378,679	378,241	438	
Department of the Air Force	263,973	263,214	759	
Total, Department of Defense	1,019,965	1,016,857	3,108	
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,108	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,134,994	2,129,235	8,206	2,447
Net increase, including Department of Defense			5,759	

[1] March figure includes 527 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 10588 dated Jan. 14, 1955.

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

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,183	1,152	31	
Commerce	2,930	2,889	41	
Health, Education, and Welfare	542	541	1	
Interior	5,925	5,765	160	
Justice	516	507	9	
Labor	108	103	5	
Post Office	2,344	2,344		
State	14,908	14,886	22	
Treasury	997	1,000		3
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	779	779		
Atomic Energy Commission	17	17		
Civil Aeronautics Board	4	4		
Civil Service Commission	11	10	1	
Farm Credit Administration	12	12		
Federal Communications Commission	29	27	2	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1		
Foreign Operations Administration	4,733	[1] 4,632	101	
General Accounting office	51	49	2	
General Services Administration	109	105	4	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	135	132	3	
National Labor Relations Board	22	22		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Panama Canal	14,929	15,076		147
Selective Service System	199	201		2
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
United States Information Agency	7,510	7,544		34
Veterans' Administration	1,270	1,304		34
Total, excluding Department of Defense	59,266	59,104	382	220
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			162	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	54	54		
Department of the Army	87,653	89,555		1,902
Department of the Navy	31,160	30,970	190	
Department of the Air Force	42,683	44,990		2,307
Total, Department of Defense	161,550	165,569	190	4,209
Net decrease, Department of Defense			4,019	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	220,816	224,673	572	4,429
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			3,857	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during March 1955 and comparison with February 1955*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	2,845	2,825	20	
Commerce	2,173	2,160	13	
Interior	8,210	8,087	123	
Treasury	6,353	6,396		43
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	133	137		4
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	922	875	47	
Government Printing Office	6,834	6,785	49	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,294	7,238	56	
Panama Canal	7,422	7,615		193
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,820	18,168		348
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,019	60,299	308	588
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			280	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	[1] 209,100	[2] 208,152	948	
Outside continental United States	[1] 43,000	[2] 43,953		953
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	238,129	237,693	436	
Outside continental United States	6,922	6,929		7
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	157,293	154,968	2,325	
Outside continental United States	5,093	8,175		3,082
Total, Department of Defense	659,537	659,870	3,709	4,042
Net decrease, Department of Defense			333	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	719,556	720,169	4,017	4,630
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			613	

[1] Subject to revision.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under United States agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of March 1955 and comparison with February 1955*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February
Austria	171	171					171	171
England	7,492	7,441					7,492	7,441
France	22,599	21,539	15,657	14,883			6,942	6,656
French Morocco	4,109	756	203		821	756	3,085	
Germany	125,305	125,291	101,716	101,707	1,965	1,969	21,624	21,615
Japan	155,756	155,445	94,299	[1] 94,299	18,481	18,457	42,976	42,689
Korea	23,222	26,824	23,222	26,824				
Lybia	967	1,048					967	1,048
Ryukyus	244	228			244	228		
Saudi Arabia	690	702					690	702
Spain	142	96					142	96
Trinidad	645	641			645	641		
Total	341,342	340,182	235,097	237,713	22,156	22,051	84,089	80,418

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported regular civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,355,810. This was a net increase of 1,902 as compared with employment reported in the preceeding month of February.

This was the second increase in succession and it was the fifth increase in 32 months since July 1952. The other monthly increases were in June, October, and November 1954 and February 1955.

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

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1954—July	2,387,833		5,187
August	2,375,988		11,845
September	2,355,170		20,818
October	2,359,325	4,155	
November	2,385,024	25,699	
December	2,368,072		16,952
1955—January	2,353,588		14,484
February	2,353,908	320	
March	2,355,810	1,902	

Total employment in civilian agencies during the month of March was 1,174,295 an increase of 2,813 over the February total of 1,171,482. Total civilan employment in the military agencies in March was 1,181,515. This was a net decrease of 911 as compared with 1,182,426 in February.

The net increase was reported almost exclusively by the Department of Agriculture, which had an increase of 1,988. Other civilian agencies reporting increases were the Department of Commerce with an increase of 686, the Department of the Treasury with an increase of 644, the Department of the Interior with an increase of 554, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with an increase of 452, Veterans' Administration with an increase of 326, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency with an increase of 311.

These civilian agency increases were partially off-set by decreases by the Post Office Department with a decrease of 1,656, and the Tennessee Valley Authority with a decrease of 372.

Increases in civilian employment in the Department of Defense were reported by the Department of the Navy with an increase of 628 and the Office of the Secretary of Defense with an increase of 44. The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 35, and the Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 1,548.

Inside continental United States civilian employment increased 5,759, and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 3,857.

Industrial employment by Federal agencies in March totaled 719,556, a decrease of 613 as compared with February.

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

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,355,810 civilian employees certified to the Committee by executive agencies in their regular monthly reports included some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 341,342 foreign nationals working for United States military agencies overseas during the month of March who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in February was 340,182. A breakdown of this employment for March follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Austria	171			171
England	7,492			7,492
France	22,599	15,657		6,942
French Morocco	4,109	203	821	3,085
Germany	125,305	101,716	1,965	21,624
Japan	155,756	94,299	18,481	42,976
Korea	23,222	23,222		
Libya	967			967
Ryukyus	244		244	
Saudi Arabia	690			690
Spain	142			142
Trinidad	645		645	
Total	341,342	235,097	22,156	84,089

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1857. A bill to establish national policy respecting the development and use of water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1858. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1859. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1860. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1861. 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 and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1862. A bill for the relief of Oscar Ems deHuy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1863. A bill to provide for the demolition and removal of temporary buildings erected in the District of Columbia since the beginning of World War I, and for the substitution therefor of permanent-type facilities constructed under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1864. A bill to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 1865. A bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States-flag merchant vessels, and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the last two above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1866. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce retirement age for women and provide insurance benefits for certain additional widows and parents, and to amend the public-assistance provisions of such act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1867. A bill for the relief of Mary Goodyear Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1868. A bill for the relief of the C-L Electric Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1869. A bill for the relief of George Papoulias and Irene Papoulias (nee Birbilis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1870. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to issue regulations regarding the charges, handling, and disposition of short-paid (postage due) mail matter and dead letters, and for other purposes;

S. 1871. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter," approved August 15, 1953 (67 Stat. 614), and for other purposes;

S. 1872. A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

S. 1873. A bill to increase the minimum postal savings deposit, and for other purposes; and

S. 1874. A bill to provide leave of absence for officers and employees stationed outside the United States for use in the United States, its Territories or possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a national policy for the development and use of water resources in the United States.

I appreciate this is a very broad subject and one which will take some time for consideration and the working out of a comprehensive plan. A great deal is being done in different areas by individual States and under the sponsorship of the Federal Government. It is my belief that a more effective use of our water resources will result if there is overall planning of such projects in relation to the major river basin within which they are located.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanatory statement of the bill be included with my remarks at this place in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1857) to establish national policy respecting the development and use of water resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

In addition to the enactment clause (sec. 1) the bill consists of 11 sections the intent and purpose of each is, briefly, as follows:

Section 2 is a declaration of 16 basic principles designed to minimize centralization of authority in the Federal Government. The effectuation of these principles, among other ends, is intended to result in: (1) Cooperative and comprehensive river basin planning, (2) utilization of adequate and reliable basic data, (3) coordination of Federal agency activities, (4) realistic program and project evaluation, and (5) equitable sharing of program and project costs.

Section 3 is devoted to definitions.

Section 4 requires congressional authorization as a prerequisite to the participation of any Federal agency in water resources development programs. Federal agencies are required to file reports containing reliable and accurate data in sufficiency to enable Congress to determine the advisability of Federal participation.

Section 5 calls for the inclusion of statements of view in reports to the Congress by the governors of the States and by top-level officials of Federal agencies affected by the proposed program on projects of the sponsoring agency.

Section 6 limits the Federal Government's participation in hydroelectric projects to multiple purpose programs and projects devoted primarily to navigation, flood control and/or reclamation. The section also requires that the Federal costs of the hydroelectric features shall be repaid in full both as to principal and interest within 50 years.

Section 7 applies the same restrictions and repayment standards of section 6 to the Federal Government's participation in projects involving the development and supplying of water for domestic and industrial purposes.

Section 8 requires the beneficiaries of reclamation projects to repay the construction costs allocable to reclamation, without interest, within 50 years after the end of a development period not to exceed 10 years.

Section 9 requires the beneficiaries of flood control and navigation projects to repay any costs therefor adjudged to be reimbursable within 50 years after the benefits are available and can be utilized.

Section 10 authorizes State and local governments and interstate agencies under appropriate conditions and safeguards and pursuant to acts of the Congress to acquire water resources projects constructed by the Federal Government.

Section 11 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to specific acts of the Congress and under other appropriate conditions and safeguards, to make loans and cost-sharing payments to State, local, and interstate agencies for the construction and acquisition of water resources projects.

Section 12 creates a Federal Water Resources Board in the Executive Office of the President to prescribe standards for the planning, appraisal, and filing of reports to the Congress and to exercise other stated appropriate functions necessary for the development and effectuation of a desirable national water policy for the United States.

REMOVAL OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RETIRED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code designed to remove discrimination in existing law against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States. It is most unfortunate that the law adopted by the 83d Congress did not give servicemen the same liberalization of income-tax deductions on retirement pay as was given other retired people under the age of 65.

It appears to me as if the congressional action of last year was a legislative oversight, which ought to be corrected as quickly as possible. At the present time our tax law in discriminating against servicemen acts as a blow to the morale and combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces. It is another indication of the reasons why our services have had difficulty in getting qualified and experienced personnel to reenlist.

There are no windfall profits in the Army. There are no excess profits in the Navy. The pilots who man our jet aircraft are not overpaid. Our men and women in uniform want no special privileges. All they ask is that they not be discriminated against because they have chosen a career of service to their country. I, therefore, propose that we amend the new tax bill so that these men and women will enjoy the same liberalization

of income-tax deductions on retirement pay as other American citizens. Perhaps this discriminatory provision was an oversight on the part of Congress. If it was, let us admit the mistake and amend the law. Let us reaffirm our faith in those who man the ramparts of America.

It is my information that the existing operation of law costs affected servicemen about $240 a year. It is wrong to specifically exempt the retired personnel of our armed services from the benefits given to other retired people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks a letter which I received from Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, in support of the objective sought by my bill, together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the American Legion convention on this subject.

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

The bill (S. 1858) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follow:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington D. C., April 4, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I was very much interested in looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1955, to note your remarks on page 4008 at the time the pay increase bill for members of the Armed Forces was under consideration.

You commented about the fact that the recent tax act failed to provide exemptions and allowances under retirement, for retirement pay for members of the Armed Forces.

Enclosed please find copy of Resolution No. 647 adopted at our 1954 national convention asking for an amendment to the tax law to take care of just this very problem.

I also enclose copy of H. R. 3999 introduced under date of February 14, 1955, by Congressman COOPER at our request, to carry out the intent of the enclosed Resolution No. 647.

Should the bill 3999 meet with your approval, I would be very happy to have you introduce a companion bill in the Senate. On the other hand, if you feel the bill could be improved upon we would still like to have you introduce your version of such a bill. I am sure we would be more than happy to support it.

Thanking you for any consideration you can extend to this request, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

RESOLUTION NO. 647—REMOVE INEQUITIES IN INCOME-TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Whereas the recent tax law passed by the 83d Congress and signed by the President, gave certain income-tax exemptions or reductions to retired civil-service employees of the United States Government, States, municipalities, and counties; and

Whereas retired personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States are specifically excluded from receiving these income-tax benefits by the provisions of this law; and

Whereas Congress by its action in so excluding retired members of the military services has taken both discriminatory and punitive action against retired officers and men of these services without any justification: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Washington, D. C., August 30–September 2, 1954, That the Congress of the United States at its next session be strongly urged to amend that portion of the law so that retired members of the Armed Forces may enjoy the same income-tax reductions and exemptions as are now granted to civil service employees of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairmen of all appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States, and to all Members of the Congress.

PROPOSED EMERGENCY PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1955. This bill provides for grants and scholarships in postgraduate education in the field of public health. The need for legislation such as this is urgent and it is my hope the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will begin hearings on the bill and on the whole problem of Federal aid to medical education in the very near future.

The bill provides for direct grants through the Public Health Service to all accredited schools of public health on the basis of their enrollment to a total not exceeding $1 million for each of the five fiscal years. Further grants are also provided for construction needs not in excess of $1 million a year and for an additional sum for scholarships not to exceed $250,000 per year. The purpose of the bill and to these grants is to make it possible to continue and extend the training of personnel for public service in the field of public health.

There are today 10 accredited schools in the United States: California, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, Tulane, and Yale. Six of these schools are supported by private philanthropy and four by the taxpayers of their States.

I have had a series of discussions with representatives of these schools of public health. It is their feeling—and I agree in that feeling—that the training of personnel to protect the public against disease is an essential part of public responsibility as is the training of personnel for the military forces to protect our Nation against a military aggressor. The request of the schools for Federal assistance to help support and expand their facilities and to aid such new schools as may be established is based on the recognition that our Government has a responsibility for the promotion of such training. The present plan for support of our public health institutions places an undue burden upon 6 privately supported institutions and upon the taxpayers of 4 States. Since our Nation gains from the training which these schools afford, it is desirable to equalize to some degree the financial cost which is now unevenly distributed.

The evidence is clear that the schools of public health are physically overcrowded. Their physical plant is bursting at the seams. The sum provided in this bill is a small fraction of what is needed, but it will help materially to provide facilities.

The scholarship section of this bill, section 376, is most desirable although it is less essential than the grants for maintenance and construction.

With specific regard to maintenance funds, a study of the facts makes it unmistakably clear that a number of the schools of public health are faced with the prospect of having to curtail or discontinue their operation unless financial relief can be found for them. In this critical period in our Nation's history, our Government cannot sit back and allow this to happen.

The formula for assistance submitted in this bill is the product of careful study by the schools of public health and by other experts in the field. It differs in some respects from the Federal aid to medical education bill of the 82d Congress which I was proud to cosponsor, and which I plan again to support. Instead of providing a lump-sum payment of $1,000 per graduate student plus an extra $1,000 for each student in excess of past enrollment, the bill which I now introduce provides for grants on the basis of 15 percent of basic operating costs of graduate instructions plus an additional $500 for each full-time student in excess of average past enrollment. This proposed formula was arrived at on the assumption that a grant based on a certain fraction of the total operating cost will cover a unit of about 30 students regardless of the size of the school. In addition, we all agreed that the larger the student body the greater is the need for additional funds. When new students arrive in a school—and the need is great, so we must encourage the enrollment of new students—the expansion of school facilities is necessary and hence my bill provides for a bonus clause of $500 for each new student.

As a safeguard, the Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1955 provides that the total grant to each school may not exceed 50 percent of the basic operating cost of the school. Furthermore, the maximum amount spent shall not exceed $1 million a year. It is also noteworthy that we determine average past enrollment on the basis of a sliding scale considering preceding fiscal years rather than any given calendar or academic years.

Finally, I wish to make it clear that in introducing this Emergency Public Health Training Act of 1955 I am in no way minimizing the importance of the

desirability of enacting an omnibus Federal aid to medical education bill. We have tried to enact such legislation for a number of years and to no avail. It is my hope that some future Congress may enact the bill. We cannot wait for that period, however. The time to act in the field of public health is now. It is for that reason I have agreed to introduce this special legislation designed to cover the public-health phase of the medical problem on its own merits.

It is my hope that this bill will become law during the 84th Congress.

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

The bill (S. 1859) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for postgraduate education in the field of public health, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROHIBITION OF OPERATION IN COASTWISE TRADE OF CERTAIN REBUILT VESSELS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1864) to amend the shipping laws, to prohibit the operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 46, sec. 883), is further amended by inserting the following new proviso at the end of the first proviso thereof: "*Provided further*, That no vessel rebuilt outside the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), its possessions, or the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be a vessel built in the United States for the purposes of this section."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 46, sec. 808), is further amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "No vessel rebuilt outside of the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), its possessions, or the District of Columbia, shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade under any provision of this section."

SEC. 3. When used in this act, the term "rebuilt" means altered in form or burden, by being lengthened or built upon, or from one denomination to another, by the mode or method of rigging or fitting.

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this act shall be effective only as to vessels rebuilt after the date of enactment hereof.

The statement presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Due to a loophole in the laws governing the documentation of vessels for the coastwise trades of the United States, it appears likely that a considerable volume of ship conversion and rebuilding of vessels for this trade may be placed by American shipowners in foreign rather than American shipyards.

The present governing statutes clearly state, with certain special exceptions not here pertinent, that only vessels built in and documented under the laws of the United States may operate in our coastwise trade. However, no mention is made as to other types of work which may be done on vessels documented for this trade, such as rebuilding, reconstruction, and conversion.

The bill would amend pertinent sections of the shipping laws to make it clear that, in order to be eligible for coastwise operation, not only the original building, but also any rebuilding of the vessel must be done in American shipyards. The bill proposes that, if such work is done abroad, the ship thereafter cannot be operated in the coastwise trade of the United States. Of course, the vessel would continue to be eligible to operate under the American flag in our foreign trade or fisheries. Only its domestic trade privilege would be affected.

Also the bill would not affect the eligibility for coastwise operation of any United States-built vessel on which work performed outside the United States does not constitute a rebuilding as that term is used in the bill. In other words, as to minor renovations or voyage repairs, there is no intent to change present law.

Obviously, enactment of the bill would not of itself furnish a cure-all for the present depressed state of the shipbuilding and shiprepair industry. However, it would close one crack in the wall of legislation which the United States has relied upon to assure the continued existence of adequate and efficient private American shipbuilding and shiprepair facilities at all times. Like the leak in a levee, unless the breach is repaired, the flow of this type of work to foreign shipyards will tend to increase.

International conditions at the present time are such that it is vital that all maritime legislation should be directed to the promotion of the national maritime policy wherever possible. The proposed bill is certainly a measure which meets this test and should be enacted without delay.

It is pertinent in connection with the proposed measure to determine the legal scope of the word built as this term is used in the present statutes.

The original law restricting American-flag documentation to vessels built in the United States was enacted in 1792 and was later substantially reenacted as section 4132 of the Revised Statutes. Until 1912 the requirement applied whether the ship was used in the domestic or foreign trade—in all cases she had to be built here to be eligible for documentation as a vessel of the United States.

Due to this fact, viz, that both domestic and foreign trade American-flag vessels were covered in the same statute from 1792 until the enactment of the free-shipping provisions of the Panama Canal Act in 1912 and 1914, and also because during this same period of over 100 years, questions as to the meaning of the term built arose almost entirely in connection with the documentation of vessels operating in our foreign trade, the needs and problems of our vessels in foreign trade, rather than those in domestic trade, were the considerations which ultimately determined the construction given these words of the statute. These now ancient administrative and judicial decisions, made in an era when all American-flag vessels had to be built in the United States, are still in effect.

One leading decision which has since been confirmed many times was handed down by the United States District Court, Eastern District of Virginia, on March 13, 1876, in the case of the *United States* v. *The Steamer now called the Grace Meade*. In that case, the question posed was whether a vessel constructed from the parts of a vessel which some time previous had been considerably blown to pieces, should be allowed registry as a new vessel or should be required to continue her former registry and name as an old vessel merely rebuilt. The court held, as a principle, that "without regard to the particular parts used, if any considerable part of the hull and skeleton of an old vessel in its intact condition, without being broken up, is built upon, the law holds that in such a case it is the old vessel rebuilt, and not a new vessel."

The Meade case has been cited with approval by the Supreme Court a number of times and is considered to be the ruling law on this question.

Using this principle as a guide, it can readily be seen that it will be very rare indeed that any instance will arise involving a large ship where any conversion, reconditioning, or rebuilding will be considered of such scope as to require a finding that because of such work the vessel has become a new vessel for purposes of documentation. Any vessel originally built in the United States and thus eligible for coastwise operation will continue to be regarded as a vessel built in the United States under existing law, even after a radical rebuilding in a foreign shipyard.

The general rule as simply stated in section 3.12 (c) of the current Customs Regulations is that "The place of building is where the hull was built." Under this rule, it is obvious that even though substantial remodeling or other such work is done on the vessel outside the United States, if the hull was originally built in the United States the vessel will continue to enjoy all the privileges of an American-built ship including the right to be enrolled for the coastwise trade.

The bill would merely supersede the provisions of existing statutes insofar as eligibility to operate in the coastwise trade is concerned, so that, any rebuilding of an American-built vessel in a foreign shipyard after its date of enactment would prevent its subsequent use in the coastwise trade.

In order to assure ease and certainty of administration of the bill when enacted, a definition of the term "rebuilt" has been included (sec. 3). The terminology used is taken verbatim from section 4170 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 39), and it is intended that the language have the same meaning as has been applied to it over many years in the administration of that section.

The bill is consistent with the spirit of the original legislation to limit the coastwise trade to United States built vessels as a means of promoting domestic shipbuilding.

PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1865) to promote the United States Merchant Marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States flag merchant vessels and to encourage the construction of new vessels in United States shipyards, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the United States merchant marine, to avoid block obsolescence of United States-flag merchant vessels, and to make possible, accelerate, or otherwise assist the construction of new vessels in shipyards of the United States, section 503 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1153), is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"The Secretary of Commerce may release any vessel subject to this section from the requirement for further documentation as a vessel of the United States in consideration of an undertaking by the owner of such vessel that—

"(1) a new vessel or vessels which will meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States, will aid in the promotion and development of such commerce and be suitable for use by the United States for national defense or military purposes in time of war or national emergency, will be constructed promptly in the United States by such owner to replace the vessel or vessels so released;

"(2) all indebtedness to the United States with respect to the vessel or vessels so released will be discharged prior to any transfer of such vessel or vessels to foreign registry; and that

"(3) all proceeds from the sale of such vessel or vessels not used to pay off any indebtedness to the United States on the vessel or vessels so released and transferred will be applied to the construction of such replacement vessel or vessels referred to under (1):

Provided, That, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, the provisions of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 1211), shall not apply to any vessel as to which a release has been executed by the Secretary of Commerce in accordance with the provisions and requirements of this section."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act or the release granted pursuant hereto shall be construed to repeal section 9 or sections 37 through 42 of the Shipping Act of 1916, or to diminish the authority of the Secretary of Commerce thereunder.

The statement presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

The Maritime Administration is attempting to solve the problem of block obsolescence of privately owned warbuilt merchant vessels, with which the several subsidized lines ultimately will be faced, by promoting agreements on the part of such lines to anticipate their replacement requirements. If such a program can be undertaken, it will avoid the concentrated replacement financing which otherwise will face such owners at a later date, it will avoid shipyard congestion and higher costs due to a concentrated ship construction program within a relatively short period of time, and it will serve to accelerate the reduction in the average age of existing fleets to make them competitive with more modern foreign flag vessels. At the same time it will assist in alleviating the present plight of the shipbuilding yards as a result either of lack of work or a low level of work by providing a reasonable continuity of the shipyard workload so essential to efficient and economic operation. Such a program, in addition to promoting foreign trade and thus the national economy, likewise will promote the national security by increasing the mobilization potential of both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry.

In addition to the trade-in-and-build cargo program sponsored by the Maritime Administration to that end, there is another avenue through which such an accelerated replacement program can be promoted, viz, the sale of older vessels in the world market. Such sales of war built vessels are effectively barred by certain statutory impediments in the case of vessels constructed with the aid of construction differential subsidies.

It is true that under certain conditions such vessels may be traded in to the Government for an allowance of credit on new vessels in the amount of their depreciated acquisition cost under section 507 or under section 510 on the basis of their reasonable value, considering the scrap value, the world market value and the depreciated value based upon a 20-year life.

On the other hand, section 503 specifically forbids the sale of such vessels to aliens for a period of 20 years by requiring them to remain documented under the laws of the United States for "not less than 20 years, or so long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the purchase price, whichever is the longer period." So it will be observed that the minimum period is 20 years and that no provision is made for the waiver of this requirement, no matter how justifiable the circumstances. The period of 20 years appears to have stemmed from the fact that, at the time the act was passed in 1936, 20 years was the then concept of age at which they should be replaced. However, if it is in the national interest to accelerate the replacement age, it appears logical that the prohibition should be correspondingly adjusted. Such action, if taken, would have the effect of placing vessels constructed under the 1936 act on a full parity with identical vessels purchased under the Ship Sales Act at substantially the same price, with respect to which latter group Congress specifically declined to attach such a condition in the Ship Sales Act of 1946, some 10 years later.

Obviously, this inflexible and arbitrary directive in the statute closes one of the most important outlets which would otherwise be available to the shipowner for the sale of these vessels. And in so doing, it contributes to the serious trend toward block obsolescence of the American merchant fleet.

While the need for legislation along the lines of the proposed bill has been recognized for some time, it has not heretofore been considered an urgent matter.

Now, however, it is understood that, in respect to certain vessels constructed under the act, the mandatory restriction above referred to is actually preventing the sale abroad of certain vessels constructed during the World War II era, even though the specific and sole purpose of such sale is to assist in financing the construction in American shipyards of replacement vessels.

The proposed bill would lift this complete embargo against the foreign disposal of such vessels before the end of the arbitrary 20-year period by granting to the Secretary of Commerce the discretion to release the owner from the restriction where such action would not conflict with the overall maritime policy of the United States as laid down in the act. An agreement by the owner to construct a replacement vessel would be a condition precedent to the exercise of such discretion by the Secretary of Commerce.

The President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, a group of impartial top business executives appointed by the President, after exhaustive study, filed its report in November 1947, almost 8 years ago, in which the committee even then recognized the problems raised by this restriction. The committee commented as follows:

"The fact that a very large percentage of the dry-cargo and tanker tonnage in the American merchant marine today consists of ships built during World War II and that these ships are, therefore, of substantially the same age, is a matter of concern in any long-range program for this country. These ships will depreciate as a block due to obsolescence and deterioration. A similar situation obtained after World War I. In the late thirties, the American cargo fleet, built during and just after that war, was rapidly being displaced in the trade routes by more modern and more efficient foreign-built tonnage. Corrective measures to avoid a repetition of this situation must be planned now to assure that the merchant fleet shall continue to include a proper proportion of modern efficient vessels. This is important from the viewpoint both of the economics of competitive commercial operations and of national security.

"Avoidance of block obsolescence can be accomplished most effectively by establishing a relatively uniform progressive replacement program. Such a program will also serve best to assure maintenance of the nucleus of specialized knowledge and skills in the shipbuilding industry.

"The early construction of new cargo tonnage, except for Government account, can be expected only if there arises commercial justification for increasing the size of the active merchant feet above its prospective level, or if ship operators can be induced to replace their existing tonnage with new ships. Since any considerable increase in the size of the prospective privately owned American merchant fleet is not assured, the construction of new cargo tonnage will hinge largely upon the replacement of existing vessels; and the problem becomes that of making it economically advantageous for operators to do so. It may be profitable to downgrade some of the better ships to be replaced from more competitive to less competitive American-flag services; but the less effective ships will require disposal. These ships can (a) be turned in for credit on new tonnage and be placed in the reserve fleet, (b) be sold foreign, or (c) be sold for scrap. To promote the building of new cargo tonnage, governmental policy should foster whichever one of these courses appears best suited to the individual case."

The committee then recommended:

"(a) Section 503 of the 1936 act should be amended to permit approval to sell foreign vessels built with a construction-differential subsidy when all indebtedness to the United States on account of such vessels has been discharged, even though the vessels may be less than 20 years old, provided it is determined (1) that the vessels are not essential for national security purposes, and (2) that the proceeds of such sale are applied to the construction of new vessels."

It is interesting to note that further on in its report (pp. 30, 31) the President's committee again emphasized this same recommendation—that some flexibility should be provided in section 503—so as to assure that United States flag vessels are the most efficient of their type in the trades they serve.

In this connection, the committee voiced its concern that, as the World War II built tonnage aged as a block, such vessels would be less and less able to compete with modern foreign-flag vessels. As a result, unless adequate corrective action is taken, foreign bottoms will carry an increasing amount of

United States foreign commerce and the need for Government operating support payments will tend to multiply.

In order to conform section 802 with this proposed amendment, it becomes necessary to eliminate the provisions of that section with respect to any vessel as to which such a release has been executed by the Secretary of Commerce.

GREETINGS OF CONGRESS TO GEN. CHARLES P. SUMMERALL

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas Gen. Charles P. Summerall retired from active service in the United States Army on March 31, 1931, after a distinguished military career commencing with his graduation from the United States Military Academy on June 11, 1892, and culminating with his service as Chief of Staff of the United States Army from November 20, 1926, to November 20, 1930; and

Whereas, despite his retired status, General Summerall's interest in national defense and in the security of his country has continued throughout his life, as evidenced by his distinguished service as superintendent of The Citadel (The Military College of South Carolina) from 1931 to 1935: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby extends to Gen. Charles P. Summerall its cordial greetings and expresses its admiration and gratitude for the outstanding service that he has long rendered to his country.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORTS ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,500 additional copies each of 14 hearings held before a subcommittee of the said committee, and not more than 3,000 additional copies each of 3 reports of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

REPEAL OF SECTIONS 452 AND 462 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 7, line 9, after $7,979,003, insert the following: "of which not to exceed $11,647 shall be available for reimbursing the city of New Town, N. Dak., for the cost of improvements to streets and appurtenant facilities adjoining property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for assistance to the public-school district for constructing additional classroom facilities at Seligman, Ariz."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 9, line 14, after Indians; insert the following: "advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the act of June 4, 1936 (25 U. S. C. 452), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 11, line 13, after tary insert the following: "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 from the funds credited to the Indians of California under the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602); for expenses of moving and relocating houses available to said Indians under the act of August 2, 1954 (68 Stat. 590, 613), but not more than $300 may be expended for any one house."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 14, after line 15, insert the following:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For the construction of the necessary laboratory and pilot plant facilities for conducting research on the distillation of coal and the products obtained therefrom and the direct reduction of low-grade iron ores to their minerals, $2 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the products derived from such facilities may be sold by the Bureau of Mines and the receipts therefrom deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 17, line 9, after amount insert the following: "of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for additional payments for the execution of the new figure for the Yorktown Monument, upon the completion of the figure to satisfaction of the Secretary, and the Secretary may release the contractor from all obligations with respect to the removal of the present damaged figure, the repair of the shaft, and the mounting of the new figure on the shaft."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, the following amendment,

namely: On page 29, after line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. Limitations in this or any other act for the Department of the Interior on purchases of passenger motor vehicles shall not apply to vehicles known as coupe pickup trucks."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 5085, making appropriations for Department of the Interior and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, since announcing, on April 20, 1955, the list of 24 cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, 2 more Senators have expressed their desire to join in co-sponsoring this concurrent resolution, which calls on the President to work to establish within the United Nations a scientific commission to study the effects of radioactivity on living things. I am pleased to announce that the two additional co-sponsors are the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

I ask unanimous consent that the next time Senate Concurrent Resolution 22 is printed, that the names of Senators KEFAUVER and HUMPHREY be added to the list of cosponsors.

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

NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR POLIO VACCINE—EDITORIAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee an editorial appearing in this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune with regard to the Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis and the need for a national program to supervise our program against the dreaded disease.

I commend the editors of the New York Herald Tribune for a most incisive series of recommendations leading up to the conclusion that Washington must act. I respectfully suggest to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee that it is time for the Congress to make a constructive study as soon as possible so as to help develop a national program.

It is my intention to introduce a bill for consideration by the Senate which will embody the five pertinent suggestions in the editorial, outlining what the Federal Government should do to bring this much needed protection to our people.

The present situation, under voluntary agreement, is beginning to get out of hand. It is urgent that the Public Health Service, which has the authority under present law to regulate the source of supply and the quality, be given also the authority to make allocations and to set the price and to deal with violators of agreements. In that way we may save ourselves a great deal of trouble.

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

WASHINGTON MUST ACT

The Salk vaccine against poliomyelitis is a national blessing which has created a national emergency. Experts have confirmed the vaccine's general efficacy. The demand is far greater than the supply. Every child in America has a right to its protection.

The serum can only be, and must be, controlled nationally.

Prior to the publication of the Francis report on the success of Dr. Salk's discovery, no agency, public or private, had thought through all the problems involved in the production and distribution of this great boon.

The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which reserves great credit for initiative, efficiency, and determination, had made contracts for the purchase of vaccine for free administration to children. It is delivering the serum to communities, but has no authority over private distribution of quantities produced in excess of its own contracts, nor can it effectively control community action after the vaccine is in the hands of local health authorities.

States and localities have improvised their own distribution systems. For the most part, these are based on voluntary allocations and priorities, and are concerned more with the acquisition of and payment for the vaccine than with seeing to it that priorities are absolutely observed. Only on Friday, after it was clear that the voluntary system was breaking down, did New York City place penalties on the unauthorized sale or possession of the Salk serum. This was a purely local move; the penalties, moreover, are light in view of the great temptation offered by the short supply of the vaccine: $500 fine, a year in jail, or both.

The Federal Government, the only authority capable of exercising national controls, made no serious effort, before the release of the report, to anticipate its responsibilities. The Public Health Service licenses and supervises the manufacture of the Salk vaccine under the National Biologics Control Act. Powers under this act have been exercised in withdrawing the product of the Cutter Laboratories from distribution.

But the law applies only to the source, only to quality. It gives the Federal Government no authority over allocation, over price, over violators of agreements. The administration has relied on voluntary cooperation and on advisory committees.

The fear of polio has haunted parents for generations. It is too much to expect of human nature that when the promise of release from that fear appears, voluntary arrangements will hold against a mother's insistence on the protection of her children or the greed of those who want to make money out of that emotion. New Yorkers remember the near riots that were produced by the distribution of gamma globulin, far less effective than the Salk vaccine. They are aware that already supplies of the new serum have disappeared into unauthorized channels and been diverted to adults when the moral right of children to priority is unchallenged.

To bring order out of this explosive situation, a national law is essential. There are five requirements for such a law:

(1) It must be simple and sweeping, giving the Federal Government the authority to follow the Salk vaccine from the producing laboratory to the person receiving the injection, fixing the price, imposing strict regulations as to records, setting firm allocations to various regions and absolute priorities according to need.

(2) It must provide for the prompt dissemination of fully evaluated information on all medical aspects of the program. Doubts have arisen across the Nation over such matters as provocation and the timing of shots in relation to the incidence of polio. Parents are entitled to know what disinterested experts think of these questions as they arise. Their children's lives are at stake.

(3) It must be clearly limited in time and subject, so that there will be no doubt that this is an emergency answer to an emergency situation, not a step toward socialized medicine. A year, or at most two, will probably bring supply and demand into balance.

(4) It must have teeth. Penalties for violators—both users and sellers—should be harsh, several years in jail, some thousands of dollars in fines, so that there will be no prospect of profit in flouting the law.

(5) Finally, and of the utmost importance, the act must be passed immediately and administered vigorously. The emergency is now—not tomorrow or next month. Congress can pass a law through both houses in a single day, if the need is great enough. It should pass this legislation forthwith. The Government should be prepared to put its execution in the hands of the country's top administrators, experienced in allocations and priorities.

Given such leadership, working in harmony with all interested parties, red tape could be cut, the machinery set in motion and speedy enforcement assured.

The parents and children of the Nation demand it. The whole world is waiting to see whether the United States will use this great new weapon against polio swiftly, efficiently, and—above all—equitably.

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. KNOWLAND.

Address on the subject "May Day: United States Way," delivered by him at Burlington, Wis., on May 1, 1955.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address entitled "Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day," delivered by him on April 29, 1955, at the Jefferson Memorial, in Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at Loyalty Day celebration at Burlington, Wis., and editorial entitled "The Celluloid Ally," published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, 1955.

Release from Atomic Industrial Forum announcing the First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry; editorial entitled "Atomic Initiative" published in the Wall Street Journal of April 12, 1954; editorial entitled "Atom Show Ship Not Enough," published in the Milwaukee Journal of April 27, 1955.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, to the collegiate division rally of the Indiana Young Republicans, at Indianapolis, Ind., on April 22, 1955.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from Far Eastern policy addresses delivered by Governor Harriman, of New York.

By Mr. DUFF:

Article concerning Senator GEORGE, written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1955.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Article entitled "The United German Hungarian Honor Senator LANGER," published in Nord-Amerika, Donnerstag, of April 7, 1955.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S FORMOSA POLICY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I spent Saturday in Chicago. In the Chicago newspapers, I read of a statement made by certain Republican Senators, in which I would gladly have joined, but had no opportunity to do so. I wish to read it into the RECORD, as expressing my own beliefs and convictions.

It reads as follows:

We believe that the President of the United States will act in the present framework of international deliberations with the same wisdom, good judgment, and full sense of right and honor he has always displayed.

Through Public Law 4, the Congress overwhelmingly expressed itself on the need to protect our interests in the Formosa area. Through this action the Congress demonstrated its faith in the President.

The President of the United States has a right and obligation to wage peace as well as to wage war. That is what he is trying to do.

As we supported the Formosa resolution, we now support the President's efforts for negotiation of a cease-fire with Communist China. We know he will carry them forward with candor and without sacrifice of this Nation's most solemn obligations.

Mr. President, including this brief statement in support of the declaration of certain Republican Senators, I may say that I first stated that although I would be for the treaty, I was against the Formosan resolution. That was because of the fact that I was very greatly disturbed by the briefing which we had before the committees. When the President said that he personally would take full responsibility, there was nothing for me to do except to trust the President completely. I did so then. I do now.

PROGRESS IN KANSAS IN THE CARE OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this week we are observing National Mental Health Week, and it is most important that we observe some of the facts about mental illness in the United States.

It is estimated that approximately 9 million people in the United States are suffering from some form of mental illness. In other words, more than 1 person in every 17 is afflicted more or less. During the past few years, great progress has been made in the mental-health field, but much more can and should be made.

During the past 10 years, through the efforts of civic, religious, medical, and psychiatric organizations, we have witnessed great changes in the care of the mentally ill. Not many years ago a person committed to a hospital for mental illness and treatment was practically consigned to the institution for life. That is not the situation today. I think no better proof of this can be furnished than what has taken place in my home State of Kansas.

Records show that 80 percent of the patients committed to the Topeka State Hospital, at Topeka, Kans., are discharged as improved or recovered within 1 year. The improvement in care of the mentally ill in Kansas in the past few years is not only remarkable, but is proof of what can be done in every other State in the Nation.

In 1947, when I became Governor of Kansas, Kansas ranked 47th in the Nation in care of the mentally ill. Eight years later, or today, Kansas is in fourth place; and I think it is going higher. I do not want to leave the impression that this was the result of my efforts only. We had the full cooperation of the Kansas Legislature and of the citizens of the State generally. Our citizens were determined that our hospitals were to be for the treatment and cure of our mentally sick people, not jails or institutions for their permanent incarceration.

As Governor, I appointed a State committee on mental hospitals, composed of outstanding lay citizens and doctors, both medical and psychiatric. We were fortunate in Kansas to have assist us on the Commission, and to work with the Commission, Drs. Will and Karl Menninger, of the Menninger Foundation.

The Commission recommended an increase—so large that it looked almost staggering—in appropriations for our mentally ill. The Kansas Legislature voted greatly increased appropriations, and we placed in operation a training program and an out-patient program which have been most successful. Last year, for instance, 450 people who were emotionally disturbed were treated in the out-patient clinic in the Topeka State Hospital, and 77 percent were sent home without ever being hospitalized.

Today, Kansas is the only State in the Union that is reducing the number of hospital beds for the mentally ill. This, of course, is a source of great satisfaction to me, in that during my term as Governor, I had an opportunity—with the assistance of the citizens of the State—to bring about a program which now is recognized as a model for the Nation. Other States are sending to Kansas representatives to study the results of this program.

State hospitals of Kansas are under the direction of the State Welfare Board. The board has served for many years; and the members are E. A. Briles, of Stafford; Blake Williamson, of Kansas City; and Martin Trued, of Topeka. They are entitled to much credit for the fine way in which they are handling this problem.

At the opening of National Mental Health Week, I am pleased to report to the Senate the splendid progress we have made in our State.

Some time ago, I participated in a short radio broadcast with Blake Williamson, a member of the State Board in Kansas; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

PORTION OF WEEKLY RADIO BROADCAST BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON AND MR. BLAKE WILLIAMSON

It is a pleasure to have with me in the studio this afternoon Mr. Blake Williamson, of Kansas City. He and Mrs. Williamson are here with their daughter, Miss Betsy, who is our Kansas Cherry Blossom Princess.

It is a pleasure, too, of course, to visit with Mr. Williamson because I well remember the time that I asked Blake and Ernie Briles and Tuffy Lutz to serve on the board of social welfare, and I remember, Blake, how reluctant you were to take that job.

Well, Senator, you well appreciate all the problems that we had in our mental institutions and welfare at the time you appointed us, don't you?

I certainly do, and I am so happy you are here because we started a program at that time that I would like to have a report on and I think the people of Kansas would like to have a report on it.

Well, Senator, I don't know of anything now that would give me any more pleasure than to give you one of the best reports of a program that you started when you were Governor of the State of Kansas, and, in my opinion, has turned out as the outstanding program in the United States and I think you ought to have an awful lot of credit for your courage back years ago when it wasn't popular.

Well now, Blake, before you go any further, I am very happy to get some credit for it, but I think the credit should go to many people in Kansas, including the legislature, yourself, and Doctors Menninger and many fine folks who worked on it, too.

Well, Senator, that is true, and that credit should go to all those various individuals. You know it would have been impossible to do the things if it hadn't been for the Menninger Foundation in Topeka, and, incidentally, now all the States in the Union are calling our friend, Dr. Will Menninger, to address joint sessions of the legislatures of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and other States to explain just exactly what is being done in the mental health field.

Blake, I just want to say this, we are all proud of it and we are also proud of the fine work that is being done by the doctors and people who are working in our program in Kansas now. Tell me, we started in rather low among the number of States on our health program, where are we today, what is the situation?

We started out in 47th place in the Nation a little over 6 years ago—as you well remember—and today we are in 4th place and, Senator, we are going higher.

I think that is wonderful and I understand from the reports I receive from the State that literally hundreds of these people that come to these institutions are soon returned back to their families, their friends, and local communities.

Well, most of it is due to the fact of the fine personnel we have been able to attract to Kansas among the psychiatrists and our great training program out there. Last year, it might be of interest to you Senator, we had 450 people who were emotionally disturbed that were treated in the out-patient clinic at the Topeka State Hospital and 77 percent of those were sent home without ever having to be hospitalized.

Isn't that wonderful. I think that is a great thing, not only for the people who are closely affected with it but for the State as a whole and I think that is a great service to the State and the Nation. Now, I think I should mention that I am the cosponsor of legislation with other Senators providing for a nationwide action on the prevention, treatment, and cure of this mental illness.

We need to do some work nationally and I am so proud that you can come in here and tell us what we have done in the State because I think it is going to help me in presenting this matter to the Senate.

Well Senator, I don't know of anybody who is better qualified to be on a national committee than you are after the wonderful success that has been attained as a result of the program that you originated in Kansas. Do you know that we are the only State in the Union today that is reducing our hospital beds for mentally ill? That is a source of a lot of satisfaction.

That is indeed a lot of satisfaction to me and it is one of the fine things I like to look back on as my service, as Governor, having started a program and after all it is a satisfaction of doing some of these little things that you get as you go through life that makes life worth living.

I think that is right and I will tell you there are hundreds of people who were formerly patients at Winfield, at Parsons, at Topeka, at Larned, and Osawatomie that have an awful lot of thanks in their heart to you for making it possible.

Well I want to say Blake that it has been a privilege to have had you on this program and through the kindness of this radio station we are again permitted to visit the people of Kansas. I thank you kindly.

REFERENDUM ON REDUCTION IN BURLEY TOBACCO ACREAGES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on last Thursday a referendum took place in the eight-State-burley-tobacco producing area, which I believe to have profound significance to this body.

The referendum was held to determine if the growers of burley tobacco were willing to accept an additional 15-percent reduction in the burley tobacco acreages allotted to their farms on the 1955 crop, in addition to a 10-percent reduction announced last November. This referendum was brought about as a result of an unexpectedly large production in the 1954 crop, which could not be forecast or ascertained until the marketing of the crop was completed in January.

The results of the referendum demonstrated an overwhelming acceptance by the growers of further reductions in acreage. The total number of farmers voting, it appears from preliminary reports, was 333,053. Of this number, 319,639, or 96 percent, voted for the revised quota.

As I have said, the significance of this vote is far-reaching. Despite weighty pronouncements by administration spokesmen insisting that price supports are of little help to small growers, lately reiterated in the April 26 letter of Secretary Benson transmitting to the President his pamphlet on Development of Agriculture's Human Resources, I point out that the average allotment of the 333,000 voters participating in the referendum amounts to 1.2 acres. Actually, two-thirds of all burley allotments are seven-tenths of an acre or less. Certainly these are small growers in every sense of the word. If price supports are not significant to this group, it would be difficult to understand the overwhelming support given to the reduced quota by burley growers which was necessary in order to retain the program of 90-percent price supports on burley tobacco.

Equally significant in this vote is the substantiation of the belief of those of us in the Congress who have consistently supported 90-percent parity supports on basic agricultural commodities that such programs can and will be successful in the presence of effective production controls by and with the enlightened support of the farmers.

For the information and study of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a copy of the letter sent to me on Saturday by Mr. Joe R. Williams, Acting Director of the Tobacco Division, Department of Agriculture, advising me of the unofficial results of the referendum.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1955.

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CLEMENTS: These are the unofficial results of the burley tobacco referendum held April 28, 1955:

State	For	Against	Percent for
Indiana	7,236	419	94.5
Kentucky	220,207	7,363	96.8
Missouri	1,271	37	97.2
Ohio	5,820	501	92.1
Virginia	13,894	675	95.4
West Virginia	2,070	66	96.9
North Carolina	16,848	373	97.5
Texas	2	1	66⅔
Tennessee	52,291	3,979	92.9
Total	319,639	13,414	96.0

Sincerely,

JOE R. WILLIAMS,
Acting Director, Tobacco Division.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the growers in every State participating in this referendum gave hearty approval to the program. They realized that unless they saved the program in this way the price of burley tobacco would be 46, 48, or 50 cents a pound, and the grower would probably get 15 or 20 cents a pound on his crop this year.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in expressing gratification that the burley tobacco growers in the several burley tobacco producing States have approved the program. In Tennessee there is a larger percentage of growers with less than 1 acre than in any other State. Their approval does not indicate that they are very happy about having to take this reduction, but they were presented with the choice of taking the reduction or losing the program.

I believe that every Member of the House from the burley growing section of Tennessee joined my colleague [Mr. GORE] and me in urging that the growers vote approval of the program, even though it might mean some temporary loss to them. I am happy that the program has been overwhelmingly approved in all the burley producing States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I think the referendum proves that if we are to have a 90 percent program on any commodity there must be acreage control. We cannot allow acreages to run wild and still have a high support program.

I emphasize the fact that the number of growers participating in this referendum broke all records in the burley tobacco area. Four years ago, at the previous referendum, 179,000 growers participated. In the latest referendum 333,000 growers participated, which indicates their desire that the program be retained, because it means so much to the growers of burley tobacco.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the senior Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield first to my colleague.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators from the burley growing States in complimenting the growers upon this magnificent vote. I wish especially to compliment the small growers, because we all recognized, when we passed the bill, that because of their small acreage, the small growers would bear the brunt of the reduction. This vote is evidence of the confidence of the growers who, in large measure, will bear the brunt of the reduction. The reduction is necessary in order to reduce the unsalable surplus. The growers were intelligent enough—and I felt at the time we passed the bill that they would be—to realize that everyone growing tobacco, especially the burley tobacco growers, would have to take a cut. Otherwise, the entire program might be lost; and if, for any reason, the entire program should be lost, the small grower would suffer to a greater extent than any other growers. The large grower could divert the use of his land into some other crop. The small grower, one with an acre or so, could not divert, because such small acreages are not transferrable into some other crop.

Therefore I feel especially proud of the vote of the small growers, who had some reason to feel that, in proportion, their acreage was being reduced to a larger extent than was the acreage of the larger growers.

I believe that the entire process has been wholesome for agriculture. It has saved the program with respect to one vital crop—vital not only to those who grow it and those who use it, but also the Treasury of the United States.

I compliment all those who participated in the process, including Senators who, at the time the measure was before the Senate, did not feel enthusiastic about the bill. I compliment all those concerned upon the acceptance of this verdict by those who are most vitally concerned.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I could not agree any more completely with my colleague. I appreciate his comments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have sufficient time to yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall require only about 10 seconds.

Is it not a fact that the affirmative vote in the burley producing States exceeded 90 percent, except in one State, where there were only 3 growers, 2 of whom voted for the reduction and 1 against it?

Mr. CLEMENTS. My friend from Virginia is entirely correct.

ADMINISTRATION BUNGLING IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] recently made a very significant speech on the floor of the Senate. He documented the administration's bungling in foreign affairs, and placed the responsibility where it properly belongs, on the President. I am happy to report that the validity of the Senator's charges has been concurred in by a number of newspapers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a representative selection of editorial comments on the speech of the Senator from North Carolina.

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

[From the Kings Mountain (N. C.) Herald]

MR. SCOTT'S SPEECH

Not long ago a Kings Mountain citizen wondered out loud when Senator W. KERR SCOTT was going to say something in Washington. Another commented that the new Senator must be getting his bearings, but offered the thought that the Haw River squire wouldn't remain silent forever.

As it happened, they did not have long to wait.

In his first major speech as a United States Senator, Mr. SCOTT was reminiscent of his old self, talking straight and talking strong. If there was any surprise, it was that the content concerned matters of international policy, where Mr. SCOTT had tread lightly during his primary campaign of a year ago, at that time on plea that he was not well-informed on global affairs.

Mainly, though, Mr. SCOTT's speech was an attack on President Eisenhower. The honeymoon for the President has lasted too long for the good of the Nation, SCOTT inferred, and it is time for the President to make decisions and to stop hiding behind his bureaucrats' skirts.

The Scott speech will get favorable cheers from the army of Democrats who are tired of having President Eisenhower regarded as a superhuman above the hoi polloi of workaday politics. It will not appeal to those Democrats who felt it was high time the checkrein was applied to the free-spending controlling element of the party from 1933 to 1953—even though many of these are disappointed that Eisenhower has not retrenched more.

At any rate, Senator SCOTT made a speech, and there will undoubtedly be more from him as the days and months unfold.

[From the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of April 5, 1955]

NO PRIVILEGED SANCTUARY

In his weekend blast at President Eisenhower as "the master architect of confusion," Senator KERR SCOTT was back in form.

Since entering the Senate the Squire has been laying low, as becomes a freshman, but last week he spoke up. His world food bank idea accentuated the positive; his acid comments about the drift and confusion of the Eisenhower administration had all the earmarks of the Haw River agrarian reformer pouring it on.

The Scott speech was no off-the-cuff performance; it was well planned and in advance and documented in detail (with appropriate quotations). While it had familiar political overtones, looking toward 1956, it also mirrored a growing opposition among many citizens against the "privileged sanctuary" status of the White House and the absence of any full-fledged criticism of the President himself.

SCOTT expressed these sentiments in typical, down-home language:

"When a baseball game is going badly the manager does not replace the bat boy. He replaces the pitcher. That is, he looks to the man most likely responsible for the bad turn the game is taking. * * *

"It is time we stopped criticizing the bat boys and begin to see just what kind of a job the pitcher is doing. It is time we began placing the responsibility for events where the responsibility really lies—on the President of the United States."

Senator SCOTT's criticism of the President referred to confusion and bungled leadership in these fields: (1) Release of the Yalta papers followed by the President's claim that he had nothing to do with it and saw nothing to gain by "going back 10 years and showing that, in the light of after events, someone may have been wrong, or someone may have been right"; (2) firing of Wolf Ladejinsky by Secretary Benson as a security risk and his rehiring by Harold Stassen—with the President again playing hands off; (3) Secretary of Labor Mitchell's advocacy of repeal of the "right to work" laws in 17 States and the President's disavowal of such views; (4) President Eisenhower's statement that "there must be no weakening of the * * * right to meet your accuser face to face," and Attorney General Brownell's opinion that the Justice Department couldn't handle the security-risk program if the accused had the right to be faced by his accuser; (5) administration confusion over policy in Indochina last year with several claiming to speak with authority (Nixon, Dulles, et al.), and final acceptance of a "bad bargain" truce; (6) planned confusion over Quemoy and Matsu and sounding off by various factions of the Republican Party.

Senator SCOTT is on sound ground, we think, when he points up these chinks in the Eisenhower armor. His speech is one sided in that it omits mention of the real achievements of the administration. But as a well-mannered criticism by the loyal opposition (not bitter in tone) it will serve a good purpose.

The White House itself is certainly no "privileged sanctuary." It is subject, and always has been, to democracy's partisan and nonpartisan cannonfire. The administration record, we think, has been surprisingly strong considering the inexperience of Mr. Eisenhower in the ways of Washington politics. But, as we stated last week, the Nation has seen numerous examples since Eisenhower's inauguration "of conflicting statements released by Cabinet members and assorted confusion about policy—all because the President himself did not seem to have a firm grip on the wheel of the Ship of State."

Along with Senator SCOTT we think General Eisenhower owes it to the American people—and to himself—to be the President of the United States in fact as well as in name.

[From the Arkansas Gazette of April 3, 1955]

A LOOK BEYOND THE BAT BOYS

KERR SCOTT's Senate speech characterizing President Eisenhower as an "architect of confusion" may at long last signal the beginning of a reasoned Democratic campaign to talk sense to the American people about what their President has done and hasn't done.

If the Democrats are to make a real fight for the presidency next year, they must cease to be dismayed by the Gallup poll's appraisal of Mr. Eisenhower's continuing popularity and join the fight on the issues.

There are plenty of valid issues, but the American people aren't going to hear about them often enough if the job is left to a few uninhibited columnists and a handful of cantankerous liberals of the WAYNE MORSE stripe. The most publicized criticisms of President Eisenhower this year have been Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler's wistful observation that the condition of Mrs. Eisenhower's health might affect a second-term decision and Senator MATT NEELY's fulminations against what he feels is an unwanted degree of self-conscious piety on the Potomac. Both incidents undoubtedly rebounded to Mr. Eisenhower's advantage.

Nobody is suggesting a willful campaign of obstruction against the President's proposals to Congress. The Democrats will continue to support the President where they think he is right, particularly in the broad field of foreign policy. But the Democrats not only must oppose the President when they think he is wrong, but must do a better job of telling the American people why.

It is past time that the people be disabused of some of the notions that have become a part of the Eisenhower mythology.

Dwight Eisenhower is not, as many voters have fondly believed, a nonpartisan President. He is an extremely partisan President, and it is good for the two-party system and the Republic that he is. But he should not be permitted to build up new strength for 1956 on the illusion that he is above politics.

Nor is Dwight Eisenhower a strong leader, as many more voters fondly believe. Except in the vital areas of foreign affairs, the President has rarely exercised the Executive authority as it should be exercised. When he has moved out forcefully, it usually has been at the wrong time and on the wrong issues.

One example serves to demonstrate both his partisanship and the faulty sense of timing inherent in his sporadic efforts to crack the whip over Congress:

President Eisenhower himself has said that his liberalized reciprocal-trade recommendations form a cornerstone of his long-term foreign policy. Yet the President has been unwilling to fight for his new Reciprocal Trade Act when the chips were down. The trade program is in grave danger in the Senate, and in fact may prove to have been just a year too late. If the President last year had used such words as "irresponsible" to describe Republican obstruction of the reciprocal-trade bill, he might have got what he wanted without the ignominious deal with Representative DAN REED which assured passage of his omnibus tax bill. Because he is a partisan President, he did no such thing. Yet, when the Democrats this year attempted to attach a small income-tax relief rider to the general tax-extension bill, Mr. Eisenhower was quick to cry "irresponsibility."

There are any number of specific issues. The 1954 tax bill itself offers a convenient example. The American people need to be told, and told repeatedly, that the loopholes left in that measure by Mr. Eisenhower's fiscal experts have cost the American people more than all the deep freezes and mink

coats that existed even in the imagination of the GOP's 1952 campaign-speech writers.

Mr. Eisenhower's new comptroller general, anxious to prove his independence, has recently drawn attention to two other issues: The past record of the company charged with building the Dixon-Yates steamplant, and the shortcomings of the administration's proposed highway-construction program.

As Senator SCOTT puts it:

"It is time we stopped criticizing the bat boys and begin to see just what kind of a job the pitcher is doing."

Senator SCOTT could have said that it appears very much like the bat boys are running the team.

PROPOSED WORLD FOOD BANK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago it was my great pleasure and honor to join the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] in proposing the establishment of a World Food Bank. The Senator from North Carolina, and more than 20 other Senators of both parties, concurrently joined me in introducing a resolution aimed at the creation of an International Food and Raw Materials Reserve. The success of these two extremely important and related proposals depends in good measure upon the public's understanding of them. Certainly if newsmen study these proposals, and give the facts to the people, the demand for such eminently sensible solutions to the problems of surplus and scarcity will increase.

In that connection, the largest evening newspaper in the State of North Carolina, the Charlotte News, on April 4 carried an editorial which succinctly summarizes the plan for a World Food Bank which could, says the News, become "an effective, doubled-edged weapon against the problems of terrible hunger abroad and mounting stockpiles at home." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the News editorial, which is entitled "KERR SCOTT'S Double-Edged Sword."

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

KERR SCOTT'S DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

W. KERR SCOTT waited long and patiently before preparing a piece of major legislation for the United States Senate. But when the time was ripe, he served up a chef d'oeuvre.

It is a bill to establish a world food bank patterned after the successful International Bank for Reconstruction and Redevelopment (known simply as the World Bank). He was joined in sponsorship of the measure by Montana's veteran Senator JIM MURRAY.

In the ruddy glow of last spring's campaign, a supremely confident Mr. SCOTT indicated that such a plan might be proposed when he got to Washington. As it turned out, this was not simply a hustings come-on.

The bill is worthy of serious consideration. On the surface, at least, it offers hope for a sensible solution to America's pesky farm surplus problem.

With near starvation and poverty in some parts of the world and bumper surpluses in other parts, a reasonable formula for redistribution is needed.

In Senator SCOTT's mind, a world food bank would "serve as a medium of distribution for the effective and businesslike disposal and utilization of so-called surplus food, fiber, and other agricultural products which have or may accumulate or be needed in this or other participating nations."

According to the Scott program, surpluses would not be given away. A bank would be created on which needy nations could draw when times are bad. Repayment would be in cash or in kind.

There are some kinks in the scheme which need straightening out. Are there really enough food-surplus nations to supply the demand? Can such an agency really deal in food as the present World Bank deals in cash?

But here, certainly, is the basis for an important program. If perfected, it could become an effective, double-edged weapon against the problems of terrible hunger abroad and mounting stockpiles at home.

WHERRY HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated April 18, 1955, which I have received for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The letter covered a sample report on Wherry housing projects. A copy of the full report has been forwarded to all appropriate standing committees of the Senate and the House.

It should be emphasized that this letter forwarded a report on only 4 of more than 250 Wherry Act projects. All of these projects, used for sampling, were within 150 miles of Washington.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 18, 1955.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your letter of January 26, 1955, and subsequent correspondence relating to Wherry Act housing projects in Virginia and elsewhere, an investigation has been made of 4 Wherry projects in Virginia, and there are transmitted herewith 25 copies of the report of investigation.

We believe you will be particularly interested in that portion of the report which shows that rental rates for tenants on all four projects were fixed on the assumption that local real-estate taxes would be paid as a part of operating expenses, although it appears that the sponsors of the Quantico, Fort Belvoir, and Fort Eustis projects may either escape payment of such taxes or secure a refund of taxes paid. Also, we believe you will be interested in the fact that rentals of over $200,000, or the equivalent of about 6 months' rentals for the entire projects, were collected on the Fort Eustis project prior to the time monthly payments under the mortgage began.

You have also expressed interest in the right of local communities to tax Wherry projects, particularly as that right may be affected by the provisions of the lease under which Government-owned land for a project is made available to the sponsor. The specific question you have raised in this connection is whether title to the buildings and other improvements placed on the Government-owned land by the sponsor should be vested in the Government or in the sponsor during the term of the lease. Statutory authority for the leasing of Government-owned land for Wherry housing projects is found in the so-called Leasing Act of 1947, approved August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 774), which is made a part of the Wherry Act by reference. Section 6 of this act provides as follows:

"SEC. 6. The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated."

It has been suggested in the correspondence you referred to us that the language of section 6 of the Leasing Act requires that leases of land to be used for Wherry projects should be so drafted, if possible, that the lessee sponsor of the project shall be subject to local taxation.

The purpose of the Leasing Act was to permit the military departments to maintain in a standby status certain defense plants and machine tools which otherwise might have been sold as surplus. Authority was given by the act to lease such plants, or parts thereof, to private commercial interests and to accept maintenance and upkeep as partial rental. Wherry housing, of course, was not authorized until some 2 years later when title VIII was added to the National Housing Act by the act of August 8, 1949 (12 U. S. C. 1748).

Considerable discussion was had during the legislative history of the bill which became the Leasing Act of 1947 as to local taxation of the plants to be leased. The bill (H. R. 3471, 80th Cong.), as originally introduced, had no provision regarding taxation.

The hearings on the bill before subcommittee No. 3 of the House Armed Services Committee indicate that it was assumed the plants to be leased could not be taxed locally, and the military departments intended to charge correspondingly high rentals to prevent lessees from securing a competitive advantage through freedom from local taxes. As a result of these hearings, the following section was added to the bill by House action:

"SEC. 6. Any lease of property authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain a provision that if and to the extent that such property is made taxable by State and local governments by act of Congress, in such event the terms of such lease shall be renegotiated."

The "renegotiation" provided for in section 6 was a reduction in rentals in the event such local taxes were permitted to be levied, as is shown by the following comment at page 5 of the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee on S. 1198 (H. R. 3471), 80th Congress:

"Section 6 recognizes the possibility of the passage of legislation permitting the taxing of federally owned property and permits renegotiation of the terms of leases executed when it was tax-free."

During the course of the Senate hearings the question of State taxation of the lessee's possessory or leasehold interest was discussed. It was stated to be the view of the War Department that property used for commercial purposes in any State should be taxed by the local authorities even though title to the property was in the United States and Under Secretary Royall suggested the addition of the following sentence to section 6 (hearings, p. 32):

"The lessee's interest, made or created pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be made subject to State or local taxation."

Thus, the two sentences of section 6 as finally enacted deal with two distinct things, the first sentence with the possessory or leasehold interest and the second sentence with the physical property itself, as is evidenced by Senator Baldwin's statement in

explaining the bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 8, page 9798) as follows:

"Section 6 expressly provides that the lessee's interest in property leased under the bill may be the subject of taxation by State or local authorities. It further provides that should such leased property itself be subsequently rendered taxable by State or local governments through any future action of Congress, any lease made under the authority of the bill shall be subject to reopening. This provision was inserted in order to prevent a lease from the Government being made a vehicle for tax avoidance."

During the legislative history of the Wherry Act there was some discussion of the problem of local taxation but no significant conclusions were reached. It is, however, interesting to note the following comments on Wherry projects contained in the committee report on the 1950 school aid bill, Public Law 874, 81st Congress (64 Stat. 1100—House Committee on Education and Labor, Rept. No. 2287 on H. R. 7940, 81st Cong., June 20, 1950, p. 25):

"The term 'Federal property' is defined in section 9 (1) to mean real property owned or leased by the United States which is not subject to taxation by any State or political subdivision. The term includes real property leased from the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force under section 805 of the National Housing Act, as amended, for the purpose of title VIII of such act. Such property is to be included as 'Federal property' whether or not it is determined to be 'subject to taxation' by any State or political subdivision or by the District of Columbia. This is the so-called Wherry-Spence housing recently authorized by Congress which is intended to play an important role in providing housing to military and civilian personnel connected with Federal activities in areas suffering acute housing shortage. The State and local tax status of the federally owned lands involved and of the housing to be constructed on them under this section of the National Housing Act is not clear at this time, the situation being complicated by the fact that the program contemplates a lease of the land to private concerns to construct and manage the housing built on the land. If all or most of the real property values involved should turn out to be fully subject to State or local taxation, the inclusion of such property as Federal property under the bill would not be necessary. Pending settlement of this question, the bill includes this type of property. Whatever taxes are paid on it by the Federal Government or by the lessees and which are available to local educational agencies for current expenditures will, of course, be deducted from any payments authorized under the bill pursuant to applicable deduction provisions."

In our consideration of the proper construction to be given section 6 of the Leasing Act we have also studied the views of the Department of Defense as reflected in a letter to you under date of February 23, 1955, from Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, General Counsel of the Department. As is pointed out in that letter, it is by no means certain that the vesting of title to the buildings and other improvements in the sponsor (lessee) of a Wherry project would permit local authorities to tax such property because of the exclusive Federal jurisdiction over many of the areas involved. It is noted that the same point was mentioned by Assistant Attorney General Morton in his letter to you of January 18, 1955.

The first sentence of section 6 of the Leasing Act specifically deals with local taxation of the lessee's "possessory interest" under a lease. However, the property contemplated for leasing under this statute consisted of certain defense plants and machine tools, and the question of exclusive Federal jurisdiction over such property did not exist. Therefore, the legality of imposing local possessory interest taxes (as for example that imposed by section 58–758 of the 1950 Virginia Code effective January 1, 1955) against a possessory interest in property such as a Wherry project which is located within exclusive Federal jurisdiction is not free from doubt. This precise question is now before the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in the appeal from the decision in *Sheridanville, Inc.* v. *Borough of Wrightstown* (125 F. Supp. 743) which was argued last month.

It should also be noted that the property which was to be leased under the Leasing Act was already in existence and belonged to the United States. Since title to the property to be leased was already in the Government, it obviously was not contemplated that section 6 would compel the Government to transfer its title to the lessee in order to subject him to local taxation. Such a suggestion was in fact made during the course of the House hearings in 1947 when Mr. Blandford asked whether the bill could not provide that the leased property be deemed to be owned by the lessees for local tax purposes only. In reply Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenney stated he did not believe that would be a wise procedure. (Hearings on H. R. 3471, 80th Cong., No. 147, p. 2353, Subcommittee No. 3, House Committee on Armed Services.)

In view of the legislative history of section 6 of the Leasing Act of 1947, it is not believed that the drafting of leases to vest title to Wherry Act improvements in the Government rather than in the sponsor can be considered illegal. We are of the opinion, and the Defense Department undoubtedly would agree, that local communities should not be required to furnish municipal services to Wherry projects without reimbursement. On the other hand, if the greater part of such services are furnished to the sponsor of a Wherry project by the Government on a reimbursable basis, there appears to be no justification for subjecting the project to local taxation at full value.

Because of the complicated legal problems involved, we believe that adjustment of the respective equities of the local communities and the Government can best be accomplished by legislation. We feel this is a matter which should be given specific attention in the event the present program is to be renewed. Both the Federal Housing Administration and the Department of Defense have been lax in failing to establish a firm and uniform policy with respect to the tax problem and other aspects of Wherry housing. The lack of consistency in administration and the absence of proper coordination between the Federal Housing Administration and the Defense Department have been responsible for the tax windfall of some $30,000 received by the sponsor of the Fort Belvoir project and the possible similar windfalls of $14,000 and $22,000 which the sponsors of the Quantico and Fort Eustis projects, respectively, may receive. In addition, the FHA procedures in effect permitted the builder or sponsor of the Fort Eustis project to collect rents prior to the beginning of mortgage payments. So far as the tax problem is concerned, it appears that this matter will be considered by the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction over Federal Areas, which is mentioned in the letter of January 18, 1955, you received from the Department of Justice, and that committee may well suggest amendatory legislation.

The papers which you kindly made available for our use in the matter are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF POLAND

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I count it a privilege again to send words of warm and prayerful encouragement to the heroic people of Poland on Poland's Constitution Day, which will be tomorrow.

On May 3, 1791, 164 years ago, the constitution of Poland was adopted. This constitution was the product of 4 intensive years of deliberation by the long Parliament, which made a brilliant effort and composed a great charter.

In a series of subsequent raids by Poland's enemies, the state was partitioned until, at the turn of the 19th century, the Polish state disappeared from the map of Europe, but the Polish nation did not disappear. The heroic Poles never accepted the partitioning and dismemberment of their country. The fight for freedom was a continuing one.

At the end of World War I, the Polish Republic was restored, after 123 years of enormous effort and sacrifice.

In 1918, Poland assumed the tremendous task of reconstruction with inspiring vigor.

Poland resumed its traditional role among the nations of the world.

The attack on Poland on September 1, 1939, was the first application of the Nazis' blitzkrieg. Poland found itself under German rule and the heroic sons and daughters of Poland again had to go underground to resume their fight for freedom. In a quick series of heartbreaking developments, the master's yoke fell into the hands of Communists and additional tyranny was heaped upon these courageous people.

Steadily but surely, a Communist puppet government was set up in Poland, holding the people in its vice-like grip and following the now so familiar and devastating pattern.

Now Poland's people are continuing their struggle for the freedom and liberty which has again been snatched from them. We know that they shall never yield. As the fight goes on, they give renewed inspiration to the entire world.

We have a deep sympathy and a continuing concern for their welfare and progress. This is characteristic of all true Americans.

We undertook an enormous program of economic assistance to the people of Poland, mounting to approximately one-sixth of the total assistance given to all war-devastated countries throughout the world, but additional aid was choked off by the Communists because they had possession of power.

I believe I speak for all Americans when I say that no people on earth could more conclusively prove their undying love of liberty and their right to it.

Assuredly, all Americans have an enduring faith that the Polish struggle for liberty and independence will again be successful.

We pray that with God's help their day of ultimate deliverance will soon be reached. We send to our friends in Poland our encouragement, our best wishes, and our prayers.

NATIONAL ACREAGE ALLOTMENT AND QUOTA REFERENDUM FOR WHEAT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, by May 15 Secretary Benson must announce the date of the 1956 national acreage allotment and quota referendum for wheat, with the vote to be held not later than July 25.

The wheat referendum this year will confront farmers with a serious decision, greatly complicated by the policies of the administration severely limiting the inducements to cooperation in making necessary production adjustments.

I wish to warn that the impact of this referendum will be felt far beyond the confines of wheat-producing areas. It will have a profound effect on great segments of American agriculture, and very likely upon our economy as a whole.

In order to encourage a better understanding of all that is at stake, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the April 18 issue of the Farmers Union Herald published by the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, entitled "Serious Problems Loom for Wheat," together with two enlightening articles from the same issue of that publication analyzing the coming referendum, one entitled "Farmers Face Year of Decision" and the other entitled "How Wheat Vote May Affect Prices." I urge my colleagues who are interested in agriculture to read them carefully.

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

SERIOUS PROBLEMS LOOM FOR WHEAT

A look ahead to 1956 and beyond is not one to cheer the wheat farmer, nor any other farmer for that matter. What happens to wheat can affect feed grains of all kinds and meat, poultry, and dairy farmers as well.

The Eisenhower administration has engineered a declining farm economy in which the wheat farmer is the immediate goat. It has been some 23 long years since the wheat farmer has had to look at a future fraught only with uncertainty of costs and returns due to price uncertainty. Coming on top of the usual gambles of weather, rust, and pests, price uncertainty makes every year from 1956 on look bleak when compared to recent years.

If anyone, expert or otherwise, can see 90 percent of parity or better wheat prices anywhere in the distant future under the Eisenhower program, please lend us your telescope.

Now comes the wheat quota referendum. Sometime before the end of July, wheat producers will vote on marketing quotas for their 1956 crop. Heads or tails, wheat farmers are going to lose something. They most certainly aren't going to win anything, no matter how they vote.

Ovid Martin, Associated Press farm writer, says in a recent dispatch, the "referendum could rock the Nation's farm-commodity markets and shake Federal farm programs to their foundations. It also could have strong political effects on next year's presidential and congressional elections. And it might force the Eisenhower administration to change some of its thinking on farm programs."

The situation is serious, not alone for wheat farmers but for other farmers as well and, perhaps, for the entire economy. Wheat producers, themselves, stand to lose in 1956 an average of about $13 to $15 an acre in gross income compared with 1953, whether wheat quotas are voted in or out. John Baker, top researcher for the national Farmers Union, has estimated that farmers' average gross income per wheat acre will be about $24 with 25 acres in each hundred available to be planted in something else if farmers accept quotas.

On the other hand, if quotas are voted down, farmers might have a gross income of about $23 an acre with no diverted acres to be used in other production.

At the recent Grain Co-op Federation meeting in Washington, USDA people voiced anxiety over a possible rejection of the quotas. The word "disaster" was used by one expert and he applied the word to the whole economy, not just agriculture.

Rejection of the quotas would tumble the support price of wheat to around $1.20 a bushel. That would put wheat in competition with corn and other feed grains. The end result could be destruction of the price support program for corn and other feed grains as well as for wheat. Farmers could look for corn and wheat prices around $1 or a little more in a free market as rough as they've ever seen.

So we say, the situation is serious. That is why the Herald publishes on page 1 of this issue 2 analyses, 1 by Porter Hedge, our Washington correspondent, and another by Mr. Baker. We urge farmers to read both of them carefully.

Top people in the Farmers Union and the Farmers Union GTA and Central Exchange meet in St. Paul this week to discuss the serious situation facing farmers. They undoubtedly will lay a plan of action before their respective boards of directors. In this case, as in all others affecting farm and national welfare, the Farmers Union and Farmers Union co-ops, can be counted on to base action on grassroots opinion.

FARM REPORT—FARMERS FACE YEAR OF DECISION

(By Porter Hedge)

WASHINGTON.—This may be the year of decision for agriculture.

A few of the top marketing officials here attach this much importance to the wheat-marketing-quota referendum coming up this summer, and to its potential effects upon agriculture as a whole.

Wheat is a basic crop in more than one sense. It's important to the farm economy as a whole. It also is important to the legal price-support structure that has been built up over the last 15 to 20 years.

AFFECTS ALL COMMODITIES

What happens to wheat directly or indirectly affects all the other major farm commodities, especially the other grains, feeds, and livestock.

For this reason, wheat producers in a sense will be voting the proxies of other growers when they go to the polls this summer.

Wheat prices are on a downslide. Forces have been set in motion in the last couple of years which makes it impossible to stop this price movement, short of drastic new legislation, general drought, or war.

There is little question about the direction of wheat prices for the next year or two, barring dramatic new developments. They have to go down. The only question is one of degree—how far prices will drift before the reaction sets in.

Prices of many other crops—corn, other feed grains, protein feeds, hogs, poultry, and so on—will be pulled along by wheat.

Wheat stocks are of a size that with just average yields on the minimum acreage allotment—55 million acres—enough can be produced to supply domestic and export requirements. Anything more adds to the surplus.

PROSPECTS FOR 1956

Wheat yields have been above average, even during the last 2 drought years.

Only the tightest control of Government-held stocks could prevent depressed markets. Without this, it is the consensus among the informed that wheat prices can't hope to attain price-support levels in the market—unless supports are so low as to make little difference.

Here are prospects for the wheat loan rate in 1956, if nothing is done to change the present law:

If marketing quotas pass, the formula in the present farm act will determine the 1956 wheat loan. Support will drop from $2.06 a bushel this year, to $1.79 a bushel—because of the sliding scale provision.

If marketing quotas fail, the wheat loan would drop from $2.06 a bushel to $1.20, based on the present parity level. Control over acreage would continue, though marketing penalties would be dropped.

If marketing quotas fail and the law should be changed to permit a somewhat higher rate than half of parity, a support of around $1.60 to $1.65 is currently mentioned as a possibility.

A breakup in the marketing quota system might be in the making this year. Growers are hurt by the cut of about a third in acreage. Controls always have been irksome, however necessary they may have been considered.

CONGRESS DIVIDED ON QUOTAS

A minority of producers always has wanted to throw off controls. Others are willing to ditch quotas now, and to loosen up on acreage controls, in the hope they can get something better. Advocates of the 2-price wheat plan are in this group. There are others who want neither marketing quotas nor the 2-price system, but an in-between program.

There is general concern as to what might happen to the farm economy if quotas fail. At the same time, some of the farm groups still are uncertain as to what position they should take. In Congress, leaders are pretty well divided.

Alternative proposals are being advanced now for the first time. The Department of Agriculture's approach to the problem is to get new legislation giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to set the wheat loan at some point higher than 50 percent of parity, in the event quotas should be voted out.

MAY INCREASE 50-PERCENT PROVISION

Present talk in USDA is for setting a loan rate of around $1.65 a bushel—just over the support for corn.

Authority to do this is provided in H. R. 5396. This is a bill by Congressman BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan. It merely amends the present Farm Act to say that if quotas are voted down the wheat price support shall be set at not less than 50 percent of parity. The law now says the support level must be 50 percent of parity unless there are marketing quotas.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson is on record as favoring this kind of approach to the wheat question. "I think it has real promise, and has in it some real value," Benson told a recent press conference. This approach has been discussed also by the President's National Agricultural Advisory Commission.

American Farm Bureau Federation also now has a new plan. Farm Bureau proposes to give producers an alternative choice on the ballot, though it would have Congress specify a minimum loan rate.

The Bureau plan: Set the minimum wheat support at 65 percent of parity ($1.55 now). Raise the minimum farm-acreage allotment from fifty-five to sixty-two million acres. Seal up CCC stocks so there could be no net sales with a wheat loan rate at the 65-percent level. Premiums and discounts for quality in the loan would be increased.

REFERENDUM LIKELY IN JULY

It's probable the wheat referendum will be held July 23. The 1956 national acreage

allotment and quota referendum must be announced by May 15, along with the date of the referendum. The vote must be held not later than July 25.

The first notion in USDA was to hold the referendum well ahead of the July deadline. Congress would still be in session and could take action in the event quotas were defeated. Now sentiment has changed to putting off the vote until late July.

HOW WHEAT VOTE MAY AFFECT PRICES

(By John A. Baker)

The Eisenhower flexible supports farm law has returned the big gamble to wheat farming. Not since 1932 have wheat farmers been faced with such uncertainty of costs and returns due to price uncertainty.

Looking ahead to 1956 and later years wheat farmers face a wide range of uncertain possibilities. None of them are good compared to recent years.

The possibilities are varied at present, largely because of the uncertain results of the referendum on wheat marketing quotas, which must be held by July 25.

The table which appears below this story summarizes the 1956 price possibilities that confront the Nation's wheat farmers as they await the referendum.

What wheat producers actually face in the way of 1956 prices and income, boils down to this:

1. If the required two-thirds majority approves quotas, harvested acres will be cut to about three-quarters of normal and backed up by 75 percent of "transitional" parity price.

2. If quotas fail to receive the necessary majority, there will be no limitation on acreage but a highly uncertain free market price will prevail.

Either alternative is a great loss from 1953, when mandatory 90 percent controls with no marketing quotas were in effect.

Price, income, acreage implications related to 100 acres of wheat to be harvested in 1956, compared to 1953

Situation	Acres harvested	Yield per harvested acre	Production	Expected price	Gross income	Acres available for other use
1953	100	18	1,800	$2.21	$3,978	0
1956—Alternatives and possibilities						
Quotas carry						
Cooperator	75	18	1,350	[1] 1.79	2,416	25
Noncooperator [2]	100	18	1,800	([3])	[4] 2,268	0
Quotas fail [5]						
90 percent corn [6]	100	18	1,800	[7] 1.57	2,826	0
85 percent corn [8]	100	18	1,800	[9] 1.48	2,664	0
75 percent corn [10]	100	18	1,800	[11] 1.31	2,358	0
50 percent wheat [12]	100	18	1,800	[12] 1.20	2,160	0
Damp wheat [14]	100	18	1,800	1.00	1,800	0

[1] 75 percent of transitional parity ($2.39×75 percent=$1.79).

[2] Farmers harvest full acreage regardless of quotas or 25 acres more than allotment.

[3] None of his production would be eligible for price-support loans, but would have to be sold on free market. Free market price might be about 85 percent of the support level or $1.83. But he would have to pay a penalty of 45 percent of parity on all excess production above quota or a marketing penalty of $1.08 in each of 450 bushels.

[4] 1,800 bushels at $1.53 equals $2,754; 450 bushels at $1.08 (penalty) equals $486; $2,754 minus $486 equals $2,268.

[5] If quotas fail, farmers could produce as much wheat as they want to and sell it all on the free market. Nobody knows or can figure what the free market price for wheat in 1956 might be under these circumstances. Listed in the next 5 lines of the table are the situations that seem to cover the range of probable outcomes in 1956.

[6] Should some disaster greatly reduce the production of corn and other feed grains the market price of corn might be 90 percent of parity or better. Since a bushel of wheat has about the same feeding value as a bushel of corn the free market wheat price might be slightly below 90 percent of corn parity of $1.57.

[7] 90 percent of transitional parity price for corn 1956 (down 5 percent from old parity).

[8] Reliable estimates now think that barring abnormal growing conditions in 1955, the corn supply percentage for 1956 will be such that corn will be supported at 85 percent of parity on the sliding scale.

[9] Assuming that for the first time in history the corn price support program is made effective in the market at the announced level of support, this would give a free market price for wheat of about $1.48.

[10] In most years, the free market price of corn has been about ⅚ or less of the announced support level. If the announced corn support price were 85 percent of parity, this would mean a corn free market price of about 75 percent of parity (transitional in 1956–57 down from old parity price).

[11] 75 percent of corn transitional parity.

[12] Should all get in 1955 a bumper production of corn and other feed grains, along with a bumper crop of wheat and oilseeds, it is likely that the corn support program might crack up under the strain dropping domestic United States prices to world levels even if CCC and Canadian wheat board hold on to present stocks. Most observers feel this figure might be 50 percent of the transitional parity price of wheat.

[13] Old parity price for wheat ($2.52) minus 5 percent equals $2.39; 50 percent of $2.39 equals $1.20.

[14] It is conceivable but not likely that the U. S. Government (CCC) and the Canadian Wheat Board might dump their stocks on the world market. In that case the world price might well drop below $1 per bushel and certainly would not be above that figure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, constructive action can be taken by this Congress to make the necessary production adjustments far more acceptable to farmers, and less disrupting to our entire economy.

In view of the seriousness of the future implications that might result from a possible rejection of quotas by farmers in the approaching referendum, I once again call attention to the Conservation Acreage Reserve proposal I have introduced, S. 1396, and urge its thoughtful consideration along with any other alternatives which may be suggested toward giving the farmer the opportunity of helping bring about needed production adjustments without severe financial loss and hardship that will affect our entire economy.

Personally, I shall urge our farmers to vote for continuing the quotas even though I fully realize the hardship it will entail for many.

However, I must point out that the serious situation now confronting farmers in the choice put before them in this referendum is the result of the policies of this administration and the action of this Congress in invoking flexible price supports.

Despite the argument that the purpose of flexible price supports was to curtail production, it now threatens to have just the opposite effect, as many of us feared, by making many farmers unwilling to accept quotas in return for such lowered support prices.

IMPORTANCE OF LEGISLATION TO ALLOCATE SALK VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that we often have to learn the hard way.

Immediately after the announcement of the effectiveness of Salk vaccine I introduced S. 1691, which proposes to constitute a Federal commission empowered to allocate and establish mandatory priorities for the use of the vaccine. Meanwhile, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and local groups were attempting to devise advisory and voluntary systems of allocation.

I may say to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that I was very pleased to hear him say that he was planning to introduce a bill on this subject, but the introduction of a bill is not necessary in order to cover the points on which he commented in his short speech this morning, because S. 1691 carries out the objectives of the New York Herald Tribune editorial. The bill was introduced some time ago, and I have called upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold early hearings on it. No hearings have yet been held. I wish to say most respectfully that, in my judgment, not only is the executive branch of the Government derelict in this matter but I think Congress also has been derelict. If we had acted quickly, much of the difficulty could have been avoided.

The recent unfortunate experiences with the Cutter vaccine show that voluntary means are totally inadequate. When the Cutter vaccine was recalled in New York City it became known that it was being distributed with favoritism and going to many outside the 5- to 9-year group in which susceptibility to infantile paralysis is greatest.

So the New York press reports that 80 packages of the vaccine had gone to friends, relatives, and employees of those operating the distributing firms. Many doctors reported that they had used the vaccine on their own children. And it was disclosed that some adults, who need it least, were inoculated.

The New York Herald Tribune has performed a valuable public service with a front-page editorial entitled "An Editorial on Polio: Washington Must Act." The program advocated in that editorial coincides with most of the provisions of S. 1691. I had intended to ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, but I understand the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has had it printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; so I shall not make the request. But, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD statistics on the incidence of polio by age group and the expected vaccine supply in the next few months.

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

Polio incidence in 1954

Age group	Number of children [1]	Number of cases	Cases per 100,000
Under 5 years	17,807,000	9,608	54.0
5 to 9 years	16,347,000	10,576	64.7
10 to 14 years	12,886,000	5,811	45.1
15 to 19 years	11,055,000	3,254	29.4

[1] July 1, 1954.

Estimated vaccine supply

	Expected production	Cumulative total supply	Cumulative total immunizations
	Million cubic centimeter	*Million cubic centimeter*	*Million of children*
On hand Apr. 12	----------	27	13.5
Production Apr. 12 to May 1	6.75	33.8	16.9
Production in May	13.5	47.3	23.6
Production in June	13.5	60.8	30.4

Present child population

	Mar. 1, 1955	Cumulative by age groups
1 to 5 years [1]	14,955,000	14,955,000
5 to 9 years	16,872,000	31,827,000
10 to 14 years	13,181,000	45,008,000
15 to 19 years	11,150,000	56,158,000
Under 1 year	----------	4,037,000
Total, under 20	----------	60,195,000

Polio contributions through March of Dimes in 17 years, $367,000,000.

[1] This excludes children under 1, because the polio "attack rate" for them is low.

Attack rate of polio in 1954

[Based on hospital admissions]

Age:	*Per 100,000*
Under 1	11
1–2	33
2–3	39
3–4	40
4–5	42
5–6	44
6–7	44
7–8	39
8–9	42
9–10	33
10–11	31
11–12	29
12–13	32
13–14	27

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said when I introduced my bill, I am not wedded to it. I am perfectly willing to accept any reasonable amendment to the bill, but it is perfectly clear that during this period of shortage in supply of vaccine, a supply which will perhaps last about 12 or 14 months, the Federal Government has an obligation to protect the boys and girls who are most susceptible to polio; namely, those who happen to be in the age group of from 5 to 12 years.

Mr. President, I advocate that the Federal Government take over the distribution of polio vaccine until such time as there is enough for all. We must not adopt anything which would produce a danger of socialization of medicine. But it is perfectly absurb for anyone to argue that the creation of a temporary bureau to control the distribution of the vaccine involves any danger of socializing medicine. What is necessary, Mr. President, is that the Congress and the administration live up to their obligations to the American people. When we have this great opportunity to speed up the means for checking polio, we cannot stand by and be responsible for a single boy or girl suffering an attack of this dread disease if it can be avoided by making the vaccine available under Government distribution.

I have provided in my bill the checks for the medical profession and the pharmaceutical houses and health groups to see to it that there is no danger that the Government is going into the business of medicine, but that it is only going to exercise its police powers in a way that will bring the greatest safety to the boys and girls of the United States.

Mr. President, the figures show that the highest polio rate occurs in the 5-to-9 age group. There are approximately 16.4 million children in this age group. By May 1, the estimated supply of vaccine was to be sufficient to immunize 16.9 million persons.

The supply now on hand just about equals the needs of the children who are in the greatest danger.

By July 1, there will have been a total production of vaccine for 30.4 million immunizations, not enough to meet the needs of all children under 10. Children under 1 year old are happily not greatly in need.

But it is obvious that effective allocation and priority control are needed immediately.

It hardly makes sense to burden every State and community with the task of attempting control. This is a national problem and should be met by Federal action.

The time to act was last month. But we should move immediately to enact the necessary legislation. I have no pride of authorship in my bill. It contains, however, some good features. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and two House Members have also introduced bills on the subject. They should be considered immediately, brought to the floor this week, and enacted.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should go to work within the hour to see to it that Congress lives up to the responsibility of saving the boys and girls of this Nation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, like my colleague from Oregon, I read the editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune. Immediately on reading it, I prepared a statement which categorically outlined my own point of view as to the course Congress should follow. The statement reads as follows:

I believe the Herald Tribune of New York, in its fine editorial on polio which appeared this morning has rendered a highly important national service.

I favor and will support any Federal legislation that may be necessary to insure equitable distribution of Salk vaccine so as to make it available free as promptly as possible to all children, regardless of their age or other conditions.

I also favor and will support any Federal legislation necessary to prevent black markets and price gouging.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the discussion of House bill 1 two technicians from the Department of State, namely, Thorston V. Kalijarvi, Deputy Assistant Secretary, and Carl D. Corse, Chief of the Trade Agreements and Treaties Division of the Office of International Trade and Resources, may have the privileges of the floor of the Senate. Their presence on the floor will enable them to be readily available to furnish technical information in regard to the operation of the trade-agreements program.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as the original text for the purpose of further amendment by any Senator who may desire to propose an amendment either to a committee amendment or the original bill.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. As I understand, after the committee amendments have been agreed to, the bill, including the committee amendments, will be considered to be a new bill, and will be subject to amendment.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. That is the customary practice.

Mr. BARRETT. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the request of the senior Senator from Virginia is agreed to.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "thereof", to strike out

containing provisions with respect to international trade, including provisions relating to tariffs, to most favored nation standards and other standards of nondiscriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters relating to such trade designed to promote the purpose of this section similar to any of the foregoing: Provided, That no such provision shall be given effect in the United States in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States;

on page 3, line 8, after the word "Provided", to strike out "further", and in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "organizational provisions of any foreign trade agreement entered into under this section" and insert "the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade".

On page 4, line 7, after the numerals "1955", to insert "or with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published in the Federal Register on November 16, 1954".

On page 4, line 14, after the word "subparagraph", to strike out "(E)" and insert "(C)"; in line 17, after the word "on", to strike out "July", and insert "January"; after line 17, to strike out:

(ii) In the case of any article which the President determines, at the time the foreign trade agreement is entered into, is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities, the rate 50 per centum below the rate existing on January 1, 1945. This clause shall not apply with respect to any article unless it is identified in the list

required by section 3 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1360 (a)), for possible consideration as an article which is normally not imported into the United States or is normally imported into the United States in negligible quantities.

On page 5, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(iii)" and insert "(ii)".

On page 6, after line 2, to strike out:

(E) In order to carry out a foreign trade agreement entered into by the President on or after June 12, 1955, to which the Government of Japan is a party and with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published on November 16, 1954 (19 F. R. 7379), if the President determines that such decrease is necessary in order to provide expanding export markets for products of Japan (including such markets in third countries), decreasing by more than 50 per centum any rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945.

On page 6, line 17, after the word "paragraph", to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)".

On page 6, line 23, after the word "on", to strike out "July" and insert "January", and on page 7, line 2, after the word "on", to strike out "July" and insert "January".

On page 7, after line 20, to strike out:

(D) If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of the amount of duty imposed with respect to an article, he may exceed any limitation specified in paragraph (2) (D) or (E) of this subsection or subparagraph (B) of this paragraph by not more than whichever of the following is lesser:

(i) The difference between the limitation and the next lower whole number, or

(ii) One-half of 1 per centum ad valorem. In the case of a specific rate (or of a combination of rates which includes a specific rate), the one-half of 1 per centum specified in clause (ii) of the preceding sentence shall be determined in the same manner as the ad valorem effect of rates not stated wholly in ad valorem terms is determined for the purposes of paragraph (2) (D) (iii) of this subsection.

(4) In exercising his authority under this section, the President shall avoid, to the maximum extent he deems practicable and consistent with the purpose of this section, the subdivision of classification categories.

On page 8, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 19, after "subsection (a) (2)", to strike out "(D) or (E)" and insert "(C) or (D)"; in line 20, after "subsection (a) (3)", to strike out "(B), (C), and (D)" and insert "(B) and (C)"; in line 25, after "subsection (a) (2) (D)", to strike out "(iii)" and insert "(ii)"; on page 10, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "and subparagraph (C) of this paragraph"; in line 12, after the word "on", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "July" and insert "January"; at the top of page 11, to strike out:

(C) In applying paragraphs (2) (D) (i) and (3) (B) (i) of subsection (a), the rate of duty on an article included in a foreign trade agreement with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published on November 16, 1954 (19 F. R. 7379), if such agreement is entered into before July 1, 1955, shall be considered to be the rate "existing on July 1, 1955."

On page 11, line 12, after "(e)", to insert "(1)"; in line 21, after the word "into", to strike out "thereunder." and insert "thereunder"; after line 21, to insert:

(2) The Tariff Commission shall at all times keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into by the President under the authority of this section. The Tariff Commission, at least once a year, shall submit to the Congress a factual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program.

On page 12, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 5. The last sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (a)), is amended to read as follows: "The Tariff Commission shall immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations, and shall cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.".

On page 12, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (b) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364 (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.".

(b) Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1364), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) As used in this Act, the terms 'domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products' and 'domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles' mean that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. Where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury.".

On page 13, after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 7. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended", approved July 1, 1954 (19 U. S. C., sec. 1352a), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 2." and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.".

CONDITIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the opposition to the Nationalist Government of Ngo Dinh Diem, which has never ceased in underground conspiracy and sabotage, has now come out in an open military action designed to destroy that Government. There has already been considerable fighting and bloodshed in the streets of Saigon.

For a time the Vietnamese Government appeared to be making some progress in consolidating the non-Communist position in South Vietnam. Headed by Ngo Dinh Diem, that Government has had the full cooperation of the United States.

From its inception the Diem government made clear that it was dedicated to the independence and welfare of the people of Vietnam. Because it was, it antagonized powerful forces, native and otherwise, in Saigon-Cholon. For the first time, the Viet Minh Communist forces in the north found themselves confronted with an opposition which had some chance of capturing the loyalties of the Vietnamese people which they had monopolized by default prior to its advent.

As Members of the Senate may recall, I have visited Vietnam during the course of two study missions in Indochina and have reported my observations to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have also spoken on the situation in Indochina from time to time in this body.

I have not been in Vietnam since last September, and I do not know the full details of the present crisis. I assume that the President and the Secretary of State do have those details since they bear responsibility for fitting our policy to developments in Vietnam.

Recent news reports from Saigon and elsewhere, however, give a general picture of what has been going on in south Vietnam. They tell of French dissatisfaction with the Diem government and the bitter animosity of various sects and other groups toward that government because of its attempts to curtail their independent power and revenue. The Diem government has been portrayed for weeks as on the verge of overthrow, with its Premier unable to consolidate his authority in the country.

They also tell of the incredibly sordid situation which the nationalist government inherited after the Geneva truce. They tell of the near anarchy in the south and the callous corruption in Saigon. They do not tell of the constant efforts to undercut the Government by an undercover conspiracy that operates back and forth between the French Riviera and the city of Saigon-Cholon.

Now that conspiracy has finally come out in the open. We see the incredible spectacle of the Premier of the Government, Ngo Dien Diem, being summoned to Paris in the midst of a revolt precipitated by racketeers. We see the incredible spectacle of a military leader who had sought refuge among the racketeers being appointed by a chief of state in Cannes over the head of the premier as commander of the national army which is supposed to suppress the racketeer's revolt.

Fortunately, over the weekend, some answers have been given to these questions, because Ngo Dinh Diem has refused to go to the Riviera to meet with Bao Dai, the chief of state, because he knew very well that the reason for the conference which had been called was to bring about his dismissal.

So far as General Vy, the inspector general, is concerned, he was appointed by Bao Dai to head the national army over the head of the Premier. He had come into power in Saigon over the weekend for 10 or 12 hours, but, fortunately, he is now out, the troops who went out with him have gone back to the national army, and General Vy has fled to Dalat, 240 miles to the northeast.

There is nothing new in this picture, except the open fighting. It is precisely the kind of situation with which the Diem government has had to contend since the outset. There is nothing in it which would lead me to revise the conclusions which I reached last year. On October 15, I reported those conclusions to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I should like to reemphasize them at this time by reading pertinent sections:

A year ago, the principal requirements for the success of our policy with respect to Indochina were political. These requirements, full independence and effective internal government, notably in Vietnam, have not been effectively fulfilled. The failure in this respect appears also to have been accompanied by a consistent underestimating of both the political and military strength of the Viet Minh, on the part of practically all concerned. In consequence, the situation has seriously deteriorated.

The United States shares responsibility for the reversal in Indochina. We should not make the mistake, however, of assuming all the blame. We gave material aid unstintingly, but its value was dissipated by inadequacies elsewhere. I report this, not so much in criticism—I am fully aware of the great contributions to the common cause made by sincere French officials and sincere Vietnamese nationalists—but rather to make clear that this country has discharged the commitments which it was asked to make last year and which it agreed to make. At that time it was not asked to commit and was even discouraged from committing manpower in Indochina. Not until the crisis of Dien Bien Phu did the question even arise. Then the pressures of American opinion operating largely through Congress discouraged a hasty, ill-conceived involvement. Our share in the defense of Indochina was clearly understood at the outset to be the supply of material aid only and we quite properly insisted that this understanding be maintained. The situation in Indochina is only one of the many crises that confront us and the burden of sustaining freedom in the world must be equitably borne.

At present, there appears to be, at best, scant hope of achieving the objectives of our policy in Indochina in the near future, with Cambodia the only exception to this conclusion. The present Government of Vietnam which is based on the sound principles of national independence, an end to corruption, and internal amelioration, is immobilized largely by a squabbling, plotting opposition. Its critics complain of the personality of the leader of that government. In view of the numerous and varied personalities who have occupied the presidency in Saigon during the past 2 or 3 years without tangible results, it seems more likely that the real question is one of dissatisfaction with the principles of the Diem government rather than the inadequacies of his personality.

Should the Diem government be forced out of office it is doubtful that under the pressure of time a more satisfactory substitute, subscribing to the same principles to which he does, will be found. Yet these principles must prevail in South Vietnam, if an alternative to the Communist Vietminh that is likely to be acceptable to the people of Vietnam is to exist. Any replacement of Diem at this time, if it occurs, will probably take the form of a military dictatorship based upon a coalition of the special interests, parties, and groups which now oppose the present Government. It is improbable that the substitute will be the kind of Government which will be generally supported by the Vietnamese people any more than the pre-Diem governments were. Nor is it likely to be a Government capable of sustaining a free and independent Vietnam eventually without foreign support. It was to develop that kind of Vietnam that the United States made available hundreds of millions of dollars of aid. In my view, only that kind of Vietnam can achieve the purpose of our policy in Indochina, which, in the final analysis, is its freedom and the consequent enhancement of our own security.

In the event that the Diem government falls, therefore, I believe that the United States should consider an immediate suspension of all aid to Vietnam and the French Union forces there, except that of a humanitarian nature, preliminary to a complete reappraisal of our present policies in Free Vietnam. Unless there is reasonable expectation of fulfilling our objectives, the continued expenditure of the resources of the citizens of the United States is unwarranted and inexcusable.

Two parts of those conclusions should be underlined in connection with the present crisis. They bear directly on it.

1. Should the Diem government be forced out of office, it is doubtful that a more satisfactory substitute subscribing to the same principles which he does, will be found. Yet those principles must prevail in south Vietnam, if an alternative to the Communist Vietminh that is likely to be acceptable to the people of Vietnam is to exist.

And:

2. In the event that the Diem government falls, I believe that the United States should consider an immediate suspension of all aid to Vietnam and the French Union forces there, except that of a humanitarian nature, preliminary to a complete reappraisal of our present policies in Free Vietnam.

A showdown in Saigon is now in progress. I know that there are side issues in this struggle. I know that it has been contended, and perhaps correctly, that Diem is too uncompromising in his dealings with other political leaders who are inclined toward the nationalist cause. Basically, however, the showdown is between two sets of forces in Vietnam. The one, presently personified by Diem, stands for a decent and honest government in an independent Vietnam. The military power alined against it is based on those who have little concept of or little concern for, what those terms mean, or have downright contempt for them. Diem has recently expressed his intention of holding elections as a first step toward representative government. Who opposes these elections? Those, apparently, whose power is not based on the consent of the people over whom it is exercised. The opponents of the Diem government have power, but it is power built largely on corruption and the fear which their private armed forces inspire. It is the power of the Black Hand, the pirate, the mercenary, the racketeer, and the witch doctor.

If the forces standing for decency and honesty and genuine national independence fail in this crisis, the cause of human freedom in Asia will not gain. This country will not gain. France will not really gain. Even those Vietnamese who help to bring about the downfall of the Government, in the long run, will not gain. Only the Communists will gain.

It is possible that a semblance of stability may be produced in Saigon if a coalition of the corrupt under a thin veneer of respectability replaces the present Government. Beneath the surface, however, the penetration of communism will go on inevitably.

My view of the present crisis remains as I expressed it in the conclusions of the report which I read today. Current developments seem to me only to emphasize the pertinence of those conclusions.

It is possible that the executive branch has information on the situation in south Vietnam going far beyond that which is currently appearing in the press. General Collins, who has been performing a difficult mission with superb devotion to duty, in support of the Diem government, has just reported to the President and the Secretary of State. It may be that in time this body will be advised of facts which we do not now have. It may be that the President and the Secretary of State will find it necessary to alter the present direction of our policy in Vietnam. That is entirely possible, and if that proves to be the case, it certainly will lie within their responsibility to make the necessary adjustments.

I am confident, however, that this Government will not aline itself with the kind of forces which are now in military and conspiratorial opposition to Diem. The expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in support of those forces would be, it seems to me, entirely unwarranted. I believe the American people would expect an explanation which would show how any such expenditures could contribute to the national interests of this country. It would be the responsibility of the Congress to see that they get such an explanation. Our national interests with respect to Vietnam can be furthered only if our policies serve to lead to a Vietnamese Government which is independent and which can put down solid roots in the Vietnamese populace.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana for his very timely address. I, for one, realize he has intimate knowledge concerning very complex, interesting, and challenging problems.

In the light of athe Senator's remarks today, I should like to call to his attention a statement which I issued on last

Friday afternoon, April 29. My statement was as follows:

There are persistent rumors here in the Nation's capital that our Government is going to permit developments in Vietnam to drift. There is far too much loose talk indicating that our Government's policy is no longer in full support of Premier Diem.

This must stop. Premier Diem is the best hope that we have in South Vietnam. He is the leader of his people. He deserves and must have the wholehearted support of the American Government and our foreign policy. This is no time for uncertainty or half-hearted measures. The Government of South Vietnam is facing open rebellion. It is receiving dubious support, and at times what appears to be opposition, from the French. We cannot display any sense of uncertainty or weakness. Premier Diem is an honest and a dedicated patriot. He is the only man on the political horizon of the Vietnam who can rally a substantial degree of support of his people. For America to default in backing him at this hour would be a display of weakness and irresponsibility that cannot be explained or condoned.

If we have any comments to make about leadership in Vietnam let it be directed against Bao Dai. It is time we broke our ties with him and not with Diem. If the Government of South Vietnam has not room for both of these men, it is Bao Dai who must go.

That statement was issued by me about 5 o'clock Friday afternoon, before open rebellion broke out on the streets of Saigon. I must say that developments since I issued the statement indicate to me that there were at least merit and validity to the observations I made. As the record reveals, and as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, Premier Diem did not go to Bao Dai. In fact, Premier Diem, for all practical purposes, through what I believe is called the revolutionary council, has broken ties with Bao Dai.

I believe the Senator's report, which was made to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Senate as a body, pointed out there may be an end of the line in terms of premiers; that if Premier Diem and the forces which are alined with him cannot stand and are not supported, there will not be much hope left. How right the Senator from Montana is.

How right he is when he points out that the group which is opposing the leader in South Vietnam consists of racketeers and those who have fought and conspired against South Vietnam and the security of the state, and that they do not merit the responsible attention of any leadership in the Government of the United States.

I was pleased to see over the weekend that we have again clarified our policy. But we cannot have these hot and cold flashes. We cannot have a policy that is in and out, that is certain and uncertain. There has been entirely too much of this. We must make our policy clear, because to waver and to indicate any doubt or uncertainty is to play into the hands of the rebel forces in South Vietnam, the forces that would destroy the government which has been trying desperately to meet almost overwhelming problems.

I for one want to raise a voice in the Senate to let the honest, patriotic leaders of South Vietnam, who are fighting hard to restore decent and honest government, know that they have friends here, and that we do not intend to back up or support those who are unprincipled, or who have waded through the sewers of corruption, those who have exercised dishonest tactics.

From all I have heard, Premier Diem is an honest, wholesome, and honorable man. He is the kind of man we ought to be supporting, rather than conspirators, gangsters, and hoodlums. Let us have a policy, win or lose, that will be based on principle and morality. If we do, we will not be in doubt.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Minnesota is right when he states that our policy should be based on morality and principle. In Diem we have a man who is known for his strong nationalism and for his devotion to duty.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana a question. Am I correct in my recollection that the Senator was in Indochina last fall?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I recall meeting the distinguished Senator from Montana in Manila, when he had just come from Indochina. I remember that in my talks with him, he stated he had personally met Mr. Diem, and that he had a very high regard for him. I wish the Senator would develop an appraisal of Mr. Diem as a man of integrity, as a man of vision, and as a man who is attempting to set up an honest government in South Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to do so.

I had the pleasure of meeting the Premier of Vietnam approximately 5 years ago. I knew him first when he was spending some time in seclusion in New Jersey. At that time I was able to gage his character; and I found him to be a man of patience and ability, and one who is sincere, honest, and incorruptible. Certainly he is a man upon whom we can depend.

Although he is stubborn in many respects, and although he lacks political experience, nevertheless his virtues far outweigh his shortcomings. In supporting him, I am sure we are backing one whom we can trust, for his interests are with the Vietnamese people, not with the French, the racketeers, or the sects, and he is trying to help the Vietnamese people take their proper places in the annals of world history. If he is given time and help, he may succeed.

I wish to say that even under the very best circumstances, the odds are against Premier Diem and a free Vietnam; but in that situation he is the only person with whom we can aline ourselves today.

I may call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey a remark made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia at the time of our consideration of the Formosa resolution, at which time the Senator from Georgia asked, "What is the alternative?"

Today I raise the same question, insofar as Premier Diem is concerned. What is the alternative, Mr. President? In my opinion, there is none, because on the other side there is an unholy alliance. A cablegram government is operating in Vietnam, or at least attempts are being made to operate such a government there. There is also a combination of the Binh Xuyen, a gangster-racketeer dominated group, which makes its living illegitimately, so to speak, and in turn gives a part of its take to the so-called Emperor, or I should say the chief of state, who is living on the Riviera. Although at one time he was Emperor, he abdicated that title, and was made chief of state by the French. Therefore, the strength of his connection with the government of Vietnam is, I think, open to question.

In addition to the Binh Xuyen, there are the Bao Dai and Hoa Hoa—religious sects which maintain private armies and carry on their activities on their own hook. Then, of course, there are the French.

Over the weekend, a very interesting thing happened—and not for the first time. When Premier Diem's government forces tried to pursue the Binh Xuyen forces of General Bay Vien, after they had been defeated, the French erected barricades in the European section of Saigon, so that Premier Diem's troops could not pursue the rebels.

But when General Vy, who had been appointed by Bao Dai as the new chief of the army, got together his 1,500 troops of the imperial guard, the French lifted the barricades, because General Vy was in opposition to Premier Diem; and the French allowed General Vy to go into the city. But as soon as General Vy's forces were overturned, the French again set up the barricades.

So in that situation we find the elements of importance to be the following: The Government forces under the direction of Premier Diem; the Binh Xuyen forces; the Bao Dai; and the Hoa Hoa. The latter three groups are opposed in whole, or in part, to Premier Diem; and his most recent opposition came from the recently overturned General Vy, who until his defeat was trying to make things difficult for Ngo Dinh Diem, the head of the recognized Government in Vietnam.

As I have pointed out, Premier Diem is the only one who can successfully oppose the Communist elements; and if he is unsuccessful in his efforts, the people of Vietnam will suffer immeasurably.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from Montana has said; and I commend him for advising us of the details.

I wish to commend him also for the tour he made to Vietnam, last year, and for the splendid report he made to our committee, upon his return from that trip.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that the United States has backed Diem ever since he was made Premier, has backed him consistently, and there has been no wobbling at any time, in our support of him? A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] stated that the United States had "wobbled" in supporting Premier

Diem; but I wish to point out that we have constantly maintained our position of support of him, and at the present time we are supporting Premier Diem's government, if it can be called that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reply, let me state that what the Senator from New Jersey has said is correct, because, insofar as I know, there has been no letdown in our support of Premier Diem.

I was pleased to note from the newsticker, this morning, that General Collins met with Premier Diem immediately upon his arrival at Saigon, and again reaffirmed the support of our Government of Premier Diem's government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his contributions to this discussion, Mr. President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to take exception to the conclusion which has been drawn in the matter of the support by our Government of the Government of Premier Diem in Vietnam. Some have said that our support of that Government has been unwavering. To be sure, on the face of things, our support of Premier Diem's government has been unwavering. However, the truth is that when General Collins was here, several weeks ago, the Vietnamese officials in Saigon were led to believe—at least, judging from the newspaper accounts I have received and also judging from the representations I have had from persons close to Premier Diem's government—that there was uncertainty as to the United States position; and some doubt was left hanging in the air. In fact, in the past 10 days our own newspapers have carried story after story regarding what would be the position of our Government toward the Diem government, in Saigon; and it was stated—and I can refer to the record to substantiate the statement—that the State Department was permitting the situation to "drift." The use of that word was not merely a slip of the tongue; but there was doubt as to whether Premier Diem could hold together the Government there. There was talk of a coalition; and the pressure was brought to bear from certain sources, and it was indicated that a coalition might be desirable.

So I think it fair to say that in some quarters there were feelings of uncertainty as to the position of Premier Diem's government, and this was so to such an extent that it affected the position of both the Government in Washington and the Government in Paris, according to the information I have had.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I, too, have seen those newspaper accounts. I do not know how much truth there is to them but I can understand that as a result of the stories or articles there might be a feeling of apprehension in Vietnam.

But I was pleased to note that the first thing General Collins did upon his arrival at Saigon, this morning, was to have a conference with General Diem, and to reaffirm, once again, the support of the United States Government for the Government of Premier Ngo Dinh Diem. I was pleased to note that because I was looking for such a reaffirmation; and I know that both the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are likewise happy that such a statement has been made at this time to the head of the Government of South Vietnam.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am pleased, too, Mr. President, to note that reaffirmation by General Collins. But I wish to state that there should be no doubt because of any statement in the press of our country or any statement in the press of any other country about our strong support of the government of Premier Diem. There is no reason to believe that we are in any way lukewarm, wavering, or doubtful in our support of Premier Diem's government. It is important that our support of his government continue to be firm and strong, for the situation in free Vietnam is critical, and it is needless to say that if there is any doubt in that area of the world as to the position or policy of the United States, or if there is any doubt as to American firmness of support or of the firmness and constancy of the United States policy, the result will be further weakness and further chaos.

I am delighted and particularly pleased at the meeting of General Collins with the leaders of the free Vietnamese, and with General Collins' statement reaffirming the American position. I am particularly pleased by General Collins' statement, because in the past there has been too much duplicity. Within the French political structure there are forces which were pro-Vietnam. Some of the French are still hanging onto the old French colonialism; and, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, the forces are diabolical, sinister, and corrupt. Certainly this is one time when we should be as clear as it is possible to be in stating and maintaining our policy; and we should make it impossible for anyone to misinterpret it. I say this because of what I consider to be the on-again, off-again attitude of our Government regarding the Formosan situation.

Time after time I have heard, on one day, that we had pledged the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, and then that we did not pledge it. I have heard, for example, that we were going to station troops upon Formosa, and then that we were not.

Once these policies are made clear, we should stick with them. We should stand firm. During the past few weeks I have become somewhat sympathetic toward the Chinese Nationalist leader. He has been led uphill and down again. The point this Senator has made time after time, regardless of his differences with the administration policy in connection with some of these matters, is that we should make our policies clear. We cannot please everyone. If we intend to defend Quemoy and Matsu, for example, let us say so. Let us not say one thing to the Foreign Minister of Nationalist China and another thing to the American press. Let us not say one thing one day and another the next day, as was done, for example, in connection with the so-called conference with the Red Chinese leader, Chou En-lai.

On Saturday last our State Department said there would be a conference only if Nationalist China attended. On Tuesday at the press conference, it was said that Nationalist China might be represented there or might not be, but that it really was not important. As an individual, I happen to agree with the latter position. But who knows what our policy is? All I am asking is that we make our policies clear. We are not only confusing the enemy with this kind of uncertainty; we are confusing our friends, which is inexcusable. Our friends ought to know where we stand. In this instance, thank God, the situation has been cleared up. I think the Senator from Montana has rendered a distinct service in pointing out the alternatives, which are few. As a practical matter, there is no alternative except to support the Diem government in Saigon, in free Vietnam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. As I see it, there is no alternative to supporting the Diem government. I certainly hope we shall not lead Diem up the hill and then down again. Our support should be unwavering, and to the hilt. We ought to recognize that this man has made a great contribution toward stopping the spread of Communist ideology in southeast Asia. He, the French, and the Americans have been responsible for the repatriation of approximately 800,000 refugees from Communist-held and Communist-dominated north Vietnam into the south. He hopes to get out 250,000 more refugees by May 16, which is 14 days away. On that date the port of Haiphong will be turned over to the Communists, and they will exercise control there.

So I hope our Government, in the person of General Collins, our Secretary of State, and the President will see to it that the support of Ngo Dinh Diem, the present Premier of free Vietnam, is continued, and that we shall be able to give him every possible assurance that we are behind him to the limit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

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

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate 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; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DEANE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. VURSELL, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 107) 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 Oklahoma, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Finance, I submit the following statement on the bill H. R. 1.

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

H. R. 1 continues for 3 years the trade agreements program initiated in 1934. During the 20 years of its operation United States trade and the trade of the nations with which we have made agreements has expanded and international commercial relations have greatly improved.

The United States has an ever-growing surplus of the products of our farms and factories which must find markets abroad. Other nations need and desire our exports and are eager to negotiate for mutually lower restrictions on trade. The importance of the trade agreements program as a factor for expanded world trade has come to be accepted by the leading free nations of the world.

The President in his speech of April 25, 1955, emphasized the importance of foreign trade to the economy of the United States:

> Trade expands markets for the increased output of our mines, our farms and our factories. In return we obtain essential raw materials and needed products of the farms and factories of others. Likewise, the markets provided here for the products of other free world countries enable them to acquire from us capital equipment and consumer goods essential to their economic development and higher living standards.
>
> American agriculture sells abroad from one-fourth to one-third of major crops such as wheat, cotton, and tobacco. Without these export markets there can be, under current conditions, no enduring prosperity for the American farmer.
>
> American factories and labor likewise have an important stake in foreign trade. Last year this country sold over $9 billion of industrial products abroad. Over 3 million workers—American workers—are directly dependent on exports for their jobs. Jungles the world round are being tamed today by American bulldozers; new mines are being opened by our drills and equipment; fields that have been cultivated by hand for centuries are yielding new harvests to our agricultural machines; our automobiles, trucks, and buses are found wherever there are roads; and new industries to employ the teeming millions within the underdeveloped nations are being equipped with our machine tools.

The committee recognizes the need for a planned and well-organized program so that trade expansion can be obtained without serious injury to any segment of our economy. The President also recognized this need in his speech when he said:

> The expansion of our foreign trade should proceed on an orderly basis. Reductions in tariffs and other trade barriers, both here and abroad, must be gradual, selective, and reciprocal. Changes which would result in the threat of serious injury to industry or general reduction in employment would not strengthen the economy of this country or the free world. The trade measures that I have recommended to the Congress were prepared in recognition of these facts.

The bill as reported by the committee continues the trade-agreements program and strengthens the safeguards against serious injury to the country's economy.

SUMMARY

At this point I should like to give a summary of the bill, as amended by the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1 continues to June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. The present authority—extended by Public Law 464, 83d Congress—terminates on June 12, 1955. In addition to the extension of the trade-agreements authority, the principal features of H. R. 1, as reported by the committee, are as follows:

First. The President would be authorized to negotiate tariff reductions by either of two alternative methods, which may not be used cumulatively.

(a) The first method authorizes the President to reduce, by a total of 15 percent, tariff rates existing on January 1, 1955, in stages of not more than 5 percent of such rates in each of the 3 years of the authority;

(b) As an alternative, the President is authorized to reduce those rates which are higher than 50 percent of the value of an import to a rate not less than 50 percent, in stages of not more than one-third of the reduction in any 1 year.

The committee desires to emphasize that this authority is subject to all requirements of existing law for full public notice—including a list of products on which concessions might be made by the United States—public hearings, peril-point determinations, and escape-clause procedures—as modified by the committee.

Second. In the case of the proposal for a trade agreement announced on November 16, 1954, the bill authorizes the same decreases in rates of duty as are authorized by existing law—50 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1945—even though the agreement is signed after June 12, 1955.

Third. The peril-point and escape-clause sections of the law were amended to make more specific the definition of what constitutes an industry. The escape clause was further amended to make more specific the extent to which imports must affect an industry before injury can be determined.

Fourth. The President is given authority to adjust imports whenever he finds, after investigation, that an article is being imported, in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security.

I believe it may be safely presumed that, in the conduct of the investigation, interested parties will be given an opportunity to be heard to present evidence.

Fifth. The President would be required to submit to Congress an annual report on the operation of the trade-agreements program. The bill, as reported, would require the Tariff Commission to continue to make the report on the program now being made under Executive order.

Sixth. Reports of the Tariff Commission containing recommendations for escape-clause action are required to be made public upon submission to the President.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL

I now refer to the amendments which were added to the bill by the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1 as passed by the House was amended by the committee as follows:

First. The House bill specified certain types of general provisions which may be included in a trade agreement and provided that no such provision should be given effect in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States. The committee deleted this language. The committee also changed the bill so as to make clear that its enactment should not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. These changes bring the language of the bill into conformity with that used in prior extensions, and do not change the authority contained in existing law.

They were made in the light of the fact that there is a pending House bill—H. R. 5550—authorizing United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation which would administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Second. As passed by the House, the bill provided that rates of duty existing on July 1, 1955, could be reduced by 15 percent. This date has now been changed to January 1, 1955. Thus, the new 15-percent authority would not be applicable in the case of any product whose duty is reduced by 15 percent or more in the negotiations presently going on in Geneva. These negotiations are concerned with a wide range of commodities. Appropriate revisions were made in other sections of the bill to reflect this change in the base date for the 15-percent authority.

Third. The authority to reduce duties by 50 percent of the January 1, 1945, level in the case of articles normally not imported or normally imported in negligible quantities was deleted.

Fourth. The committee deleted those portions of the bill which authorized the President to round out rates of duty to an extent not exceeding one-half of 1 percent ad valorem, in making changes in rates.

Fifth. Also deleted was the provision in the House bill providing that the President should avoid to the extent practicable the subdivision of classification categories.

Sixth. The committee added a provision requiring the Tariff Commission to submit a factual report to the Congress at least yearly on the operation of the trade-agreements program.

Seventh. The committee also added a provision requiring the Tariff Commission to make public immediately, upon transmission to the President, its findings and recommendations in escape-clause proceedings, including any dissenting or separate findings, and to cause a summary to be published in the Federal Register.

Eighth. The committee added provisions to the House bill relating to the determination of injury for the purpose of escape-clause action and defining domestic industry for peril-point determinations and escape-clause cases.

Ninth. The committee had before it several proposals dealing with specific commodities, namely petroleum, fluorspar, lead, and zinc. In lieu of specific action on each of these, the committee adopted an amendment which specifies that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization shall report to the President when he has reason to believe that imports of a commodity are entering the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security; that the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made if he feels there is reason for such belief; and that the President, if he finds a threat to the national security exists, shall take whatever action is necessary to adjust imports to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

The committee believes that this amendment will provide a means for assistance to the various national-defense industries which would have been affected by the individual amendments presented.

The White House issued on February 26, 1955, a report based on a study by the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy which indicates the importance of a strong domestic petroleum industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the President's Advisory Committee report to which I have just referred.

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

An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary. In this complex picture both domestic production and imports have important parts to play; neither should be sacrificed to the other.

Since World War II importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States has increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the United States market for fuels.

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

The committee recommends further that the desirable proportionate relationships between imports and domestic production be reviewed from time to time in the light of industrial expansion and changing economic and national-defense requirements.

In arriving at these conclusions and recommendations, the committee has taken into considerations the importance to the economies of friendly countries of their oil exports to the United States as well as the importance to the United States of the accessibility of foreign oil supplies both in peace and war.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, although no similar study is presently available for fluorspar or lead and zinc, the committee feels that the Director of Defense Mobilization will be cognizant of the serious situation existing in those industries.

Congress can initiate and adopt such legislation as it might deem advisable should the action needed to protect these essential industries not be taken.

One commodity amendment would have changed the tariff classification of hardboard, a commodity which would not be covered by the amendment noted above. The committee, without in any way prejudicing the hardboard amendment did not vote on it because it concerns a matter of tariff classification and might better be taken up separately or in conjunction with some more closely related legislation. The merits of the hardboard amendment were therefore not voted upon.

An amendment was offered by Senator SMATHERS which would require the State Department to take positive action to protect exports of agricultural products from discriminatory practices engaged in by countries with which the United States has entered into reciprocal trade agreements. The amendment was withdrawn when it was agreed by the committee that it would be more appropriate for a statement to be made in the report expressing the wish of the committee that responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government make a full investigation and take appropriate action.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

H. R. 1, as amended, changes existing law in the following respects:

First. It extends the period during which the President is authorized to enter into trade agreements from June 12, 1955, until the close of June 30, 1958.

Second. The bill provides for changes in the existing limits on the President's authority to change rates of duty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement showing the differences between existing law and the changes made by H. R. 1 as reported by the Finance Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LIMITS ON PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY TO CHANGE RATES OF DUTY

UNDER PRESENT LAW

1. Duties may be increased by up to 50 percent of the duty existing on January 1, 1945.
2. No transfers of articles may be made between the dutiable and free lists.
3. Any rate may be decreased by up to 50 percent of the duty in existence on January 1, 1945.
4. Not in existing law.
5. Not in existing law.

UNDER H. R. 1 AS REPORTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE

1. No change.
2. No change.
3. This authority expires on June 12, 1955, except that under H. R. 1 it may be used in order to give effect to the results of the negotiations, notice of which was published on November 16, 1954.
4. Authority to reduce rates existing on January 1, 1955, by 15 percent over the 3-year period of the bill (reductions of no more than 5 percent of the January 1, 1955, rate may be made in any one year).
5. Authority to reduce rates above 50 percent ad valorem down to 50 percent ad valorem (no more than one-third of any such decrease of over 15 percent may be made in any one year).

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, no part of the authorized 15 percent decrease in duty may become initially effective after June 30, 1958. However, if any part of the decrease has become effective and then the decrease is suspended for a period because of an escape-clause action, the period of time the decrease is not in effect is to be excluded in determining when the 3-year period expires.

Third. Under existing law the President "may" suspend the application of concession rates to the products of countries that discriminate against American commerce or engage in other conduct tending to defeat the purpose of section 350. The bill as reported provides that the President "shall as soon as practicable" suspend such application in like circumstances.

Fourth. Under the bill as reported the President is required to submit to Congress an annual report on the trade-agreements program. The report is to contain among other things information on modifications of trade agreements including a report on the inclusion of escape clauses in existing agreements and information relating to agreements entered into. An additional amendment removes the existing requirement that the President report semiannually regarding action taken to incorporate escape clauses into existing agreements.

Fifth. The annual report to the Congress by the Tariff Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program now required by executive order is, under the bill, made a statutory requirement.

Sixth. The existing escape-clause procedure has been amended to require the Tariff Commission to immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations.

Seventh. The escape-clause procedure is further amended to require that in the determination of serious injury "increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Tariff Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry."

Eighth. Under existing law there is no definition of what constitutes a domestic industry for the purpose of peril-point determinations and escape-clause procedure. The bill as reported in effect defines a domestic industry to mean "that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles." It is also provided that where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, "distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury."

Ninth. The law has been amended to give the President authority to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of any article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security. Such action may be taken only after the completion of a factual investigation. Responsibility for advising the President when there is reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security is vested in the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a technical analysis of H. R. 1 as amended by the Finance Committee.

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

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF H. R. 1 AS REPORTED

The first section of the bill provides that the bill when enacted may be cited as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

Section 2: This section extends the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements for an additional period, from June 12, 1955, through June 30, 1958.

Section 3: This section amends section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which contains the basic authority to enter into and carry out trade agreements.

Subsection (a) of section 350, containing five numbered paragraphs, is set forth in the bill in its proposed amended form.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) sets forth the purpose for which the President may enter into trade agreements. The text preceding subparagraph (A) repeats existing law.

Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) authorizes the President to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof.

Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), as amended by the committee, contains a proviso, stating that the enactment of this bill shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Subparagraph (A) makes no change in existing law.

Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), authorizing the carrying out of trade agreements by proclamation, makes no change in existing law. The authority to carry out trade agreements by proclamation is no broader (and no narrower) than under existing law (the terms of which are identical with the terms of subparagraph (B)).

Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) is divided into subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D).

Subparagraph (A) continues unchanged the present prohibition against increasing any rate of duty to a rate more than 50 percent above the rate existing on January 1, 1945.

Subparagraph (B) continues unchanged the present prohibition against imposing a duty on a duty-free article or exempting from duty a dutiable article.

Subparagraph (C) continues unchanged (with respect to trade agreements entered into before June 12, 1955) the present prohibition against decreasing any rate of duty to a rate lower than 50 percent below the rate existing on January 1, 1945. As noted above, a committee amendment to this subparagraph continues this authority with respect to the negotiations involving Japan now going on in Geneva, notice of which was published on November 16, 1954.

Subparagraph (D) fixes maximum limits on decreases in rates which may be made to carry out trade agreements entered into on or after June 12, 1955. A rate of duty may be reduced under two alternative methods which are set out in clauses (i) and (ii). These alternatives are not cumulative but the President may decrease a rate to the lowest of the rates resulting from application of either of the alternative methods.

Clause (i) authorizes decreases in any rate to 15 percent below the rate existing on January 1, 1955 (that is, to a rate which is 85 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1955).

Clause (ii) authorizes decreases in rates of duty which are higher than 50 percent ad valorem (or equivalent) to 50 percent ad valorem (or equivalent). In the case of articles subject in whole or in part to a specific rate of duty (i. e., 5 cents per pound, or 5 cents per pound plus 20 percent ad valorem), the determination of whether a rate of duty is higher than 50 percent ad valorem, and the determination of a rate equivalent to the 50-percent ad valorem rate to which it may be reduced, will be made by the President on the basis of the value of imports of such products during a period which he finds is representative. In making such determination, the President is to be guided, to the maximum extent practicable, by the standards of valuation for customs purposes contained in section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as the provisions of that section exist during the representative period. The reference to the standards of valuation contained in section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is to make it clear that no action may be taken under the second sentence of this clause which would result in any change in existing rules for determining the basis on which any ad valorem rate of duty is to be assessed. For example, if a rate of 50 percent ad valorem is established pursuant to such second sentence with respect to an article subject to a rate of duty any part of which may be based on American selling price (as defined in sec. 402 (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930), the new rate would be subject to application on the basis of American selling price in the same manner as the ad valorem rate is applied under existing law.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (a), divided into subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) establishes procedures for giving effect gradually (at intervals of at least a year) to decreases (under the two alternatives in paragraph (2) (D)) in rates made pursuant to agreements entered into on or after June 12, 1955.

Subparagraph (A), except as limited by subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (3), continues in substance the provision of existing law that the proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall be in effect from and after such time as is specified in the proclamation.

Subparagraph (B) fixes the time limits within which the decreases in rates authorized by subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) described above may be made effective. These time limits are as follows: A decrease of no more than 5 percent of the rate existing on January 1, 1955, may become initially effective at one time if the total amount of the decrease is 15 percent or less. If the total amount of the decrease is greater than 15 percent, no more than one-third of the decrease may become initially effective at one time. In the case of either of the two alternatives, no part of the decrease after the first part can become initially effective until the immediately previous part has been in effect for at least 1 year.

Subparagraph (C) provides that (subject to an exception stated in the second sentence of the subparagraph as explained below) no decreases under the first alternative method (the 15-percent decrease authority) may be made effective after the expiration of the 3-year period which begins on July 1, 1955 (that is, after June 30, 1958). The result of this limitation, when applied with the 1-year requirement for each decrease, is that the full 15-percent decrease under the first alternative cannot be made unless the first

5-percent decrease takes effect before July 1, 1956. Subparagraph (C) does not apply to the alternative (the authority to reduce a rate to 50 percent ad valorem). The exception to the June 30, 1958, deadline in the case of the first alternative method (the 15-percent decrease authority) relates to the situation where, by reason of legislation of the United States or action thereunder, a decrease which had been made by virtue of the exercise of that authority and given effect, and which was thereafter nullified, could be reapplied (and its successive stages, if any, applied), even though the 3-year period extended beyond June 30, 1958. The following illustrates the application of subparagraph (C) in a case where the first decrease takes effect before July 1, 1956:

(1) Assume the following:

(A) The first 5-percent decrease takes effect on April 15, 1956, and remains in effect until the close of November 30, 1956 (a total of 230 days).

(B) On December 1, 1956, the reduced duty is increased as a consequence of an escape-clause action.

(C) The duty resulting as a consequence of the escape-clause action remains in effect through May 31, 1957 (a total of 182 days).

(D) On June 1, 1957, the decreased rate is restored.

(2) Under the facts stated in paragraph (1) above, the 5-percent decrease will not have been in effect for a total period of 1 year until the close of October 13, 1957. Thus, if the second decrease is to become effective it must become effective no earlier than October 14, 1957, and no later than December 29, 1958 (182 days after June 30, 1958). In order to permit the third decrease to become effective, the second decrease must become effective on or before December 29, 1957.

(3) If the second decrease takes effect on October 14, 1957, and remains in effect for 1 year through October 13, 1958, then the third decrease could take effect at any time on or after October 14, 1958, and before December 30, 1958.

Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) provides that trade-agreement concessions shall apply to imports of the goods of all countries, except that the President shall, as soon as practicable, suspend the application of these rates to the products of countries which discriminate against American commerce or engage in other conduct tending to defeat the purpose of section 350. As under existing law, this provision is subject to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which requires the President to withdraw benefits of trade-agreement concessions to imports from U. S. S. R. and from any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) authorizes the President to terminate at any time in whole or in part, any proclamation made pursuant to section 350. This continues a provision of existing law; it has been moved to this separate paragraph solely for reasons of clarity.

Subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill amends existing law to make applicable to products of Cuba the new limits of authority to reduce tariffs. In effect, this would permit maintenance of existing margins of preference with respect to such products.

Subsection (c) of section 3 makes necessary technical amendments to subsection (c) of section 350 to conform with substantive changes in other parts of the bill. It is made clear that the limitations on increases or decreases in duty relate to rates of duty other than rates of duty which apply to products only by reason of action taken under section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

Subsection (d) of section 3 adds a new subsection (e) to section 350.

Paragraph (1) requires the President to submit to Congress annually a report on the trade-agreements program as recommended by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy. The report is to contain, among other things, information on modifications of trade agreements, including a report on the incorporation of escape clauses in existing agreements, and information relating to agreements entered into.

Paragraph (2) requires the Tariff Commission to keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements and to submit to the Congress, at least once a year, a factual report on the operation of the trade agreements program. This will require by law the report of the Tariff Commission heretofore made pursuant to Executive order.

Section 4: This section deletes the requirements now in section 6 (b) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 that the President report semiannually regarding action taken to incorporate escape clauses into existing agreements. New developments on this score would be covered by the annual report of the President provided for in the new section 350 (e) described above.

Section 5: This section amends the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 to require the Tariff Commission, in escape clause actions, to make public immediately its findings and recommendations to the President, including dissenting or separate findings, and to cause a summary of the findings to be published in the Federal Register.

Section 6: This section, added by the committee, amends the escape clause procedure and peril point provisions of the existing law.

Subsection (a) amends subsection (b) of section (7) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, containing the criteria for arriving at a determination in escape-clause proceedings, by providing that increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

Subsection (b) adds a new subsection (e) to section 7 defining (for the purpose of the peril-point and escape-clause provisions) the terms "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products" and "domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles" to mean that portion or subdivision of the producing organizations manufacturing, assembling, processing, extracting, growing, or otherwise producing like or directly competitive products or articles. It is further provided that where a particular business enterprise is engaged in operations involving more than one industry, or more than one readily determinable segment of a single industry, the Commission shall, so far as practicable, distinguish or separate the respective operations of such business enterprise for the purpose of determining injury.

Section 7: This section, also added by the committee, amends section 2 of the act of July 1, 1954 (the 1954 Extension Act) by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In order to further the policy and purpose of this section, whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, he shall so advise the President, and if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If, on the basis of such investigation, and the report to him of the findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall take such action as he deems necessary to adjust the imports of such article to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer a technical amendment, on page 10, line 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 25, following the period, it is proposed to insert quotation marks.

Mr. BYRD. This is purely a technical amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Did the committee consider the proposed amendment with relation to making the decisions of the Tariff Commission final, except in cases where the national security was involved?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. There was extensive discussion in the committee about it during the course of its hearings, which lasted almost 60 days. I think all such matters were considered very fully.

Mr. PASTORE. Can the distinguished Senator from Virginia enlighten me as to the reasons for the rejection of the proposed amendment?

Mr. BYRD. The reason which I think prompted the committee to reject it was that the President should not be bound in making such decisions. This is in harmony with the general procedure of the reciprocal trade agreements program?

Mr. PASTORE. Did the committee feel that a change in the present law with reference to that situation might disturb the whole philosophy behind tariffs?

Mr. BYRD. That was the belief of quite a number of the members of the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. I understand the bill as reported by the Finance Committee amends the bill as it came from the House, to the extent that the 15 percent cannot be further added to any concession made by GATT at the present session at Geneva. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct, if the Geneva reductions are 15 percent or greater.

Mr. PASTORE. There has been an additional improvement made by the Finance Committee in the bill as passed by the House, to the effect that the bill now provides, as an element of evidence before the Tariff Commission, that the Commission shall take into account a threat to American industry. Under the present law, there must be actual injury to American industry. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct that a change was made in the escape-clause procedure.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. My question relates to page 6 of the report, paragraph (7), which reads:

The escape-clause procedure is further amended to require that in the determination of serious injury "increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the [Tariff] Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry."

I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject, and I certainly am not an expert, but I know that many persons are alarmed about the long-drawn-out procedure or time lag between the making of a complaint to the Tariff Commission, and the date when some actually constructive action is taken or can be taken.

Will the Senator indicate if the committee considered that a time limit was already placed upon the action of the Tariff Commission, or was it thought that the Commission should be given unlimited time in which to investigate?

Sometimes the investigations run into long periods, so far as some of the industries which might be injured are concerned.

Mr. BYRD. A great deal of attention was given to that subject, but it was regarded as unwise to impose a time limit within which definitive action had to be taken.

I think probably the investigative machinery of the Tariff Commission could be improved. I agree with the Senator that many investigations have taken entirely too long. But I think we can all agree that to place an arbitrary limit on all investigations would not be practicable, because some investigations require much more time than do others.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I can see some justification for not fixing a positive time limit. It would not be practical to do so in all cases. But the criticism which has been advanced by industries which have been suffering losses heretofore has been the slowness with which the Tariff Commission procedure permits even some type of relief to be suggested or held out as hope.

I simply wonder whether the committee has gone into that question in its hearings. No doubt it has.

Mr. BYRD. The committee went into the question. The law requires that the Tariff Commission shall promptly make investigations and report thereon within 9 months. The existing law provides as follows:

Should the Tariff Commission find, as the result of its investigation and hearings, that a product on which a concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such increased quantities—

And so forth. So apparently, the custom is to allow 9 months under the existing law. The bill makes no change in that respect. However, I agree with the views of the Senator from Kansas. I have suggested that the Senate Committee on Finance keep in touch with the Tariff Commission, whenever there is any unreasonable delay, to see if the Commission cannot make its reports more promptly.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that under the bill as it came to the Senate from the House, before an industry could petition for relief it first had to be actually injured? As the bill has been reported to the Senate, is it not true that an American industry can petition for relief under the escape clause even when there is a threat that injury will result?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have had considerable correspondence with various producers groups in Minnesota, which have been very much concerned about the injury that might be caused them by undue or heavy imports of dairy products, more especially roquefort cheese, for instance, and also from those engaged in the fabrication of wool, such as the manufacturers of woolen blankets.

In the event there was a threat to those industries by reason of undue imports, the Department of Agriculture could immediately request consideration and action by the Tariff Commission, in order to stop imports of those commodities in such quantities as might well destroy some segments of the dairy industry, or even individual business firms, which might be engaged in fabricating woolen blankets, for instance. Does the bill provide such a safeguard?

Mr. BYRD. It does. The President, upon investigation, can impose quotas on agricultural products under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Mr. THYE. The President may do so. Such action will not have to await the cumbersome process of, first, the Department of Agriculture requesting the Tariff Commission to investigate, and then the Tariff Commission going through lengthy hearings and finally making its recommendation to the President? Can the President impose an embargo, and then have an investigation made?

Mr. BYRD. The President can impose quotas as he deems wise. I shall read to the Senator a list of articles on which quotas have been imposed by the Department of Agriculture. The existing law now provides that on agricultural products, the President has a right to impose quotas after an investigation has been made. He has taken such action in a number of cases.

Mr. THYE. That is true. One complaint, however, was that oftentimes the damage and harm would have been done by reason of carloads of products having been shipped in while the Commission was in process of holding hearings to ascertain the facts and needs of the industry.

Mr. BYRD. During the 19 years in which section 22 has been in effect, the Tariff Commission has been directed to make 12 investigations covering the following commodities:

Raw cotton, cotton products, wheat and wheat flour, edible tree nuts; wool, 2 investigations; certain dairy and other agricultural products, including tung oil; oats, 2 investigations; rye, tung oil, second investigation; and barley.

As a result of investigations under section 22, the President has proclaimed import restrictions on raw cotton, wheat and wheat flour, almonds, filberts, certain cheeses and other dairy products, peanuts and peanut oil, flaxseed and linseed oil; oats; rye; and barley.

The President did not make effective the Tariff Commission's recommendation, submitted early in 1954, for restrictions on wool imports since the administration had earlier submitted to Congress recommendations for a new wool-support program which would eliminate the necessity for such restrictions. The President also did not put into effect the Commission's 1954 recommendations on tung nuts and tung oil because of voluntary export restrictions applied by Argentina and Paragray.

Mr. THYE. One of the complaints which has always been lodged against the Tariff Commission and against the failure on the part of any administration to act was that the mechanics of the act itself were such that by the time the Tariff Commission had been requested to hold hearings, had completed hearings, and had made recommendations, often the injury had been done; the imports had come in by boatloads, with resulting damage to a concern, for example, engaged in the fabrication of wool blankets, or to the dairy industry as a whole because of imports of butter or other dairy products. The mechanics of administration were such that it did not make much difference what the action taken was; the harm had already been done. That is one of the complaints which seems to linger in the minds of persons who have written me.

I can share their feeling, because I know what damage the imports which came into this country did to them.

I am in full accord with H. R. 1. I intend to vote for it, and against any crippling amendments. I think the committee has reported a splendid bill. I wish to commend the committee for it. But I should like to make certain that if a hearing should be requested before the Tariff Commission, opportunity to appear would be afforded to those requesting hearings, and that reasonably prompt action would be taken, so that a person or an industry would not be ruined before a determination was finally reached. That is the only question which concerns me. Otherwise, I wish to commend the committee for bringing before the Senate what I think is a fine bill, proposing to extend for 3 years the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In general, enactment of the bill will make possible freer international trade, which will encourage not only foreign exporters, but likewise any American exporter who would like to get into the field of international trade.

I commend the Senator for the very excellent results of the committee's study and report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wonder if the chairman of the committee will yield to me so that I may ask him several questions.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I know the answers to them, but I should like to have the chairman confirm what I consider to be the answers. As the chairman of the Finance Committee knows, since I wrote him a letter on the subject and the letter went into the committee's record, we have a problem, particularly in Massachusetts and New England, in connection with the textile industry. I should like to ask the Senator 3 or 4 questions which are particularly important to the textile industry and to the men and women who work in that industry.

My first question is whether the effective date for lowering the tariff has been put back by the committee from July 1 to January 1, 1955. Am I correct in assuming that has been done?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose of that is, is it not, to have any reductions take place based on what is already in effect and on what we know, rather than to leave open the question of what may be the base on which percentage reductions are taken?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Furthermore, the provisions regarding the inclusion of GATT, so called, and the new organization for trade purposes, have been omitted from the bill, have they not?

Mr. BYRD. They have been stricken from the bill in toto.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The provision regarding the opportunity for the President to reduce tariffs on goods imported in negligible quantities has also been stricken from the bill, has it not?

Mr. BYRD. It has been stricken from the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the provision regarding imports from Japan, which would allow greater leeway for reduction in tariffs, also been stricken from the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. That appears on page 6 of the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Another provision is that reports of the Tariff Commission are to be made public as soon as they are submitted, so that any interested person may have an opportunity to discuss any matter covered, or write the President of the United States about it. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Heretofore the reports were not made public for 60 days. Under the bill the reports are to be made public as soon as they are submitted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield, I should like to say I think that is a strengthening feature of the bill, because it will eliminate the long drag in administrative steps which have occurred in the past.

Mr. BYRD. Furthermore, the bill specifically provides that the Tariff Commission shall report directly to Congress, and the President also shall report directly to Congress. This is the first time legislation of this character includes those two provisions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore, it will give opportunity to those who are interested to have full knowledge of what is contained in the report.

Mr. BYRD. Yes. Moreover, it is provided that an annual report shall be made to Congress. Heretofore reports have been made pursuant to an Executive order. I am speaking of the annual reports. I believe the Senator is speaking of the escape clause.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The bill provides that under the escape-clause procedure the Tariff Commission shall make public its findings and recommendations when they are sent to the President. Heretofore they were not made public for 60 days.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the chairman of the committee describe a little more accurately than I perhaps am able to do, the committee's recommendation for redefining what a commodity or industry is, or perhaps both? The definition provides that if one part of an industry may be losing substantially, the Tariff Commission may make recommendations which will aid that part of the industry. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct. If one segment of an industry is losing money by reason of importations of products manufactured by that segment of the industry, but the whole industry is making money, there could be redress for that segment of the industry. A half dozen different articles may be made by a particular segment of a particular industry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that involved in the so-called peril point or escape clause?

Mr. BYRD. That is involved in both the escape clause and the peril points.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Are there any other new commodities which are given a peril point, or which are covered by the escape clause, which would help an industry which might be affected in any part?

Mr. BYRD. Here is one, section 6, which the Senator will find on page 12 of the bill. That section reads:

> Increased imports, either actual or relative, shall be considered as the cause or threat of serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products when the Commission finds that such increased imports have contributed materially to the serious injury or the threat of serious injury to such industry.

That provision was offered by the Senator from Colorado, who will speak later on the bill and explain it more fully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance, that provision would liberalize or broaden the definition of what is competition. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is the final question I should like to address to the Senator. The problem of oil imports is taken care of in the last section of the bill. This gives the opportunity to the President to adjust imports, under restrictive conditions or quotas, after a report by the Director of Defense Mobilization, and after a separate, independent investigation by the President, if he believes the national security is being affected.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct, except the amendment applies to all commodities; it applies not only to oil, but to all commodities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It applies to all commodities, does it?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. In other words, it puts other commodities on the same basis as agricultural commodities. It simply leaves to the President the power, in his discretion, to decide whether to impose a quota or to reduce the imports.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does that apply to every import of every character?

Mr. BYRD. It does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It applies to every commodity which might involve our national security, does it?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say to the chairman of the committee and to the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], that, as one Member of the Senate, I certainly appreciate very much their efforts on this bill, because it is a measure which has caused great concern and worry to those of us in New England. Although we may not have gotten all that we requested—and, of course, we could not expect to do so—nevertheless, to me, as one Senator, the result has brought great relief, because the addition of these amendments gives me a clear conscience in voting for an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

I only hope that the chairman of the committee, with his customary persistence in matters in which he is interested, and—and I may add this with a smile—almost his obstinacy, will see to it that what the Senate votes for is maintained in conference.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think the question I have in mind may have been answered incidentally during the colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the senior Senator from Massachusetts. In the report, on page 4, in paragraph 9, specific commodities are mentioned, namely, petroleum, fluorspar, lead, and zinc. As I remember, they were the only specific commodities which were discussed before the committee.

Do I correctly understand that if any other commodities whatsoever fall into that category, namely, the category of commodities being imported in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security, whatever those commodities may be—the remedy in this paragraph will be applicable?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator from Vermont is entirely correct. The reason for mentioning fluorspar, lead, zinc, and petroleum was that they were the only concrete proposals before the committee.

But the amendment is very clear; at the bottom of page 13 it provides:

Whenever the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security

And so forth.

Mr. FLANDERS. That seems to be clear. In accordance with that wording, if, for instance, imports of optical goods should seem to threaten the existence of an optical goods industry in this country or to seriously impair its existence, such imports would then be subject to the remedies provided in that section, would they not?

Br. BYRD. The Senator from Vermont is certainly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to the answer—which is ample—given by the Senator from Virginia, in response to the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts, I may say that the amendment to which he referred was adopted by the committee in lieu of a number of amendments dealing with special commodities which affect all the States—mine especially; also the State of Virginia, represented, in part, so ably here by the Senator from Virginia; and also Massachusetts, Vermont, West Virginia, and many other States. Instead of adopting an amendment dealing with the separate commodities, each being dealt with in a separate amendment, and instead of undertaking to impose quotas, the whole subject was left to the discretion of the President, based upon recommendations by the Director of Defense Mobilization as to whether any of the commodities were essential to the national defense.

What might happen under another bill on this matter and what may happen under this bill may be two different propositions.

My own personal view was that I would have liked to see the bill passed in such a way as simply to extend for 3 years the authority of the President to deal with international trade agreements and to work out reciprocal concessions, agreements, and programs which would promote international trade, which is so essential not only to other nations, but also to the United States.

But in lieu of all those separate amendments—in 1 or 2 of which I, myself, was interested from the standpoint of my own State—this amendment was offered, giving the President authority, upon recommendation of the Director of Defense Mobilization, to do these things, if he finds and if the Director of Defense Mobilization finds that the commodities are essential to our national defense. I think it will be easy to prove that many of them are essential to the national defense.

So the amendment was approved by the committee because it sought to place the responsibility where it really ought to be, under the reciprocal-trade arrangement, namely, on the President of the United States, so that he would determine, upon suitable recommendations, whether any of these commodities—many of which were named in separate amendments—were essential to the national defense. If the President finds they are, he can impose such quotas or take such other steps as he may believe to be desirable in order to maintain the national security.

Many Senators felt impelled by local situations and their own obligations to support individual amendments calling for reservations, exemptions, or quotas for particular products. However, the amendment approved by the committee was voted for by an overwhelming majority of the committee, in lieu of the other amendments.

Although this amendment is not entirely satisfactory to everyone, yet in all likelihood it will result in as much benefit as the benefit which would have come by means of the adoption of the separate amendments which would have been offered by various Members of the Senate. I make that statement as a Senator who is particularly interested in some of the products which are affected by the bill and will be affected by whatever the President may do—products which have been rather disastrously affected by imports into the United States.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts will find that the amendment which has been approved in lieu of all the other amendments, will go as far, probably, as it is possible to go in this sort of a bill, keeping in mind that in the case of the industries of his State and the industries of other States in New England which are particularly involved, no one can know in advance what the President will do, because the President must act on the facts which are submitted to him by those who are named in the bill, headed by the Director of Defense Mobilization, whoever he may be.

I wish to make this explanation as to why some of us voted for this particular amendment, although we have in our own States industries which are affected by importations and by the economic situation brought about by the importations. We thought it wise to accept this amendment to this bill, as contrasted with another kind of bill. After all, the pending bill provides for a simple extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, thus authorizing the President to do these things. Under this bill, that authority would be extended for 3 years. Let me say that I think it could not wisely be extended for less than 3 years, for otherwise no agreements would be entered into, inasmuch as no one is able to know what any one year will bring forth.

So I think the Senator from Massachusetts is wise, as he usually is, in accepting this suggestion, as it presents itself in conection with a bill of this sort.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield once more to me, so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said, for it seems to me that the amendment demonstrates draftsmanship of a remarkably high order and a great degree of commonsense on the part of the committee. I congratulate the committee for reporting an amendment which in so few words, if I may say so, satisfies so many persons.

All of us want the reciprocal-trade treaties to be extended, because we realize that trade is necessary. None of us wish to place greater burdens on the President, but in the case of national security he has the burden anyway. He cannot escape it. This measure is a logical extension of the reciprocal-trade program, which is in his lap anyway, and must be handled by him, particularly as it affects the national security.

I agree with the Senator from Kentucky. I repeat that I think the committee is to be congratulated upon its ability to cover so many points and meet so many difficult situations by compromise language, if you will, which will allow the reciprocal trade treaty program to be administered with a greater degree of enthusiasm than, perhaps, has been present in the past.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. Let me add one word, in anticipation of a possible effort to reduce the period of the extension of the act from 3 years to some shorter time. I think it is absolutely necessary that the extension be made effective for 3 years, because that would give the President ample time, without restriction, to enter into agreements which are mutually advantageous. I hope, a little later in the debate, to show the advantage which has come to our country by reason of the increase in trade with nations with which we have had such agreements, as compared with those with which we have not had such agreements.

I think it is an indisputable fact that during the life of this law our prosperity and our trade with other nations have expanded almost beyond the anticipation of those of us who sponsored the law in 1934, and voted for it.

If we fix any period less than the 3-year period provided in the bill, we handicap the President and make it almost impossible for him to enter into any such agreements. For the past 2 years the law has been extended for only 1 year at a time, and practically no agreements have been entered into. If we shorten the period provided in the bill, I think the same result will occur.

We all know that we must have international trade. Men who work in any industry must find a market for what they produce, in order that they may sell it. That is as true of America as it is of any other country in the world.

So I hope no amendment will be offered to shorten the period, and if it is offered, I hope it will be defeated. I think the President of the United States, whoever he may be, be he Democrat or Republican, must have certain leeway in entering into negotiations, which are sometimes almost interminable, in order that equitable agreements may be reached with other countries for the exchange of our products for theirs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the Senator from Kentucky says. I discussed with the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] the possibility of making the extension effective for 2 years instead of 3. I can see the point which the Senator from Kentucky makes. Furthermore, other language which the committee has placed in the bill, particularly with relation to the Tariff Commission, the publicity to be given its reports, and the greater liberality of the peril point and escape clauses, makes it desirable to have the period of extension sufficiently long so that new agreements may be entered into.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I thank the Senator from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very able presentation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee, under its very capable chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has reported a good bill. It is not perfect.

One of the great pressures on the committee was for the adoption of amendments relating to specific commodities. The pressures were the greater because in each case there was a volume of evidence indicating the importance of those amendments to the livelihood and happiness of many people.

However, it was felt that it would be wiser to find some means of providing for an orderly and carefully considered method by which relief might be obtained by industries vital to our national security without coming to the Congress each time a threat of injury appears.

After a great deal of careful analysis and study a proposal was drafted which I feel is adequate and fair. It provides a method by which the President will be made acquainted with situations that might need correcting. The President is certainly the best informed of all those interested in our national security. When he is informed of the possibility that imports may be threatening that security he, under the amendment adopted by the committee, would have a careful study made; and if such threat is found to exist he must act to limit imports to a degree removing that threat.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, a capable and patriotic public servant, whenever he has reason to believe that imports are entering in such volume as to threaten the production of essential items, "shall" so advise the President who, if he believes that there is reason for such belief, "shall" cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine the facts. If he finds facts that warrant action, then he "shall" take action and must adjust imports to a level that will not threaten to impair the national security.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization can receive from many sources the information which may start the machinery of the amendment in motion. He will have his own staff alerted to the problem. All the agencies in any way connected with national-security problems will be watching carefully for possible cases. Domestic industries directly concerned will, I am sure, not hesitate to present evidence to the Director upon which he may base his decision to start that machinery. Congress always has the joint responsibility of national security and it, its committees, or its individual Members may inform the Director of circumstances which may call for action.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, or does he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he passes to some other point.

The Senator stated that he had explained the amendment which was offered with reference to imports which might endanger the national security. In connection with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization bringing to the attention of the President dangers which might be caused, for example, by excessive oil imports, is it not true that the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization has already reported, as a member of the President's Cabinet Committee on Essential Resources and Supplies, that any significant increase of oil imports above the ratio of 1954 would endanger the national security?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Under those circumstances, does the Senator from Colorado believe that by the terms of this amendment the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization would have to make a new study? Or is it the Senator's opinion that the study which has already been made would be sufficient for the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization as a basis for his opinion to the President that there would be danger to the national defense if future imports were greater than the ratio which existed between imports and market demand in 1954?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have no opinion as to how the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization might feel, or whether he would consider that he should plow the field again. But certainly a large start has been made on the subject in the studies which have already progressed.

Mr. DANIEL. I take it that is probably one reason why the committee embodied the report from the President's Cabinet Committee in its report on the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct. The significance of that decision was fully explained to the committee, and I think it has considerable cogency.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator feel that there was sufficient evidence before the committee to indicate that an increase of imports over the 1954 ratio might endanger the national security?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my personal opinion. The judgment of the committee never focused on that question, but that is my personal judgment.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator feel that action would be taken if over an extended period imports should be in excess of the ratio which existed in 1954?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do; and while I do not propose to put a jinx on the processes we have recommended, if those processes do not work, I shall be among the first actively to support special measures.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator. I am glad to have his statement. I know of the Senator's interest in this subject. I take it he believes that the national security should be protected, insofar as it would be adversely affected by imports of oil and other products mentioned in the committee report.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my feeling. My own State of Colorado is an oil producer. It produces fluorspar; it produces coal; it produces many items which are essential to our national defense. If I did not think this amendment would protect us, I would be urging something else.

Mr. DANIEL. At least it is the intention of the Committee on Finance that this amendment shall be used to protect us in the matter of oil imports and the importation of other commodities which are necessary to our national defense.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Committee on Finance did not make a direct decision to that effect. I can say, however, that the Senator from Colorado believes it should be used for that purpose.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The amendment which the Senator from Texas and I have been discussing has been accepted by the administration. It has been approved by Senators from States where the production of items essential to the national security is large and important.

Colorado has coal and petroleum; it is a very important supplier of lead and zinc; it is one of the few States producing fluorspar. Not many States have a greater interest in the effect of this amendment than the great State which it is my good fortune in part to represent.

It is of considerable importance to me that this amendment provide an adequate vehicle for assistance to industries whenever imports threaten to impair their ability to supply the commodities needed for national defense or security.

I am convinced that the proposal can and will work. It grants to the President authority to take whatever action he deems necessary to adjust imports if they should threaten to impair the national security. He may use tariffs, quotas, import taxes, or other methods of import restriction. He is not limited as far as commodities are concerned except that they must be involved in our national security.

It is a proposition which should serve to alleviate many of the tensions and much of the anxiety in the industries affected. It permits the President to fully exercise his responsibilities as Commander in Chief.

It is my hope that the Senate will overwhelmingly accept this committee amendment.

Congress endeavored to make clear its intent regarding peril-point and escape-clause procedure. However, after several years of operation we find within the Tariff Commission, the agency most concerned with peril-point studies and escape-clause investigations, serious differences in interpretation of the intent

of Congress as outlined in the language of the legislation.

Section 6 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended by the law of 1953, reads as follows:

> No reduction in any rate of duty or binding of any existing customs or excise treatment, or other concession hereafter proclaimed under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

Two important points of difference have arisen, and the decisions of the Tariff Commission are frequently split and lack harmony because of varied interpretations. Some Commissioners have consistently held that Congress intended that, in a finding of injury under the escape clause, the imports in question must be the sole cause of the injury.

Other members of the Commission have taken the position that, even though there may have been other minor contributing factors, a finding of injury resulting from increased imports may be found so long as imports have contributed materially to the injury, and that said injury might be mitigated by a modification of the concession.

Another serious point of difference has been that some Commissioners have defined "industry" as meaning a large, all-inclusive category of producers and items which must show overall injury and perhaps an overall loss in total operations as a result of imports of a commodity which actually affects only one segment of that industry.

Other members of the Commission have argued that the term "industry" should be defined in a narrower sense so that producers would not be divested of their business segment by segment, without any recourse so long as they retained one profit-making line.

Just how these two major points of difference should be settled is a problem on which we have given much serious study and thought. I do not believe that there can be any doubt that the law, as it now stands, is being interpreted in different ways by the individuals who play such an important part in its administration. In the interest of good government it should be cleared up insofar as it can be done legislatively.

I want to quote from a couple of the reports of the Tariff Commission to indicate how serious the matter is.

With regard to differences of opinion as to whether imports need be the sole cause of the injury the majority report of the Tariff Commission on glacé cherries contained the following statement:

> The decline in domestic production (of glacé cherries) was also partly attributable to the high prices that prevailed in 1951 for domestic sulfured cherries.

Although this was just one of the reasons why aid to the glacé cherry industry was denied, it indicates a difference of interpretation as the minority opinion was that assistance should be given the industry even though the high price of sulfured cherries in 1951 might have had some influence on the decline in domestic production. The minority did not feel that imports were required to have been the sole cause of the injury.

Another illustration of the widely divergent views of members of the Commission as to the intent of Congress is found in the report of clothespins. Here the disagreement was on a 3-to-3 basis.

I quote from that part of the report written by one of those divisions:

> The decision was based principally upon a different assessment of the factual information obtained in this investigation in relation to the fundamental question of whether increased imports of spring clothespins are causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry concerned. It will be seen from this language (of the act) that while the increased imports need be only in part due to the customs treatment reflecting the concession, the serious injury to the domestic industry must be attributed to such increased quantities of the imports in question as to cause or threaten the serious injury. Literally, this means that increased imports must in and of themselves be found to be the cause or threat of serious injury before a recommendation for "escape" action can be justified. Obviously, therefore, the extent of the increased imports must be of such scope and intensity as to be in and of themselves responsible for serious injury.

The point of view of the other three members of the Commission was exactly the opposite. I quote again from the report:

> Upon consideration by the full Commission of the facts obtained in this investigation, including the hearing, the Commission divided into two equal groups, each of which was unanimously agreed upon opposite findings.

Three of the Commissioners found that imports were "injuring or threatening with injury" the domestic industry, even though the imports were not the sole and only cause of the injury.

I do not believe that Congress would want this seemingly wide divergence of views to continue. The matter should be cleared up one way or another. Either we should decide that imports should be the sole and only cause of the injury, or we should say that if a substantial part of the injury can be definitely linked with imports, then the injured party should be subject to some form of relief.

We have given long and serious consideration to a means of making clear the intent of the Congress. I grant that that term we finally decided upon, after a great number had been carefully weighed, is subject to some varied interpretation. It is absolutly impossible to spell it out with mathematical precision and some judgment must be left to the members of the Tariff Commission. It was felt that if the imports did "contribute materially" to the injury, then the Commission may make its finding accordingly.

There is nothing unreasonable about such language. It seems a fair and equitable way of administering the law, and I feel that I am in a position to state that it was the intention of many of the Members of the Congress when the escape clause was written to provide such an avenue of relief, and it was not intended that imports need be the sole and only cause of injury if assistance to the injured industry was to be granted.

With regard to the difference of opinion as to what constitutes an "industry" the Tariff Commission is just as widely split.

The dissenting views of two Commissioners in the report on garlic included the following statement:

> It is doubtful that the production of garlic in the Unied States is properly to be regarded as by itself constituting a domestic "industry" for the purposes of the escape clause.

Four members of the Commission based their findings on the fact that there did exist a "garlic industry" and that a number of growers were being injured as a result of low-priced imports.

The minority statement in the divided-vote report on glacé cherries included the following:

> This situation apparently leads the majority to the conclusion that there is no glacé-cherry industry, as such.

Further in that report the minority stated:

> Thus, based on such reasoning, even if imports of glacé cherries are seriously injuring the glacé-cherry business of domestic producers who manufacture and sell glacé cherries, no serious injury can be found to such producers because they are or may be producing other products as well as glacé cherries and their overall operations might still be profitable; the majority apparently believes that, if any injury that may be caused to producers of glacé cherries by a decline in the production of that product can be compensated for by the manufacture and sale of other products, no finding of injury is warranted. We wish emphatically to dissent from any such interpretation either of the facts as revealed in the investigation or of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

The Tariff Commission was evenly divided in its report on "wood screws" on the question as to what constitutes a domestic industry. Three of the members of the Commission were unanimous in the following statement. I quote from pages 9, 10, 11, and 12 of that report:

> (2) "The domestic industry producing the like or directly competitive product" is the domestic producers of wood screws of iron or steel and no other products or producers are involved. The domestic industry in this case is the group of domestic productive units that make wood screws of iron or steel. Such wood screws are the only product under consideration in this investigation. It is the "like or directly competitive domestic product" and the only one domestic product which the law indicates is to be considered in this case.
>
> Products other than wood screws of iron or steel manufactured by many of the same and other different concerns are: Wood screws made of nonferrous metals, machine screws, tapping screws, cap screws, nuts, bolts, and various other fasteners, locks and related hardware, other builders' hardware, and handtools, other hardware, and miscellaneous products. None of these other products, however, has any part in this investigation. None of them are included by the domestic industry in its application, by the Tariff Commission under its order of the investigation, and by the Commission in its order of the public hearing, and in its taking of

testimony at the hearing. The factors such as profits involved in the production and sale of these other products likewise are excluded from consideration in this investigation. All that may properly be considered under the law and under the orders in this investigation are those factors which are directly and inherently part of the operations in the production and sale of wood screws of iron or steel.

If, therefore, the domestic production and sale of wood screws of iron or steel in the United States market are being seriously and adversely affected as determined by the facts with respect to the criteria of the "escape clause" provisions (sec. 7 (b)) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 cited above, it would follow that a finding should be made that the domestic industry producing such wood screws is being seriously injured.

Were this phrase "domestic industry" to be interpreted as including the profits on all other products such as nonferrous wood screws, machine screws, tapping screws, builders' hardware, etc., that might be produced by these same concerns that produce wood screws of iron or steel, as long as the companies, though losing money on wood screws of iron or steel, were making such other products at a profit and the company was making an overall profit or could find some other alternative products to manufacture other than wood screws of iron or steel, that would show an overall profit, few claims of injury would be allowed as a result of escape-clause investigations. Under such an interpretation, a great part of domestic production, article by article, might be forced to stop by the destructive competition of imports and, if the manufacturing companies turned to importing and made good profits at it, they would be adjudged to be uninjured as a domestic industry. Such an interpretation of this "domestic industry" phrase in the escape-clause law would practically nullify the escape-clause provision in trade agreements as a possible remedy of serious injury, and in effect would almost, if not entirely, void the escape-clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act. One by one each small domestic industry could be severely injured and put out of business because of imports and section 7 would be inoperative as a remedy, and we believe Congress intended section 7 to be a remedy.

This is clearly recognized when it is recalled that perhaps 90 percent of all manufacturers and farmers in this country produce not just a single product, but a variety of products, sometimes many different articles in the same plant or on the same farm. No relief would be granted for any of the thousands of individual chemicals as long as the chemical industry was making satisfactory overall profits. The same with the textile, pottery, glass, steel, woodworking, machinery, machine-tool, metal-fastener, and many other industries.

To thus permit imports to take over the United States market one product at a time, because the domestic producers may have found or may be able to find alternative products that they can produce at a profit, may result in allowing imports to take over the domestic market for many articles produced in the United States if imports of such articles are able to enter in constantly increasing quantities over the lowered concession tariff rates and no relief under the "escape clause" is available. "Divide and conquer" is an old policy and an effective one if permitted to operate. Armies use it in war and the Communists used it after the war and are now making use of it with a number of European and Asiatic nations.

Again I say, Mr. President, the Congress has a responsibility in this matter, and its intent should be made clearer than it is at present.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As a very junior member of the Senate Finance Committee, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado for his excellent leadership and cooperation with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in reporting to the Senate a bill which I think not only merits the Senate's approval, but the approval of the Nation. It is always difficult to deal with problems of this type, and it has been especially difficult this time, in view of the many witnesses representing industries who furnished proof and information that their industries were being damaged. But, through the leadership of the Senators whom I have mentioned and other members of the committee, the committee has reported a bill which I consider to be meritorious. I think it is a bill under which our Nation can not only expand its international trade, but under which, at the same time, American industry, American labor, and American agriculture will be protected.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado and the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia are entitled to much credit. I attended most of the hearings held by the committee, and I know some of the problems involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas, and I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to mention one item which already has been discussed, namely, the section dealing with what started out to be several amendments regarding quota import limitations. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not feel that the committee has drafted a very satisfactory amendment which will take care of the situation regarding oil and other mineral products of that type.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the amendment is adequate to accomplish that purpose, and I believe it will be accomplished.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield. I saw the distinguished Senator from Kentucky on this side of the aisle a while ago. It took many years to get him over here, but then he did not stay long.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is no indication that I do not appreciate the comradeship and the camaraderie which exists now and then between the Senator from Kentucky—the junior Senator from Kentucky, I wish to emphasize—and many Members on the other side of the aisle.

When I was a Senator previously, and while I was honored to be the Presiding Officer of the Senate for 4 years, I found genial associations on the other side of the aisle. I find them now, although I have not taken advantage of them quite so frequently as I used to. Being a junior Senator, I am a little modest; I am making the approaches gradually, not by jumping over the fence suddenly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the Senator not be too modest; let him come over and join in the camaraderie.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his cooperative efforts in reporting from the committee a bill which seems to meet with the approbation of so many Members of the Senate.

As the Senator knows, I have been identified with the reciprocal trade program from its inception in 1934 under the leadership of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull. While I was a Member of the Senate I voted for all the extensions of the act. I have been interested in the subject, not as a partisan but as a believer in the ultimate decision of Congress and the governments of the world to deal with tariffs as an economic and scientific question, rather than as a political question. I have always deplored the injection of partisan politics into economic and scientific problems, and I have contributed in my modest way toward keeping them apart.

I appreciate the cooperative spirit of the senior Senator from Colorado and other Members of both parties in the Committee on Finance. The committee held long hearings on controversial matters. We all sought information which would guide us in deciding upon the kind of bill to report. Therefore, it is really gratifying to see that, in spite of some adverse conditions and the local, particular interests which were presented to the committee in great detail, the committee was able to prepare and report a bill which is constructive. I think the bill undertakes to meet the problems which are involved in a constructive, forward-looking way.

I wish to thank the senior Senator from Colorado for his great contribution as the former chairman of the Committee on Finance, at a time when I was not a member of it, I regret to say, and also at a time when I am a member of it, and when he is the ranking minority member of the committee. He has really been constructive in his efforts to draft a bill which should be reasonably satisfactory. The bill cannot satisfy everyone, in the very nature of things, because it deals with a very controversial subject. But, on the whole, I believe the committee has done a good job by trying to resolve problems in a way which will place the responsibility where it really belongs, by authorizing the President of the United States, no matter who he may be, to enter into agreements with other nations to facilitate international trade.

I would not want the opportunity to pass without saying that I, as a member of the committee from the opposite party from that of the Senator from Colorado—not always opposite, but every now and then opposite—wish to commend him for his constructive efforts and cooperation in this regard.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky very sincerely for his compliments. During all the time I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senator from Kentucky has been a

member, with the exception of a short period and has been a tower of strength there. I should not like the occasion to pass without saying that his cooperation in the work we have done has been of inestimable value in the past, as it is now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to ask my colleague, who is the ranking member of my party on the Committee on Finance, if, in his opinion, the selection of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization as the source through whom questions of injury to the industries affecting national security will come limits the initiative of investigations for that purpose to the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not say so. The whole field of industry has its regular escape clause remedies before the Tariff Commission. The bill is designed to focus interest in national defense problems upon the special machinery designed for those problems.

Mr. BENNETT. If an industry feels that it is essential to the national defense, under the bill, will it be possible for such an industry to approach the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and have him consider its problems from that point of view?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If that should not be possible, I would like to see a new Director in that office.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Colorado that it is certainly within the power of the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Ways and Means, specifically, to call the attention of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to an industry which the members of those committees feel is necessary to the national defense, and which may be injured?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say that it is the special prerogative of those two committees, as it is also the special prerogative of any Member of the Senate or House, to bring to the attention of the Defense Mobilizer any matter which bears upon the question of the impairment of an industry which is vital to the national defense.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not the effect of the bill to provide two avenues by which an industry which might consider itself injured could receive a remedy: One through the Tariff Commission, and the other through the Office of Defense Mobilization?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say so; and I should further say that neither is exclusive. All the remedies available before these remedies were proposed will be available afterward, particularly those which focus on defense industries.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I, too, wish to commend the excellent work of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] relative to H. R. 1. I have attended practically all of the sessions of the committee, but I think those two distinguished Senators have attended every session. I think both of them, because of their long experience in financial affairs, as they relate to the Federal Government, probably understand better than any others of us the great issues confronting the Nation.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if those who will execute the proposed law and who are in conformity with our ideas of protecting the industries of America will find in the bill facilities with which to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say so.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As the distinguished Senator from Utah has stated, the American industries would also have the facilities of the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should say those committees especially should concern themselves with the operation of the amendments to the law which the bill contains.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Senator from Colorado is, of course, well aware of the fact that there are in the United States many vital industries which are now being affected by importations, particularly from countries where the wage and living scales are much below those of the United States. But under the proposed law facilities will be provided by which such situations may be corrected.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The bill specifically provides that the peril point and the threat of injury procedure shall be maintained.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As I understand, the bill greatly strengthens the peril point and escape clauses of the laws which have previously been enacted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it does so in several respects, as I have indicated in my remarks to the Senate today.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in indicating to the Senate today why I intend to support H. R. 1 without crippling amendments, I wish frankly to admit that I consider continuation of our reciprocal-trade-agreements program with some additional authority to lower import duties to be only a part, and perhaps not even a major part, in an international program of restoration of normal international trade.

In the first place, some 800 million people now behind what we call the Iron Curtain are to a large extent excluded from what might be called normal trade relations with the remainder of the free world. In the second place, there are such roadblocks in Western Europe as lack of currency convertibility, quotas, and currency manipulations which can be just as disruptive of normal trade as high tariffs.

I am also aware, as I shall later point out in greater detail, that it will be neither practical nor feasible for us to reduce our import duties, even in return for commensurate concessions from some other nation, to the point where the dollar value of our imports will be expanded as much as some persons believe.

Therefore, in my humble opinion, the two principal values of the enactment of H. R. 1 will be: First, it will enable the President, after full and very careful consideration of all factors involved, to ease some irritating spots in our international-trade program; and second, it is a token of good will, friendship, and a willingness to cooperate with friends and allies, which we hope will strike a responsive chord in their hearts and prompt them to take steps to bring about a closer economic union among themselves as well as with us.

Every one familiar with the extreme nationalism which developed in Western Europe following World War II has realized the need in that area for three types of union—military, economic, and political. At long last, we have achieved in part, and part only, a military union under which it is possible for Western Germany to be rearmed. But little progress has so far been made toward a more perfect union among our allies either from the economic or political standpoint.

H. R. 1 MISREPRESENTED

During my 10 years of service on the Ways and Means Committee of the House, when I was devoting almost my entire time and attention to matters pertaining to taxes and tariffs, I became fully aware of the specious arguments presented by the high priests of protection whenever any proposal was pending to lower the inordinately high and, in many instances, prohibitive rates of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930. But in all of my 22 years of service in the Congress, I can recall no proposal for legislation which has been more widely misrepresented and misunderstood than the bill now before the Senate.

Knowing so well the type of fight that might be anticipated, had I been privileged to draft the bill I would have made it a bit simpler and a bit less comprehensive than was recommended by the Randall Commission. But since we now face a fact and not a theory, I feel it to be my duty and that of every other friend of international cooperation to take the time, even though it involves a rather extended discussion, to explain the true meaning of the pending bill and point out how its provisions have been so grossly misrepresented to the general public, and especially to the employees of numerous industries which in the past have enjoyed substantial tariff protection and who feel that in the future they will need the same measure of protection.

I have received hundreds of letters from constituents who felt they knew enough about H. R. 1 to take a positive position on it and to tell me how I ought to vote.

These have included many well-reasoned letters from persons who gave evidence of some knowledge of the principles involved and a basic understanding of the intention of the bill. Some of these reached conclusions which I share,

and others reached differing conclusions, which I, nevertheless, respect.

Unfortunately, however, a numerical majority of the letters I have received indicated that the writers had been given a distorted or completely false picture of the bill. I still recognize the right of these people to have opinions and I am pleased to have them advise me of their views. But I feel they have been victimized, cruelly in many instances, by persons who have unnecessarily aroused fears of job security or loss of earning power.

I have no quarrel with those who explain the provisions of H. R. 1 and then argue as best they can that it is to the disadvantage of certain individuals or groups of individuals. But I deplore similar arguments of disadvantage which are based on inaccurate descriptions of the content of the bill.

EXAMPLES OF CORRESPONDENCE

To cite a few examples from my correspondence:

I have received letters saying that H. R. 1 "would lower tariffs and give advantage to goods made in foreign countries," and that it "would reduce United States tariffs 15 percent over the next 3 years." These indicate only comparatively mild misunderstandings, but my colleagues, of course, know that the pending bill would not of itself necessarily lower any tariff.

It merely would authorize the President to negotiate for cuts on specific items when this can be done as part of a reciprocal agreement which he feels is to the advantage of the United States. Reductions which he might approve are limited to 5 percent a year for 3 years, except in the cases of items which have been under rates amounting to more than 50 percent of their value.

Other letters indicating greater misunderstanding of the bill have suggested that specific tariff cuts would automatically result from its passage. They refer to "Congress trying to push through tariff cuts on a lot of goods such as pants, shirts, blouses, and underwear made in foreign countries." Or they speak of a "bill that would lift the tariff on Japanese textile goods," or a bill "for Japan to manufacture our clothing."

Examples of even greater distortion have been letters saying H. R. 1 "gives the President the power to further reduce these tariffs even down to nothing without any action of the House and Senate," or which say the President's program calls for "across-the-board cuts and not reductions made on a factual basis by consideration of each product."

The source of some of these misunderstandings was suggested by a letter which said:

> There was a letter posted on our bulletin board stating that Congress is trying to put through tariff cuts on a lot of goods made in foreign countries. In doing this it will take jobs of a lot of United States workers and of course it will endanger my own job and that of my coworkers.

Now, it is obvious that most workers in industrial plants have no ready source of information as to the true nature of this bill or as to the overall value of a mutually beneficial system of international trade. But they know it is within the power of their bosses to reduce the number of employees or to close down the plant, so naturally many have written their representatives in Congress what they were bidden to write without pretending to a personal understanding of anything as complex as tariff legislation.

One correspondent took her instruction so literally that her letter to me began:

> DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Tell him to vote against H. R. 1.

Because of my sympathy with the position in which these people find themselves, the primary purpose of my remarks today will be to reassure them. I want them to know that the party of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson was not unmindful of the interests of those who work with their hands, whether on the farm or in the factory, when it adopted as one of its principal tenets the theory of tariffs low enough to stimulate rather than to stifle trade. I want them to know that Cordell Hull was thinking of the men in the factory and in the field when he proposed the reciprocal trade program. And I want them to know that members of my party who always have stood for this principle are happy to find themselves in accord with a President who believes in the same doctrine, even though he was elected as the nominee of the party which traditionally has advocated, and when in power has imposed, the highest tariffs.

In my effort to remove fears and clear up misunderstandings I want, first of all, to discuss briefly a booklet many of my correspondents apparently have seen which was gotten up in comic book style, with drawings and hand-printed text.

FALLACIES OF INNOCENCE ABROAD

This booklet, titled "Innocence Abroad, or World Trade in 10 Easy Lessons," is, in reality, a cruel attempt to take advantage of innocence at home, and to mislead persons who may find it easier to understand pictures than words. The tone of this essay is indicated by its jibing references to a boy who studied economics in college and went to a school of business administration and whose businessman father, therefore, "knows better than to argue with" him. The implication is that anyone with a formal education is incapable of understanding business problems.

Use of that argument in this context is understandable because the sponsors of the book must know that anyone who had studied economics would immediately see through some of their fallacious arguments.

For example, there is the statement:

> More than half of our imports enter free of duty now, and the other half pays an average duty of less than 13 percent. The high United States tariff wall that we hear so much about has long since been reduced to a low garden fence.

Mr. President, the ratio of duties collected on actual imports to the value of those imports cannot, of course, be honestly used as a measure of trade restriction because that ignores the fact that whenever a duty is high enough to protect, it keeps goods out. If we made our tariff rates so high that no product subject to them could be imported and sold at a profit, none of these items would be imported and no duties would be collected. The average duty on imports would then be zero; and, according to the theory of this uncomic book, we would have free trade.

And again it must be remembered that even under the Hawley-Smoot tariff there were a great many items which bulked large in our foreign trade such as rubber and tin, in addition to coffee, spices, and so forth, on which there has never been a tariff. Therefore, if we average imports on which the tariff is 50 percent or more with those on which there are no import duties we get what appears to be a low average rate; but it is a very deceptive figure. As a matter of fact, after adoption of the high Hawley-Smoot rates in 1930, the proportion of duty-free imports increased.

Again, the picture booklet distributed as a brief on the subject of foreign trade suggests that it is unfair to American workers to allow foreign-made goods to be sold here, unless there is imposed on them a tariff which makes up for the difference in wage levels here and abroad. It refers to workers in Germany who are paid 50 cents an hour, while American workers producing the same article receive $2.50 an hour; and it implies that the prices of foreign-made goods are low because their wages are low, and that the prices of American-made goods are high because our wage rates are high.

WHY WAGE LEVELS VARY

Actually, the sequence of cause and effect is just the opposite. The industry which can obtain a high price for its product can afford to pay high wages and can still make a good profit; but the industry which has to sell at a low price is unable to pay more than a low wage. In any case, the important factor is not the hourly rate for labor, but the cost of labor per unit produced. The claim that low-paid labor always can undersell high-paid labor is contradicted by the fact that the United States, with the highest wage-level in the world, regularly exports billions of dollars worth of goods every year, much of it to countries where wages are notoriously low. About 70 percent of our exports are manufactured items; and some of our leading exports, such as automobiles and machinery, are produced by industries which have the highest wage-levels, even in comparison with other American industries.

What the high tariff advocates' easy-to-read booklet does not reveal is the competitive effect of American mass-production methods and the high individual productivity of the American worker.

Research studies have shown that the average American worker, including those in small industries, as well as those in mass production lines, turns out three times as much per year as does the average European worker, and is paid, on the average, about three times as much per year. While the worker in an American factory is producing 100 units, the comparable worker in Canada will produce

80, and the worker in Western Europe will produce numbers varying from 49, in Sweden, and 45, in the United Kingdom, down to 20, in Italy, and 15, in Spain. Of course, the Spaniard who, with inadequate equipment, produces 15 units while the American is producing 100, cannot receive as high an hourly wage; and to say we will not accept Spanish goods until their wage-level equals ours or unless there is a tariff high enough to cover the difference in hourly wage rates, is just another way of saying we will not trade at all.

By adopting the wage-equality principle, we can keep out handblown glassware and leather gloves. We can exclude Swiss watches, because their finishers are paid only 55 cents an hour, while American finishers receive $1.85. But, naturally, other nations will follow our lead, and will exclude our automobiles and other products of industries with high wages but low unit costs; and they also will be unable to buy our great agricultural export commodities, such as cotton, tobacco, and wheat.

The net result would be for us to subsidize those of our domestic producers who are least able to pay high wages because they are less efficient, and to penalize the American industries which have been able to pay the highest wages because they can compete successfully, not only with their own countrymen, but also with producers in other nations. This would mean lower overall wage levels in the United States and a checking of the gradual shift from low-wage to high-wage industries which raise our total production per capita and so raise our plane of living. It would simply be a refusal to accept the basic economic principle that standards of living are raised when those who can produce one item most efficiently exchange with others who can produce other items most efficiently.

Carried to its logical end, that refusal would lead to a situation in which a doctor would be making his own shoes and a shoemaker would be compounding his own remedies, because their hourly pay rates are not the same; and for them to exchange skills would therefore, according to the theory of the American Tariff League booklet, be unfair competition.

DAMAGE FEARS UNREALIZED

The argument that industries in the United States cannot compete with industries abroad, except under protected conditions, and that businessmen and workers in the United States will suffer irreparable damage if the lower tariffs, in order to promote world trade, is an old and familiar one. It was used when the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was proposed by Cordell Hull, in 1934; and it has been revived each time the act has been up for renewal.

Twenty years ago, before we had any experience with this program, these expressions of fear had at least a measure of credibility but it has been interesting to note in succeeding years how witnesses appearing against reciprocal-trade legislation have continued to rely primarily on warnings of dire consequences in the future rather than factual accounts of damage already done.

For example, in 1934 a representative of the United States Potters Association told the House Ways and Means Committee that the bill then pending would undermine our business, and he protested against taking away a man's business in this manner as a violation of the 14th amendment. This year the representative of that industry was back before the Ways and Means Committee, again opposing reciprocal trade and complaining that the Congress is ready and anxious to abrogate its prerogatives and duties under the Constitution and to make tariff reductions that will injure dozens of American industries.

In his last appearance the potters' representative referred to his business as one older than the Nation itself, that has always maintained an honorable position in the family of business.

Despite its age and respectability, however, the industry which produces china and tableware in the United States never has had the ability to expand which has characterized many newer industries and there have been wide swings between good and bad years regardless of tariff restrictions at the time.

In 1934, for example, the witness for the potters' association gave the Ways and Means Committee figures showing production of 18 million dozen items in 1933 as compared with 30 million dozen in 1929. This sharp decline had taken place while we had the highest tariff wall in American history; and if the industry was as sick as it then was made to appear, it might have been expected to expire within 6 years under the much-feared reciprocal trade law.

As a matter of fact, however, when I, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, questioned the Potters Association witness in 1940, he testified that the industry was running close to capacity and had suffered no great damage from trade agreements. He said the payroll alone of the industry in 1940 was $23 million as contrasted with a total value of $16.3 million for the products it shipped in 1934. He still opposed the trade program, however, and predicted a dire effect on his business in the future.

This year the Potters' witness refused to accept as accurate production figures prepared at his own request by the Tariff Commission, which showed an output of 45 million dozen items in 1950. That figure would have indicated production 50 percent over the good year, 1929, and 2½ times as great as in 1933, the year before the reciprocal-trade program started.

The Potters Association's own figures, which differed apparently because of a more strict classification of articles included in the count, showed a production of 27,293,000 dozen in 1947, of 26,600,000 dozen in 1950 and of 19,337,000 dozen in 1953. From this it would appear that the industry is subject to yearly fluctuations now, as it was 20 years ago, but the swing from 1947 to 1953 was not as great as the swing from 1929 to 1933, when it had the highest tariff protection.

Another figure introduced at this year's hearing placed value of American potters' products in 1953 at $53 million, which is more than three times the 1933 value and would indicate it had about held its own with inflation.

Naturally those engaged in this industry would like to see it expand along with our rate of national production rather than barely hold its own, but I question the justification for the Congress to promote such expansion by a high tariff wall at the expense of every citizen of this country who buys a plate or cup and saucer.

Also, it is obvious that the industry has not been victimized, as its spokesman claimed it would be if the reciprocal trade program were adopted. The truth of the matter is that a major portion of the imported products which compete with this industry has come from Japan and there has been no reduction since 1930 in the tariff rates applied to those items. And so long as the industry is able to make out a hardship case for itself I see no reason why it need fear that during the next 3 years the President of the United States will approve tariff cuts which would bring about the total destruction of the industry which its spokesman said he feared.

CHEMICAL INDUSTRY GROWTH

The prophets of doom resulting from continuation of our reciprocal-trade program include other small industries like the potters, which have obvious expansion problems, but it is harder to understand the quakings and tremblings of giants like our young chemical industry, which has been expanding at the rate of more than 10 percent a year and has been exporting from 3 to 6 times the value of chemical imports.

One witness for this industry testified this year before the Ways and Means Committee that the company he now heads was started on a modest scale by his father in 1901. In 54 years it has grown into one of our industrial giants with assets of $375 million and subsidiary plants in a dozen other nations, as well as scattered over the United States. Its sales have almost doubled every 5 years. It spent $255 million for expansion of facilities in the 10 years from 1943 to 1953, another $41 million in 1954, and has planned further expansion which will cost from $30 to $50 million.

This witness justifiably pointed out that expansion of organic chemical production in the United States was greatly stimulated when Germany was eliminated as a competitor during World War II, and that as Germany and other European nations rebuild their industry, competition will become increasingly hard to meet.

I can understand his desire, as a sound businessman, to retain, if possible, the advantage which has been given American producers by import duties on chemicals ranging from two-thirds of the value of the product to as much as 2½ times its value.

I do not blame him for telling the committee that if tariffs are reduced his company will alter its policies and will concentrate on production of products from raw materials which give it an advantage over foreign competitors rather

than items with respect to which others have an advantage.

It does seem to me, however, that a company which boasts in its annual report that 40 percent of its sales are of items which were not being made 10 years ago and which has pioneered in development of so many new products would be able to offer some kind of assurance to its present employees that they will be taken care of even if its phenomenal rate of growth slows down.

Employees of this company in Virginia have written urging me to vote against H. R. 1 and indicating their belief that their jobs were dependent upon the success of efforts to defeat this bill.

Perhaps foreign competition has made this particular plant less profitable than had been contemplated when it was built. Perhaps tariff cuts applied to its product, if they should be approved by the President, would make continued production by that unit unjustified.

This is a company, however, which has had the privilege of rapid amortization of an investment of many millions of dollars in recent years, and which has planned a vast program of additional expansion. It has built substantial reserves while still paying a handsome dividend to its investors.

I cannot conceive that the progressive management of this company would under these circumstances abandon its Virginia employees instead of including them in its plans for the future which involve new plants and new products.

This particular company increased its exports by 25 percent in 1954 as compared with 1953. The chemical industry of the United States increased its exports from $817.5 million in 1953 to more than a billion in 1954, a rise of more than 20 percent, while chemical imports declined from around $293 million in 1953 to around $249 million in 1954. Moreover, our imports are far less significant from the standpoint of our domestic industry than those totals might indicate, because about one-half of the imports are fertilizer or similar noncompetitive materials.

The chemical industry as a whole and the organic chemistry industry in particular cannot hope to continue indefinitely to expand at the same rate as during the last decade, but it should be able to stabilize at a high level. When it does this it should be able to meet import competition on terms which will not reverse the movement toward expanded world trade, and which will permit us to continue to sell to other nations the products of American ingenuity and scientific ability which we can produce most efficiently.

With all due deference to the industry witnesses to whom I have referred, I must say that their attitude reminds me of the story related by Cordell Hull when he was testifying before our committee in 1940.

Mr. Hull told of the man who complained to his neighbor that his wife always was worrying him about money. "Before breakfast she asks me for money," he said. "She asks for money when she sees me at lunchtime. She worries me about it at suppertime and when we go to bed all I hear is money, money, money. She's driving me crazy."

"How much money have you given her thus far?" the neighbor asked.

"Oh," said the complaining husband, "so far I haven't given her any."

Now, that is pretty much the position of most industries which have complained of damage from the reciprocal trade program. So far the damage has not been done.

As another example of fears about the possible effects of H. R. 1 which I feel are not justified by facts, let us consider the textile industry.

TEXTILES AND WORLD TRADE

It is, frankly, somewhat puzzling to me that the trade organizations representing this industry should be so well agreed on efforts to weaken the bill and thereby jeopardize our trade program when the industry has so large a stake on the export side of the picture.

In 1954 we exported 605 million square yards of cotton cloth, which represented more than 6 percent of our domestic production. Imports of cotton cloth that year were only 73 million square yards, which was less than 1 percent of our production.

For synthetic fabrics the situation was even more favorable, with exports amounting to 7 percent of our production, and our production and exports growing while our imports have been declining.

Industry spokesmen have been either extremely general in their expression of fear of injury from import competition or else have been specific only with regard to certain items such as velveteens, damask, and ginghams. It is only on these specialty items that imports amount to more than an insignificant fraction of our domestic production, and those lines represent in themselves only a tiny fraction of our total production. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the list compiled by the Randall Commission staff of commodities for which imports probably would supply from 10 to 90 percent of domestic consumption if tariffs were completely removed, there is only one cotton product—that is lace, largely a handmade material.

My attention was attracted to velveteen because there is a mill in Virginia which produces that material and I believe every employee of that plant wrote me a letter expressing opposition to H. R. 1. At least I know I received several hundred letters.

So, I looked into this particular item. I found that production of velveteen in the United States in 1954, as reported by industry spokesmen to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, was only about 3 million square yards as compared with 11 billion square yards of broad woven cotton cloth and that there are less than 1,000 workers producing velveteen, as compared with over 1 million textile mill workers of all kinds, including 320,000 producing broad woven fabrics.

I learned also that velveteen is manufactured by a branch of the industry which makes pile fabrics, including corduroy as well as velveteen and that velveteen comprises only about 20 percent of this industrial operation. Velveteen has been having difficulties since World War II in retaining its market, but during the same period corduroy has enjoyed tremendous expansion. For example, in 1939, the United States produced 5 million yards of velveteen and 39 million yards of corduroy and in 1953 our production figures were 7 million yards for velveteen and 142 million for corduroy. In the light of these figures it would seem reasonable that any excess of workers producing velveteen might be shifted to the production of corduroy by the same companies.

There are no imports of corduroy to speak of, and corduroy is not on the list of products being considered in the present trade negotiations. Corduroy is protected by a 50 percent ad valorem tariff, which has never been reduced in any trade agreement. Yet the workers who wrote to me had been led to believe that their livelihood depended on defeat of H. R. 1.

Leaving out corduroy and considering velveteen alone, I learned that imports of this material practically disappeared during the war and reestablished themselves slowly thereafter. The percentage of increase of velveteen imports from 403,000 square yards in 1949 to 4.7 million in the first 11 months of 1954 sounds tremendous. But it should not be overlooked that imports in 1936 were 5.2 million square yards and post-war imports have not yet reached the pre-war figure.

Another factor which must be considered is that an extra boost was given to imports when foreign producers found that by adding waterproofing, which disappeared at the first washing, they could get their product in at a tariff rate of 12.5 percent instead of 38 percent. That loophole was plugged in January of this year by administrative action, and this action should substantially reduce import competition. If, however, imports continue to threaten the existence of domestic producers of velveteen, they have the right to present their case under the escape-clause provision of the Reciprocal Trade Act, and I have the personal assurance of President Eisenhower that their case will be given full consideration, consistent with his promise to administer the law in such a way that no American industry will be jeopardized.

Considering the cotton-textile industry generally, it appears that of some 320,000 workers employed only 2,000 or 3,000 are producing products directly affected by present imports, but that from 20,000 to 25,000 owe their jobs to exports of cotton cloth, and a far larger number depend indirectly on American exports for their employment.

Substantial increases in imports of cotton cloth from Japan in the last quarter of 1954 have been mentioned as an indication of the threat which our industry faces for the future, but it should not be overlooked that last year the Japanese Government undertook a policy of deflation, which left textile manufacturers of that nation short of resources with which to purchase raw cotton for

their production. They therefore began to liquidate their inventories of cloth at distressed prices to acquire capital, and this naturally resulted in a sharp increase in our imports.

With this liquidation completed the movement should return to a more normal volume.

The other side of this particular picture, of course, is that Japan took 963,000 bales of United States raw cotton in the 1953–54 crop year, and if a way had not been found to continue that trade our farmers would have felt the pinch and passed some of it on to those with whom they do business.

Production of textiles in Japan and other nations need not menace American manufacturers if expanded world trade is promoted, because world per capita consumption of cotton textiles is only one-sixth that in the United States. If we help to increase the buying power of other nations and their people are able to increase their use of cotton by only a small fraction of the amount we now use, there will be tremendous new markets for our products as well as those of Japan.

COTTON TEXTILES UNDER H. R. 1

But let us now consider the cotton textile industry more specifically with relation to H. R. 1 to see just what basis there is for fear of the results of passing this bill.

If H. R. 1 is enacted, authority to reduce duties on cotton textiles would not be radically changed from that which is provided by existing law. Tariff cuts up to 50 percent from January 1, 1945, levels can be made under the present law and negotiations with Japan and several other nations are now in progress under that law. The actual amount of reductions which might be made in these negotiations is limited, however, by the fact that many cotton items, other than those imported chiefly from Japan, already have been cut an average of 30 percent since 1945, so they could not now be cut more than an average of 20 percent.

H. R. 1, as it passed the House, theoretically would have permitted a maximum additional cut of 15 percent to be made during the next 3 years on rates resulting from the pending negotiations and textile industry representatives felt this put them in double jeopardy. The question of whether the 15 percent formula would have applied to concession rates made in the pending agreement with Japan was largely academic, because, on the basis of past experience, it seemed highly improbable that a concession rate to Japan on an important, contentious item such as cotton cloth, would be made the subject of a further duty reduction to that country within a period of 3 years.

But, in order to remove any doubt, the Finance Committee adopted the George amendment, which specifically prohibits any additional cuts in rates which are reduced as much as 15 percent by the current negotiations. And this amendment applies to items other than cotton and to countries other than Japan.

In response to another fear expressed by the textile representatives, the George amendment also deleted from the bill a provision allowing reductions up to 50 percent of the January 1945 rate on items normally not imported or imported in negligible quantities.

The chief difference H. R. 1, as amended, would make, therefore, from the standpoint of the cotton textile industry, is whether the current negotiations with Japan can be continued, if necessary, beyond June 12, 1955, when the authority given under the existing law will expire. Surely Senators having important cotton-textile industries—Senators who always have stood for liberal trade-agreements policy—who have had the bill amended in committee at their request, should support it now without other amendments that would further weaken the bill.

Let us see how little they have to fear.

The most important cotton-textile products are countable cotton cloths, which are listed for the current negotiations involving Japan.

Ever since World War I imports of cotton cloth have been small not only compared to United States production but also compared with their exportation, and since World War II the ratio of imports to production has been even smaller than it was before that war. Production in the United States of countable cotton cloths has risen since the immediate prewar years by as much as 10 percent to 25 percent, depending upon the years taken for comparison. Imports, however, have failed to regain their postwar magnitude.

In 1937, a year of record production and record imports for the 1930's, imports were equivalent to 1.7 percent of domestic production. In comparison, in 1954, a year of about average postwar production but record postwar imports, the yardage imported was equivalent to only eight-tenths of 1 percent of domestic production. Also, in 1954, the yardage imported was only one-eighth of the yardage exported.

So, we come back again to the picture of an industry not hurt by imports but fearing a blow, especially if concessions are made to Japan. The industry should realize, however, that if an increase in imports should threaten serious injury both the present law and the pending bill provide machinery for relief.

PROTECTION GIVEN COTTON CLOTHS

Back in 1935–36, in a Democratic administration, with Cordell Hull as Secretary of State, when we were threatened by excessive imports of cotton cloths from Japan action was taken to raise under the flexible provision of the law the rates which had applied under the Tariff Act of 1930 and those rates have never subsequently been lowered. That protective action was taken, moreover, without benefit of the escape clause which now permits action to be taken more quickly than under the flexible provision which required an exhaustive cost investigation. Additional protection has been provided by the peril-point provision and the President has never approved a reduction below a peril-point announced by the Tariff Commission.

So far as the branch of the textile industry which deals with manmade fibers is concerned the picture is this:

Almost the entire authority under existing law to reduce duties on textiles of manmade fibers has been exhausted and none of these fabrics are included in the current trade agreement negotiations. In spite of the reductions which have been made, however, total imports of these textiles are only one-fourth to one-seventh as great as our exports which exceed in value $200 million a year.

It would appear, therefore, that the limited new authority conferred under H. R. 1 would be to the interest rather than the disadvantage of the manufacturers of products like the synthetics which would gain by the reduction rather than perpetuation of existing barriers to world trade.

The safeguards for American industry which have been included in the existing Reciprocal Trade Act and the restrictions placed around the limited additional power which would be granted under H. R. 1, fully justify the position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce in calling the bill "an appropriately cautious and gradual approach" to an extension of the trade act, and the editorial comment in the Christian Science Monitor which said the President's program, which the bill represents, "actually is a mild one, not likely to achieve by itself either the great good or the great evil extremists foresee."

THE OIL AMENDMENT

Time will not permit me to discuss all details of the foreign oil limitation amendment, but I wish to mention briefly why I am opposed to it. It is being sponsored primarily on behalf of the bituminous coal industry which, of course, has suffered serious competition from both natural gas and oil since the coal operators permitted the head of the United Mine Workers to price their product out of the market to justify his boast to the members of his union that they were the best paid in the Nation.

I am, of course, very much interested in the coal business because of its importance to Virginia, and I am deeply concerned about the economic problems which now confront it, but I do not believe the answer to those problems is to cut off oil imports as is proposed. From 1947, the peak of coal production, to 1953 demand for our coal decreased by 155 million tons, but consumption of heavy residual fuel oil increased during that period only by an amount equivalent to 11 million tons of coal, and of that increase 6 million tons were in public utilities where coal consumption increased during the same time by 26 million tons.

The major reasons for the decline in use of coal were dieselization of railroads which cost 82 million tons and conversion of space heating to natural gas and light oil which cost 38 million tons. There also was a decline of 35 million tons in our exports of coal; and one sample of the reason for that decline was what happened in Denmark when we cut off the imports of bleu cheese they had been sending to us, and the Danes then stopped buying West Virginia coal and started using Polish coal instead.

Our coal exports in 1954 had a value of $304 million, and that represents the substantial stake of this industry in world trade, especially since industry spokesmen have testified that American miners who produce nine tons a day can make coal available to Europe at a lower price than German miners who produce only 1.2 tons per man per day.

An effort to regain lost markets by promotion of use of coal here and abroad would profit the coal industry much more than the amendment limiting oil imports.

Aside from the fact that the proposed oil limitation amendment would not materially benefit the coal industry, it would be distinctly detrimental to other American business and to consumers of fuel oil.

Most of the residual oil now comes from Venezuela, which has been taking imports from the United States to an annual value of $500 million. Manufacturers in 30 States employing an estimated 100,000 people now producing exports for Venezuela would be hurt by the loss of that business. There also would be a generally detrimental effect on our relations with Latin America which would mean loss of export business to other nations in that area.

Homes which now use oil for heating and industries which use heavier fuel oils also would be affected by a cutting off of imports to an extent out of all proportion to the benefits to the coal industry. Their problem would not be simply one of paying a higher price for fuel but of paying large amounts to convert heating plants from oil to coal use and to provide coal storage space. Many, of course, would refuse to do this and instead of changing from oil to coal, if oil became scarce, they would change to natural gas.

The national defense angle also must be considered. Existing coal mines, by going to a full week without overtime, could increase our coal production by from 150 to 200 million tons a year; so, without further stimulation, we have the potential to produce all the coal that would be needed in a war emergency. On the other hand, our need for additional oil in such an emergency would be critical and oil supplies from friendly countries would be badly needed.

To quiet any lingering fears as to the defense aspect of oil imports, however, the Finance Committee adopted the Byrd-Millikin amendment authorizing the President to limit imports of any article being imported in such quantities as to threaten our national security. That amendment would apply also to such items as lead and zinc.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, those of us who have supported the reciprocal trade program since its inception are primarily concerned as to whether this bill will be as effective as it should be in stimulating world trade. The effect of a reduction of not more than 15 percent in tariff rates over a period of 3 years on a limited number of items should be negligible from the standpoint of American industry, but the question is whether we shall be able to offer sufficient inducements to attract nations into agreements that would expand our exports as much as we would desire.

LARGER QUESTIONS INVOLVED

In considering the pending bill and the program with which it deals, we must realize that something much bigger is involved than the welfare of any one small segment of American industry.

We are proud of our American industrial system. We believe that citizens who are guaranteed religious and political freedom and an economic freedom which includes the privilege of profiting from the fruits of individual enterprise can compete successfully with any nation in the world.

We know that in spite of our overall ability to outproduce any national economic rival there are some specific items in which others who have a natural advantage excel. Where these are concerned our choice is to sustain our production through some kind of subsidy, whether direct or through import restrictions, or to let production dwindle and perhaps stop.

High-tariff advocates cry out that to allow any of our industries, however small and unimportant, to sink under the tide of foreign imports is a heartless deed on the part of the Government. It is self-evident, however, that many who take that position do not believe that what is good for the Government is good for them in their own business.

Large companies with multiple plants and diversified operations frequently find that a line of goods being produced is not returning a satisfactory profit; or that a factory unit, perhaps because of outmoded equipment or unfavorable location, is operating at a loss. Does the management then recommend to the board of directors that the status quo be maintained by taking from the return of the more profitable units enough money each year to balance the losses of the unprofitable ones? Oh, no. If it did, there soon would be a new management. What the competent manager does is to eliminate the cause of the loss.

Sometimes this can be done fairly simply by modernizing plant layout and putting in new machinery or by bringing out a new model. At other times the change is more complicated because it means teaching workers new skills or even abandoning a plant and reopening in another city, with new workers replacing those unwilling or unable to make the move.

These changes may be made coldbloodedly, as has happened in cases where employees and communities have complained bitterly of a runaway plant. Or they may be made considerately, with every possible effort to avoid injury. But successful business executives, including some who are pillars of the American Tariff League, know that operating at a profit is a fundamental requirement of our economic system, and that when this calls for stern measures they must be taken, or else business failure will result in still more losses of jobs as well as profits.

The puzzling thing is the unwillingness of many of these businessmen to apply the same principle on a national scale. I would be the first to protect against a policy of our Government suddenly removing tariff barriers and leaving some of our industries and communities in the same kind of difficulties as those caused by a heartless management which runs away with its plant. Whatever may be the theoretical advantages of free trade, I realize that that system is impractical and would be unjust in the position in which we now find ourselves. But even the original concept of the reciprocal trade-agreement program contemplated no such harsh measures, and the very much watered-down version we now have and propose to extend is more considerate of our problem industries than many individual corporations are of their own weaker units.

Having given full consideration to those who might be inconvenienced or whose prospects for future growth might be limited by a continuation of reciprocal trade, however, we must look to the larger interests of our Nation and the world.

A decision on freer international trade involves the hard core of our foreign policy, because economic warfare, while it may fall short of cold war, is nevertheless a disrupter of peaceful cooperation.

The Hull program, which those familiar with tariff history know was the only practical means of modifying the extreme and in some instances prohibitive rates of the last general tariff act of 1930, has its foundation in the Christian principle of doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us. With some 800 million people already isolated behind the Iron Curtain of communism, the nations left in what we call the free world must have an opportunity to exchange the things they produce for things they do not produce and to have the mutual advantage of trading the things they produce best for things others produce best. If denied the privilege of such exchange with other free nations, some at least of them will be forced to exchange with countries behind the Iron Curtain, thereby increasing the military as well as the economic power of the Soviets and, by the same token, their potential threat against us.

A program of freer world trade also has deep domestic significance.

DOMESTIC SIGNIFICANCE

All of us who represent agricultural States know that farmers now engaged in production of cotton, tobacco, and wheat face a dim future if we must continue to shrink production to the level of domestic demand. For example, Secretary of Agricultural Benson recently referred to an export "goal" of 6 million bales of cotton, which would amount to around 40 percent of our annual production. But we have not exported that much cotton in any year since 1935, and to preserve our domestic market in recent years it has been necessary to reduce acreage quotas to a point where many small farmers have had too small an allotment for subsistence. Tobacco farmers who have counted on exporting 25 percent of their crop likewise have felt the pinch of acreage restrictions.

Representatives of industrial States cannot overlook the impact of our trade program especially on mass producers of durable goods. In 1953, for example, we exported 23 percent of our tractors, 22 percent of our textile machinery, 32 percent of our sewing machines, 15 percent of trucks and busses, 13 percent of refrigerators, and 36 percent of civilian aircraft. Our manufactured goods exported that year accounted for 70 percent of our total exports and had a total value of $9.5 billion.

A third and most important domestic factor which no member of Congress should ignore is the right of American consumers to buy in a free and competitive market. For many years we have had good antitrust laws on the books, but we have never had adequate enforcement of them, and I fear we never shall have it. The whole trend of American industry is toward domination of the domestic market by a relatively few large industries. Even if the leaders of those industries do not sit down behind closed doors and fix prices, it has become relatively simple, when only a few big industries are involved, for them to agree on a type of price fixing which is not illegal but is just as effective as if it were.

It does not take an investment of $1 billion or more in plant and equipment for an American importer to bring into this country manufactured goods the sale of which will constitute a restraint upon monopoly price control.

As an example of the influence of foreign competition on our prices: American manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment have complained in recent years because of orders given to foreign manufacturers, and their representatives appeared as witnesses against H. R. 1, pleading they must have tariff protection as a national defense measure.

Nevertheless, General Electric was able to bid $1.5 million less than was bid by the lowest foreign bidder for eight large generators for the Dalles Dam last September; and after all of the original bids for generators at the Chief Joseph Dam had been rejected, Westinghouse demonstrated what it would do when faced with competition by winning with a bid $716,000 below its original price.

It is understandable, therefore, that Secretary of Defense Wilson, with his background in big business, but with his devotion to the welfare of the United States, should have testified in favor of this bill and said that two-way trade with out allies is just as important, from a defense standpoint, as military alliances; and that Secretary of Commerce Weeks, another businessman, should have said the bill would foster prosperity and would not harm efficiently managed American industries.

It also is understandable that the principal farm organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and the CIO, and also organizations of consumer groups including housewives, who spend most of the family money, should have endorsed the bill because they felt the people of the United States should have the privilege of buying at a reasonable price foreign-made goods which complement but do not directly compete with domestic products.

A program of freer international trade is not a starry-eyed, visionary program of professional do-gooders. Neither is it what might be called a "give away" program under which we give or loan without hope of repayment. We have had too much of that in the past.

This program, of course, does involve permitting foreign nations which desire to purchase our products to acquire American dollars through normal channels of international trade. Some dollars can be acquired by services like shipping and by the spending of our tourists, but the bulk of dollars required to finance a proper export of American goods must be acquired through our purchase of foreign-made goods. This need not alarm us, however, because all economists except those employed to use tricky figures to prove the harmful effects of imports on domestic production are agreed that 95 percent of a good domestic market is better for our producers than 100 percent of a poor domestic market. There never has been a time, so far as I can ascertain, when if imports were properly dispersed and not concentrated we could not absorb without harm imports to the value of 5 percent of our domestic production.

The soundness of our present position from this standpoint is indicated by the fact that in 1953 the total volume of our imports represented only 3.2 percent of our gross national product and in 1954 only 2.8 percent.

A QUESTION OF CONFIDENCE

I am supporting H. R. 1 without hamstringing amendments, therefore, because my confidence in the value of promoting world trade on a mutually beneficial basis remains as strong now as it was 20 years ago, and also because I have confidence in the repeated statements of President Eisenhower that he will administer the law in such a way that no American industry will be jeopardized. That confidence, naturally, is in the President himself, and not in any underling in the State Department; and, therefore, when I say I trust the President and ask my colleagues to do likewise, it is with the definite and distinct understanding that when any issue arises as to the effect of tariff rates on domestic industry the President will get all the facts and then will make the final decision and assume responsibility for the action taken.

As I said at the outset of these remarks, despite misrepresentations to the contrary, not a single tariff rate can be reduced under the bill except by a deliberate and considered action of the President. The vote on the bill, therefore, boils down to one of confidence or lack of confidence in the man in the White House. The decision is one which should be made without partisan considerations. But I feel justified, speaking from the Democratic side of the aisle, in asking: If the members of the President's own party refuse to give him a vote of confidence on this issue, on what logical ground can they ask the people to back their choice in the next national election?

In supporting this bill I assert my belief in intangible realities—the value of good will among the democratic nations of the world, and the necessity for faith in assurances of our Chief Executive that his supreme purpose in life is to promote it.

ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE AT BANDUNG, INDONESIA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, all of us have noted with considerable interest the reports of the recent Asian-African Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia.

While the United States Government was not officially represented at this Conference, and, in fact, failed even to transmit greetings to the Conference, a number of American citizens were in attendance at the Conference as unofficial observers.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, was among the unofficial observers who attended the Conference as an individual. We are proud of Representative POWELL's outstanding performance at Bandung. The Nation should be grateful to him. The plain fact is that Representative POWELL was one of the few Americans who understood the highly significant nature of the Conference and took it upon himself to indicate to the delegates and to the world that many Americans are interested in the problems and forces which concern the peoples of the great African and Asian Continents.

Representative POWELL understood the basic motivating forces behind the delegates attending the Conference. He understood the follies and errors of past Western colonialism, as well as the dangers and threats presented by present-day Communist colonialism.

Representative POWELL gave an on-the-scene answer to the erroneous and exaggerated propaganda so viciously spread by the world Communist propaganda mechanism concerning the treatment of Negro and minority groups in the United States. The strides which have been made toward the achievement of equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens can be a great weapon against Communist propaganda, if the truth be placed alongside the realization that there is going on in the United States a constant struggle to eliminate from our Government and our society the remaining elements of injustice and discrimination.

It is interesting to note that Representative POWELL'S contribution has been recognized in all parts of our Nation. On April 22 a column written by the eminent editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mr. Ralph McGill, was published in the Miami Daily News. The column gives an extremely interesting analysis of Representative POWELL's attendance at the Bandung Conference, and of the official American attitude toward the Conference. I concur in Mr. McGill's observations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. McGill be printed in its entirety at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Miami Daily News of April 22, 1955]

REPRESENTATIVE POWELL AT BANDUNG

(By Ralph McGill)

WASHINGTON, April 22.—One of the really astonishing stories in Washington is that of the Negro Congressman, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, and the reluctance of the State Department to grant him a visa to go to the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia.

He is paying his own expenses. He is at Bandung to say to the Communist world that the American Negro believes in democracy. It would have been a bad idea, in fact, to pay his way because he then would have been an official representative. But it is a sad commentary on the most public-relations and advertising-wise nation in the world that we did not encourage him to go.

I telephoned his office and a young lady said they had not heard from him but that this was good. He was to contact them only if he was in trouble. They said they were pretty proud of him and, I guess, we all are.

GEORGE EXPRESSED CONCERN

Representative POWELL met with very strong resistance when he applied for a visa. I tried to get an answer from the State Department and, of course, got nowhere. They said, "No comment." I got as far as the Assistant Secretary and it still was no comment.

Senator WALTER GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, last week expressed a great concern about the State Department attitude toward this Asian-African conference. He said we were making it appear we were hostile to the meeting. He was of the strong opinion we should have been on record there as a friendly nation interested in peace.

Representative POWELL publicly and privately sought to have President Eisenhower send greetings to the conference. This, too, was refused.

Anyhow, Representative POWELL went. And he has proved to be a very real thorn in the side of the Communist leaders there. It is a conference of nations of colored peoples. The United States was not invited since the meeting was one of Asian and African countries. Yet Representative POWELL proved to be perhaps the most effective person we could have sent had we been invited.

They didn't allow him to speak, since he was not an official delegate, but at a press conference he naturally drew a great crowd of reporters.

At this press conference Representative POWELL fired both barrels at the Communists. He said he was there as a Negro to say the Communists lied when they talked about how horribly the Negro is treated in America. He was in the strong position of being there on his own. The could not charge him with being a paid voice.

He told them that racism and second-class citizenship are on their way out in America. He had a list of Negroes who have been elected to office in the United States and he made a point that a number of these were in the South.

WE ARE COLDLY ALOOF

Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune, reported that the Communist reporters present put away their notebooks in disgust. They were not happy to have their favorite anti-American propaganda upset by an American Negro who had paid his own way there to tell them the truth.

There are 29 nations at Bandung. Romulo of the Philippines has done a good job of carrying the ball for the free nations. It is interesting to note that he placed his finger on our great foreign policy weakness which is our support of unworthy, colonialtype governments. We had other friends there.

But this great world power sent no greetings. We stood coldly aloof despite the fact we had stanch friends there. Representative POWELL did a great service to his country. He said the tyranny of communism lied about the place and the role of the colored people in America. Why they didn't want him to go and why we did not send greetings is a troublesome mystery. And, also, an accusing commentary on the State Department.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there was another individual at that conference, an official representative of his country to whom the United States and the entire free world owe a debt of gratitude. I refer to Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, who was the chief of the delegation of the Philippine Republic to the Bandung meeting. General Romulo is, of, course, an old friend of the United States, while he is at the same time a tireless advocate of the interests of his own country.

I think he is generally recognized, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world, as one of the leading statesmen of the free world. He has long been one of the most eloquent spokesmen of the ideals and aspirations of the peoples of Asia and of Africa, too. General Romulo played a magnificent role at Bandung. In the actual developments of the conference, his was one of the most influential and forceful voices. He did much—as much as any other single individual I know—to expose, at that conference, the concept of Communist colonialism.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a commentary on General Romulo's role at Bandung, written by Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the New York Post of April 29, 1955.

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

ROMULO'S MANEUVER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps as important as anything that happened at the recently concluded Asia-Africa conference at Bandung, Indonesia, was the constant repetition of 1 simple, but telling, message to people who are still free in that great area of the world.

This is that Russia and the Red Chinese colonialism is just as bad as, if not worse than, the form of colonialism which nations of Asia and Africa have shaken off, or are in the process of shaking off.

What was so important was that this message—this truth—was spoken, not by the West, but by representatives of the Asian and African nations themselves. For the first time hundreds of millions in Asia and Africa, newly aroused, newly unshackled, looking about for means and measures to realize their independence, were plainly told by their own kind of the new danger. They were told, in effect:

"Be sure you do not drop 1 set of chains only to take up another."

One man is recognized here as the genius of this particular strategy. He long ago felt that the most effective way to check the advance of communism in Asia is for people of their own kind who know about communism and understand its devious and seductive tactics to tell Asia and Africa about it.

This man, the brilliant and eloquent Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, went to Bandung with the idea of making it a forum for the simple message. Very skillfully he outmaneuvered Prime Minister Nehru of India, who wanted to keep out critical talk; and he got the conference opened at the outset to all who wanted to talk—and many did, and critically of Russia and Red China.

Romulo, is, as we know, a friend of the West. He is also a champion of the Asians. Once he had the conference opened up, then he himself opened up, and one after another followed spokesmen for Thailand, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and, finally and to some unexpectedly, the Prime Minister of a country not hitherto identified with the West, as were the others. This was Sir John Kotelawala, Premier of Ceylon, which happened also to be one of the sponsoring nations, and thus a host.

Speaking up frankly and boldly, he said that the Soviet Union had colonialized Central and Eastern European countries from the Baltic States south to Bulgaria and Albania. As for Communist China, he challenged the sincerity of its pronouncements that it was ready to coexist with other countries without interfering in their internal affairs. All he had to do was to point, as he had done with Russia, to subversive movements by Red China. Of Russia and China, he said:

"They have not attempted to disguise the fact that their ultimate and constant aim is to weaken and undermine the legally constituted governments of our countries so that at the appropriate time we can be transformed into satellites of Soviet Russia or Communist China."

He asked that both Communist colonialism and western-type colonialism be condemned. There was no denying the effect of the Ceylon Premier's blunt speech. He and others skeptical of Russia's and Red China's motives shunted aside Indian Prime Minister Nehru's tightrope-walking performance.

It was in a comprehensive speech showing how Russia and Red Chinese colonialism has meant the end of liberties that General Romulo delivered his warning to Asian and African delegates present not to shake off one colonial domination only to come under enslavement of a new tyranny.

"I do not think," he declared, "we have come to where we are only to surrender blindly to a new superbarbarism, a new superimperialism, a new superpower."

He told how the yearning for national independence can be exploited.

"It is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact," he said. "Because it expresses the deepest desire of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a facade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection."

His hearers knew of whom he spoke there. They did, too, when he said in countries thus subverted in the name of national freedom he wondered if you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen anything resembling the open criticism and other attacks that were common fare in places like India and the Philippines even before independence.

MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have the privilege of serving as honorary chairman of Mental Health Week in the State of Delaware this year, and in that connection, we will have in Wilmington tomorrow an appropriate observance of the occasion.

In accepting the chairmanship of the week-long program, I did so with the conviction that the Nation's mental health problem is of such proportions as to require significant and constructive attention from public and private sources alike.

I understand that more than half the hospital beds in this country are devoted to the care of the mentally ill, and that, at the present rate of illness, 1 in every 12 children born in this country will spend some time in a mental institution—Hoover Commission's Task Force on Medical Services.

In my State of Delaware, which is an affiliate of the National Association for Mental Health, we are hoping to make every Delawarean aware of his stake in the often neglected health problem of mental illness.

We are trying also to demonstrate ways and means of improving the mental health of our communities, and to this end we have been seeking the support of voluntary organizations, Government and professional groups, churches, business and labor organizations, service clubs, schools, hospitals, and clinics.

It is our hope that by the development of a detailed plan of activities and events we can make real advances in striking back at mental illness and can build mental health in Delaware and throughout the Nation.

HIGHWAYS FOR SURVIVAL COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in the April 28 issue of the New York Journal-American an important article describing the formation of a new rational organization, entitled "Highways for Survival Committee."

The organization's leaders include Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, who took a key part in organizing this committee.

The distinguished men and women who will comprise the committee are an encouraging indication of its outstanding caliber. And, so, I wish this committee every success in its vital efforts.

Here in the Congress, while there are obviously some difficulties being experienced in working out the financing of America's highway modernization program, the fact of the matter is that neither this, nor any other obstacle, should prove insuperable or should cause long delay in getting this indispensable highway-expansion program under way. Highways for survival can help, and will help, point the way.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Journal-American's article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

HIGHWAYS FOR SURVIVAL: FORM NEW GROUP TO SPEED ROADS — THIRTY-EIGHT LEADERS UNITE TO GET MORE ACTION ON PROGRAM IN CONGRESS

(By Don O'Connor)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—A new organization called the Highways for Survival Committee was formed yesterday to get more action and less talk out of Congress on an improved national highway program.

Thirty-eight prominent industrial, business, and civic leaders, including William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, took part in organizing the committee.

The group announced its sole aim is to arouse public opinion to the need for modernizing and completing the 40,000-mile interstate highway system within the next 10 years.

This, they said, would lead to greater interest in primary, secondary and urban roads.

Arthur O. Dietz, president of the CIT Financial Corp., was named provisional chairman of the committee.

WANT PROGRAM STARTED

In explaining the group's aims, Dietz declared:

"Our committee does not advocate any specific legislature. Our only concern is to get an adequate highway program underway and get it completed as soon as possible."

While not endorsing any one plan, Dietz said the committee is satisfied that President Eisenhower's recommendation to spend $101 billion in Federal, State, and local funds over the next 10 years would provide adequate roads.

He said the organization also believes the administration's proposal to finance highway construction with long-term credit is feasible, but emphasized that any sound financing method would be acceptable.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Other members of the committee are:

Murray A. Baldwin, former mayor of Fargo, N. Dak.; J. D. Biggers, Toledo, chairman, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; Walter Bimson, Phoenix, Ariz., chairman, Valley National Bank; Mrs. Theodore Chapman, Jerseyville, Ill., president, Women's Clubs of America; L. L. Colbert, Detroit, president, Chrysler Corp.; John L. Collyer, Akron, chairman, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Gardner Cowles, New York, president, Cowles Magazines; Harlow H. Curtice, Detroit, president, General Motors Corp.; Donald K. David, Boston, Harvard University.

Calvin Fentree, Jr., Skokie, Ill., president, Allstate Insurance Co.; Charles T. Fisher, Jr., Detroit, president, National Bank of Detroit; Henry Ford, II, Dearborn, president, Ford Motor Co.; Walter D. Fuller, Philadelphia, chairman, Curtis Publishing Co.; Hugh Gregg, Nashua, N. H., former Governor of New Hampshire; Paul G. Hoffman, Los Angeles, chairman, Studebaker-Packard Corp.; Devereux C. Josephs, New York, chairman, New York Life Insurance Co.; Oscar Lawler, Los Angeles, president, Farmers and Merchants National Bank.

Paul W. Litchfield, Akron, chairman, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.; Thomas R. McCabe, Chester, Pa., president, Scott Paper Co.; Alan C. McIntosh, Luverne, Minn., publisher, Rock County Star-Herald; Robert Moses, New York City Coordinator of Construction; Herschel D. Newsom, Washington, master, National Grange; Howard C. Peterson, Philadelphia, president, Fidelity Philadelphia Trust Co.; B. Earl Puckett, New York, chairman, Allied Stores Corp.; Alfred Reeves, New York; John A. Riggs, Jr., Little Rock, Ark., president, J. A. Riggs Tractor Co.

W. F. Rockwell, Pittsburgh, chairman, Rockwell Manufacturing Co.; George Romney, Detroit, president American Motors Corp.; Harold F. Schnurle, Augusta, Me., vice president, Central Maine Power Co.; Louis B. Seltzer, Cleveland, editor, Cleveland Press; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York, president, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Inc.; Robert G. Sproul, Berkeley, president University of California; John Wickham, Cutchogue, N. Y., president, New York Good Roads Association; Frazar B. Wilde, Hartford, president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; and Ben Wooten, Dallas, president, First National Bank in Dallas.

THE INSPIRING FILM "ASSIGNMENT: CHILDREN"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 5 there will be an invitation screening here in Washington of a notable American film. It is "Assignment: Children," filmed in color by Paramount Pictures, with the world-famous comedian, Danny Kaye, on behalf of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

This film is one of the finest short features which it has ever been my privilege to witness. It will give a great lift to all who see it. It will show them, as only the magic of the motion picture camera can, what is being done on behalf of the children of the world.

The children of today will be the men and women of tomorrow who will conduct the affairs of the world. This picture will cause us and them to realize and accept the responsibility which we and they have. I suggest that all who can see the motion picture do so.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

A MODERN FULFILLMENT OF "SUFFER THE LITTLE CHILDREN TO COME UNTO HIM"

All religion teaches us love of children and tending to their needs for "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

Throughout the world, in every faith is found the injunction to protect these innocent little ones.

Yet, it has been estimated that 600 million children—two-thirds of the children of the world—are without adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, or minimum medical protection.

That is certainly a shocking fact to us Americans whose children fortunately enjoy the highest standard of living and the highest life expectancy of any youngsters on earth.

Everything in America's humanitarian tradition, everything in our religious background, impels us to do what we can on behalf of suffering youngsters abroad.

UNICEF's marvelous accomplishments

Fortunately, we have in the U. N. Children's Fund an ideal medium by which to fulfill our responsibilities.

With a relative minimum of appropriations, UNICEF has performed sheer miracles.

This year in its tuberculosis vaccinations, in its treatments against malaria, yaws, and trachoma, and in its child-feeding projects, it is reaching 31.8 million mothers and children throughout the world.

To date, it has vaccinated 43.5 million youngsters in 58 countries and territories against tuberculosis alone. It has provided penicillin to cure 3 million children of yaws. It has protected 13 million against malaria. And there are countless other impressive statistics on UNICEF's work.

UNICEF involves no handouts

Let me point out that UNICEF is no handout organization. While it draws contri-

butions from nearly 100 countries and territories, it works on a matching basis with the governments of the countries which benefit from it.

Much of its work is in the training of nurses, midwives, and other child-care workers in backward countries. And implicit in all the work is the concept of real continuity, having the country which benefits carry on with the work long after UNICEF has helped get it underway.

Film industry cooperation on picture's release

All this is the great subject matter of the Danny Kaye movie—an enterprise for which he traveled 40,000 miles.

The fact that the feature comes off well is attested by Hollywood itself, which gave Mr. Kaye a well-deserved academy award for his contribution to the film and to American entertainment in general. The film is, of course, being greeted enthusiastically throughout the Nation and Paramount Pictures which has done such a tremendous job in the nonprofit production is going all-out in its distribution plans with the cooperation of theater owners throughout America. Proceeds are, of course, donated to UNICEF.

Back in February, Assignment: Children was previewed at the U. N. General Assembly Hall and at the Paramount Studio on the west coast where it was welcomed with unanimous acclaim.

At the United Nations preview, Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold expressed his appreciation for the great job which had been done by Paramount Pictures and others on the film, as did Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, chairman of the United States Committee for UNICEF, and Dr. Balachandra Rajan, chairman of the UNICEF's Executive Board.

Here in Washington, I had personally arranged for a preview screening which numerous public officials and private citizens indicated they thoroughly enjoyed.

Now, I am pleased to announce the public international screening this coming Thursday night, at the Ontario Theater. We hope that all of the many individuals in the executive and legislative branches having to do with UNICEF will have the opportunity to see this fine film at that time. Assignment: Children is, it should be noted, being presented by the United Nations and the motion-picture industry.

Washington premiere committee

A distinguished local committee for the premiere has been working on it, and I am pleased now to list the members of the committee.

Washington premiere committee of "Assignment: Children"

Honorary chairman: Mrs. John Foster Dulles.

Chairman: Mrs. Robert Low Bacon.

Mrs. Louella Miller Berg, Mrs. Mary M. Bethune, Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, Hon. Frances Bolton, Mrs. Fred H. Brooks, Mrs. Morris Cafritz, Mrs. Julius Cahn, Mrs. J. Miles Carter, Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, Mrs. Raymond Clapper, Mrs. Harry Davidow, Mrs. Carlos Davila, Dr. Martha Eliot, Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Dr. Dorothy Ferabee, Hon. J. William Fulbright, Mr. Marvin Goldman, Mr. Philip Graham, Mrs. Robert Guggenheim, Mrs. J. Dennett Guthrie, Miss Christine Heinig, Mrs. Dorothy D. Houghton, Mrs. James W. Irwin, Hon. Walter H. Judd, Mrs. Randolph Kidder, Mrs. John Lee, Mrs. Herbert Lehman, Mrs. Reeve Lewis, Mrs. Roy St. Lewis, Mrs. Olya Margolin, Miss Margaret Mealey, Mr. Robert McLaughlin, Mrs. Perle Mesta, Mr. Edgar Morris, Miss Marguerite Rawalt, Mrs. Nelson Rockefeller, Mrs. Francis Sayre, Mrs. Bernard M. Shanley, Mrs. Carolyn Hagner Shaw, Mrs. Jouett Shouse, Miss Bess Davis Schreiner, Mrs. John Farr Simmons, Mrs. Hobart Spalding, Mrs. Alexander Stewart, Mrs. J. Austin Stone, Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, Mrs. Frank Strope, Mrs. DeForest Van Slyck, Senator Alexander Wiley, Mrs. Charles Willis, Mr. E. Raymond Wilson.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

THE MINORITY REPORT ON THE EXTENSION OF THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States, recognizing the temptation to barter the domestic economy for foreign policy considerations, pointedly separated the responsibility for the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade from the fixing of foreign policy.

The first is delegated to the legislative branch under article I, section 8; and the second is definitely the responsibility of the executive branch, under article 2, section 2.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY TIED TO FOREIGN POLICY

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act tied the two together under the President through the simple expedient of transferring the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade from the Congress to the President. It effectively amended the Constitution without submitting the amendment to the people, and constituted one more link in the 22-year chain of the transfer of the legislative power of Congress to the executive branch.

The act places in jeopardy every product or industry in this Nation needing protection to maintain our wage standard of living as compared to the lower wage standard of living of foreign nations.

Prior to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act the century-old principle of adjusting the duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition was to develop the whole country and industries alike. Now, under the principle of including international political considerations, the President may trade any sector of the American economy for an international political purpose if in his judgment the overall interests of this Nation are benefited.

NATIONAL ECONOMY—BASIC SECURITY

Mr. President, an amendment to H. R. 1 was accepted, in the Senate Finance Committee, providing that if the Office of Defense Mobilization, which Mr. Flemming heads, reports to the President that imports are endangering the security of the Nation, the President may investigate, and if he finds as a fact that the security is endangered, then he may arrange quotas or safeguards.

Mr. President, any imports from the nations of the Western Hemisphere will not seriously impair the security of our Nation, but such imports may seriously impair the national economy upon which the basic security of this Nation is founded.

FLEXIBLE DUTY—IMPORTS

Mr. President, a flexible duty or tariff, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, does not prevent imports; it simply brings the imports in when they are needed on the basis of our own wage standard of living.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is considering what could easily be the most vital piece of legislation in the 84th Congress—H. R. 1, a bill to extend and modify the reciprocal trade agreements program. The course of action taken by the Senate may very well prove to be the making or undoing of a strong foreign policy and a stable economy in the United States and the world. Congress must, and I am sure they will, send to the White House a trade program which will cement the solidarity of free nations and promote the economic stability of our own people.

The United States must take the leadership in liberating the free world's great economic potential. This is imperative because we in America have the political and economic power to lead the course of action.

What we do in the next few days may mean the success or failure of our foreign-trade policy. The final form of H. R. 1 can mean prosperity, a high level of employment, a sound trade policy, and a stable business economy, or it can mean falling prices, unmanageable surpluses, unemployment, and a slump in our domestic economy.

Since 1934 the reciprocal trade agreements program has been an essential part of our foreign economic policy. An expansion of this program is in our own enlightened self-interest just as much as it is in the interest of the peace and security of the other nations of the free world.

Since 1947 the Trade Agreements Act has been somewhat diluted. In that year there was reached between congressional leaders and the State Department an understanding under which an escape clause was to be written into the agreements. Two years later came the peril-point provision, which requires that before reducing any tariff duty the President must first secure the advice of the Tariff Commission as to the points beyond which he cannot reduce duties without injuring domestic producers. By 1951 both the peril-point provisions and the escape clause were incorporated in the Trade Agreements Act itself. H. R. 1 represents a modification of the present law and increases the President's power to negotiate limited tariff cuts.

H. R. 1 provides the authority to reduce duties by 15 percent of their July 1955 levels. Another provision would allow the President to reduce duties presently higher than 50 percent to that ceiling. An additional provision gives the authority to lower duties to 50 percent of their January 1, 1945, levels on imports entering in negligible quantities only. This is somewhat of a curtailment because under the present law the President has the power to reduce all duties

by this amount. In addition, the Senate Finance Committee has made other modifications and compromises.

It is important to bear in mind that H. R. 1, like the present law, is authorizing legislation only. It would confer powers upon the President; but its enactment, in and of itself, would not assure the reduction of a single tariff duty.

H. R. 1 has become the occasion for an old-fashioned, knockdown, drag-out, protectionist free-trade fight. I think all Senators are generally familiar with the operation of the Trade Agreements Act. So let us turn to the two important issues at stake in the free world, namely, the effect of this trade program on our domestic and foreign policies.

American industry has a big stake in export markets. In 1953 we exported nearly 25 percent of our lubrication oil, nearly half of our tracklaying tractors, and 36 percent of our civilian aircraft. In addition, 9 percent of our anthracite coal, 10 percent of our tinplate, 10 percent of our steel rails, 13 percent of our refrigerators, and 31 percent of our construction and mining equipment found overseas markets last year; also, 45 percent of our copper sulfate, 27 percent of penicillin, 55 percent of rice, 31 percent of dried fruits, and 60 percent of tallow. For us now to take steps which would endanger these exports would force many of the industries into the most fundamental readjustments, and would set off a wave of repercussions which would affect our whole economy.

Even small local businesses share in the benefits of a high level of foreign trade, because of the extra purchasing power placed in the hands of workers in export industries.

There is much to be gained from increased trade. As taxpayers, we benefit because more imports help reduce the need of other countries for our aid. As all of us know, there has been extensive criticism of foreign aid. Increased trade is one substitute which will not upset the applecart.

Increased trade makes it possible for consumers to purchase more foreign-made goods than we need. Producers benefit because imports help foreigners earn the dollars they need to buy more American goods which they need and want, but cannot otherwise afford. Foreign trade promotes more profitable American investments abroad. All of us benefit because increased international trade creates a stronger free world, and thereby contributes to the possibilities for maintaining world peace.

The case for a sensible and practical foreign-trade policy does not rest simply upon its impact on our need for friends and allies. We ourselves stand to gain in economic terms if we choose the right policy. If we do not, we stand to suffer a heavy economic loss if we err. In dollar terms, our foreign trade amounted to $37 billion in 1953; $16 billion of imports and $21 billion of exports. This amounts to 5 or 6 percent of our total production which goes into export trade. These figures seem insignificant at first glance; but we cannot overlook the fact that imports and exports, taken together, sustain 4½ million American jobs. We forget that we are no longer self-sufficient; we must rely on foreign sources for many of our critical raw materials and pleasures of life. Fifty years ago we could close our eyes to the rest of the world, and would retreat into our shell. Not so today. The world has become smaller, through the new and modern modes of transportation and communication. Our population is steadily increasing; our standard of living and consumption of raw and finished materials continues to rise. We must cooperate with the rest of the free world if we are to survive.

As pointed out in the House Report on H. R. 1, probably no segment of our economy has a greater stake in foreign trade than does agriculture. It has been estimated that annual exports of agricultural commodities represent the production of from 50 to 60 million cultivated acres. Our agricultural exports provide a market for the produce of 1 out of each 10 acres of cropland. In 1951, when our agricultural exports ran to $4 billion, this was the equivalent of $1 out of each $8 in cash farm receipts in the United States.

In 1953, of our total production we exported 45 percent of our rice, 26 percent of our tobacco, 24 percent of our cotton, 21 percent of our soybeans and products, 19 percent of our wheat and flour, 18 percent of our lard, 17 percent of our barley, 6 percent of our raisins, and about 5 percent of our pears and apples. From these statistics it can be seen that we export about one-fourth of our total production of some major agricultural commodities.

Since 1951, our agricultural exports have been falling off. Any time there is a falling off in exports of agricultural commodities, there follow lower prices and increased surplus problems, and there may follow acreage restrictions and marketing controls. In many cases, cropland is diverted from production for export to production of other commodities for domestic consumption. This means that even the agricultural commodities that are not exported can be directly affected as a result of a reduction in exports.

One of the most important answers to the problem of our agricultural surpluses is an expanded foreign market. Under the trade-agreements program, concessions have been obtained for almost every agricultural product customarily exported from the United States in any significant amount. The enactment of a liberal trade program will expand the foreign markets for agricultural products produced by American farmers—expanded foreign markets which they need so badly.

It is frequently stated that future reductions in tariffs will cause serious unemployment in particular industries by permitting large volumes of imports to enter the United States, underselling domestic production. The unemployment resulting from reduced tariffs is frequently exaggerated. As I have already stated, over 4 million jobs are attributable to work generated by our foreign trade—both export and import. On the other hand, it has been estimated that not over 100,000 workers might be threatened directly or indirectly, with the loss of their jobs, by increased imports resulting from a hypothetical reduction across the board of 50 percent in present tariff rates.

In order to displace 5 million jobs, there would have to be an increase of over $25 billion in imports. This is equal to twice our actual imports, and four times our dutiable imports. The $25 billion figure is arrived at by taking the Department of Labor figure on the average value of output per employee—$5,000—and multiplying by 5 million workers.

Low tariff barriers have failed to depress labor standards and wages in the United States at any time in our history, and I do not think they will now. During the period in which the trade-agreements program has been in effect, the people of the United States have achieved the greatest prosperity the country has ever known. During this period, wages and working conditions of our workers have steadily improved, despite increased imports.

Opponents of the trade program often argue that tariff reductions in industries essential to national defense in time of war, endanger our mobilization base. They state that excessive imports can so reduce domestic production in these industries that capital investment declines and skilled workers disappear into other lines of work, with the result that the rapid buildup necessary in an emergency would be impossible. H. R. 1 calls for a selective, not an indiscriminate, reduction of tariffs. The President, with his National Security Council and Department of Defense, will retain his full responsibility for safeguarding the national defense.

Since the introduction of H. R. 1 on the first day of the 84th Congress, the Nation's Capital has been bombarded with "protectionist" groups seeking to subordinate vital American interests to the creation of privileged, non-competitive positions for a few industries. If they are allowed to succeed, these few who are seeking privileges will become many. These protectionists would cut off many imports. In short, they would insist that we use up our own scarce resources, rather than draw them to the fullest economical extent from nations more willing to sell from their own abundance. These interests would impair the administration's power to grant firm tariff concessions to others in exchange for concessions to us.

The protectionist would, of course, impose upon the consumer the high prices that must always rule in a protected industry. By stimulating fears of imports, they attempt to divert attention from the need for genuine remedies in situations of industrial weakness.

The vital question here is, Would higher tariffs actually contribute to their strength, or would they merely add an unnecessary burden on the consuming public? Tariffs do not necessarily give new life to a dying industry; nor do they give life to an industry that is noncompetitive in the world market. Higher tariffs are not a sure cure by any means; they can easily increase and intensify the problems.

Too much emphasis is being placed on tariffs as a cure-all. Industries can find

much more shelter if they pursue the possibilities of improved management, shifts in production lines, modernizing investment, withdrawal or relocation.

We should not freeze domestic production against all import competition. One of the great virtues of our individual enterprise system is its adaptability, its ability to adjust to technological and other changes.

There are problem areas. I am among the first to admit this, but higher tariffs will not help much. In the case of hand-blown glass, it has been stated that we have more of an art than an industry, and I am inclined to agree. It competes more on prestige and taste than price. The hat industry has reason to complain, but the United States Government cannot insist that American men and women wear hats.

Perhaps the two most publicized instances of sick industries are coal and textiles. The coal industry needs help, and we should do all we can to help, but placing quotas on heavy fuel oil imports will not be of any material help to the industry.

It has been pointed out to me that, should restrictions be placed on the importation of heavy fuel oil, the existing work force would only have to work 5 more days over the year, or a total of 179 days, to supply the maximum amount of coal that the east coast consumers could possibly require should all who are able to do so convert to coal from heavy fuel oil. In 1954 these workers worked 3.3 days per week, and consequently we could not anticipate the reemployment of any coal miners who are now unemployed.

The chief causes of coal's losses have been the dieselization of railroads and the appeal of cleaner, more convenient fuels for home heating. The decline in use of coal by railroads between 1946 and 1953 amounted to 83 percent of the total decline in the United States use of coal during this period. The consumption of coal for space heating in 1953 was approximately half of that in 1946.

Another area in which coal has lost markets in recent years is in the export field. Bearing in mind the recognized reciprocal aspect of foreign trade, coal producers can hardly expect to retain the export market they have while urging that heavy fuel oil imports be shut off. A unilateral program to the benefit of coal interests is impossible, so they must reciprocate.

In addition, natural gas has become a major competitor of both oil and coal. The solution to the crisis in the coal industry is not quotas, tariffs, or a forced conversion back to coal.

Turning to textiles next, we find another instance in which the facts need to be considered. There is not one textile industry but many, and only a few are sick. Woolens and worsteds and carpets have been sick. Cottons and synthetics have not. We export 6 percent of our production of cotton textiles and import the equivalent of only one-half to 1 percent. Our cotton textile industry is the most efficient and most innovating in the world. Any temporary advantage in wages abroad will not upset the industry. The synthetic textiles are even better off.

Wool textiles are in a different status. The industry is badly organized. Many inefficient mills need to be reorganized. Synthetics hit the industry hard. From 1947 to 1953 there was a decline in sales of men's woolen suits of 7 million units. A high protected wool price, fluctuating widely, aggravated a bad situation. I believe the solution probably lies in a system of integrated woolen textile companies which can adjust flexibly to consumer tastes and demands—not in higher tariffs.

When an industry fails to demonstrate actual injury they shift to the argument—protection against cheaper labor costs abroad. This again is a baseless argument. In the majority of cases, European industries' cheap labor is not cheap at all, once the manufacturer calculates his costs on a unit basis. These foreign products may cost little by the hour, but often they cost a great deal more by the piece. In most every industry, the European pays 2 or 3 times more for his capital than does his American competitor. In every industry, his power costs are higher; in most industries, his raw material costs are higher, too. Almost universally, he does his business on a scale so small that he cannot begin to equal the economies of our own industries. Finally, he often operates in an environment saddled with the restrictions of the cartel, in which the incentive to cut costs is weak and diffused. His wage costs are multiplied by fringe benefits, too. With these handicaps, I think the European who can match our prices in our market is a man to be admired. One additional fact—American industries, large and small, have been able to outsell Europeans even in their own home territory.

We cannot freeze domestic production against all import competition. One of the great virtues of our individual enterprise system is its adaptability, its ability to adjust to technological and other changes.

Imports naturally will create competition. In some cases such imports might displace a few workers and firms, yet the imports might be essential to the national interest. Adjustments will have to be made. Adjustments can be made through legislation at Federal and State levels. There are many things that can be done which will cushion the impact of justified foreign imports—an increase in unemployment-compensation benefits, advancement of the age of retirement, provision for retraining for younger workers, provision of moving allowances, an increase in the lending power of the Small Business Administration, and provision of engineering assistance and marketing advice to firms finding it necessary to adjust their operations, to mention only a few possible approaches.

We are living today in a divided world, the free and the enslaved, with the two parts engaged in a competitive struggle to prove the superiority of their respective systems. Economic solidarity on our side in this struggle is imperative if we are to maintain our position and increase our influence in those parts of the world which are as yet uncommitted. Now to proclaim, by failure of our trade system, that we are ending our policy of cooperation in trade and tariff matters in favor of protectionism would drive a wedge in Western economic unity which would go far to undo all the great efforts we have made in the last few years to build strength and vitality in our part of the world, through the Marshall plan, point 4, and other economic and military-aid programs.

Our free-world friends have made great strides since the war in regaining their economic strength, aided in substantial measure by United States assistance. As their economic health has returned they have been faced increasingly with a dilemma whether they can confidently rely on the United States for an expanding two-way trade with their exports and as a source for their necessary imports. If we do not make it possible for them to develop their trade with us they may be forced by the economic facts of life to yield to the inducements of the East and become more and more dependent upon trade with the Soviet bloc. The danger to us and to them of a development along this line is so obvious that it needs no emphasis. Economic dependence can become political dependence, and our laboriously built system of free-world alliances could easily begin to disintegrate while we stand helplessly by.

The days of economic aid, except for certain particular areas, are just about over, but the dollar gaps remain, concealed to some extent by our extraordinary military aid and military expenditures abroad. As these taper off, as we plan they should, the gap will become more apparent again and we shall be faced with the alternative of continuing some sort of aid program, reconciling ourselves to a reduction in our exports which foreign countries will still need, or accepting more imports. The last alternative can be mitigated considerably by increases in United States foreign investment. A general increase in trade, including triangular trade made possible through greater currency convertibility, will enable all of us to expand our economies and our output, and at the same time contribute to the removal of the currency imbalances. An essential element in any such development would be, however, a liberal United States trade policy and a willingness on the part of the United States to cooperate fully in the economic sphere. Renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation must be an integral part of the cooperation.

In recent months Formosa and the offshore islands have had the major part of the attention of our foreign-policy interests. While we have been preoccupied with the Formosa Straits, we have come close to losing an outpost in Asia far more important than Formosa; namely, in Japan. We have been striving to build up Japan as a bastion of United States and free-world defense in Asia. But the Japanese still face a desperate economic situation. Japan must sustain 88 million people in an area smaller than Montana, with few natural resources and only 16 percent of its land arable. As an industrial and island

economy, Japan must import raw materials and export the manufactured goods. In short, Japan—like Great Britain—must trade to live.

We want the Japanese to limit their trade with Communist China for strategic reasons. But to compensate for its former large trade with mainland China, Japan must find greater outlets in the free world.

This, in my judgment, is a deadly serious issue. The world must open its markets to Japan or risk the greatest industrial nation in Asia slipping into the Communist orbit, either by the sheer necessity of trading with the Chinese Communists, or by growing economic distress leading to internal Communist subversion.

It is essential that Japan be kept within the orbit of the free world. In a very real sense, an economically strong Japan is an integral part of the defense system of the United States in the Pacific. There is no assurance, of course, that the strengthening of Japan, tradewise, will automatically hold Japan in the free-world orbit. But the opposite is a foregone conclusion if the free world closes its markets to Japanese goods. Japan inevitably will trade with the Communist bloc. For Japan must trade.

Japan's natural markets, to be sure, are in the Orient, and at the present time the only Asiatic countries with whom she can trade in volume are Communist controlled. Eventually, perhaps, Japan will be able to rely on her Asiatic neighbors for markets. This area, however, is presently underdeveloped, and until it becomes developed the countries of the West, particularly the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, will have to be willing to take their fair share of Japanese merchandise. Figures for January–October 1954 show that the United States exported to Japan $758,857,000 in goods and produce. In return, during the same period we imported Japanese products valued at $221,366,000. If we lost our Japanese markets, we would be losing a very valuable source of income. If we cut off the Japanese imports, we certainly cannot expect to maintain the Japanese market for our goods. Oriental imports may hurt several of our smaller industries, but in light of the overall picture, should we sacrifice a $750 million market and an ally for the sake of several small industries that can be helped by other methods, adjustments, relocation, and conversion?

It is not my intention to give the impression that the United States is the only nation which needs to revise its trade regulations. Far from it. If freer trade is to be worth while, other nations will have to remove trade restrictions. But because of the dominant role of our economy in the world system, we must participate in the elimination of restrictions, and it is important that we be among the first to take the necessary steps.

Freeing trade will not cure all the world's economic maladies. Underdeveloped areas, for example, will need economic assistance for a long time to come. But United States leadership in reducing trade barriers may, in addition to its economic effects, remove a convenient scapegoat on which some nations have fallen back in making excuses for not putting their own economies in order. United States action in this matter will also rob Communists of a propaganda weapon to use against the United States.

Freer trade between the nations of the free world with their abundance of resources and skills will increase opportunities and standards of living everywhere. To reverse the trends of the last 20 years now, and return to policies of restrictionism and protectionism, would lead to rigidity and stagnation in our economic life.

In addition, we need our friends and allies as much as they need us; we should not let any part of the free world go by default.

Many countries view us almost entirely through our trade policy. We are the chief market for Swiss watches, for Scotch whisky, for Cuban sugar; Spain sends us three-quarters of her pickled olives; Portugal sends us 40 percent of her cork. It is easy to lose sight of cork in all the trade statistics, but we can be very sure that Portugal does not lose sight of it. When we raise the tariff on a foreign product, we not only hurt a good customer but we cut down sharply on what the nation can buy here and at the same time we give deadly ammunition to our enemies, who live by poisoning the minds of our allies.

In the last analysis, we are all in the same boat. This is true not only of Americans, but of millions of people around the world who trade with us, who share in the common defense and who are trying to make a success of democracy.

When we hurt a neighbor's trade, we hurt his capacity and his will to be strong. A poor nation cannot afford defense; and when its citizens feel they have nothing to defend, it is no longer an ally, but a liability.

We have come to the crossroads. We must make a choice now whether we will lead the free world forward to widening markets and expanding production, or permit it to lapse into intensified economic nationalism and political division. The adoption of a clear-cut policy of tariff liberalization would provide fresh impetus toward liberating the free world from crippling economic restrictions. It would be a powerful stimulant to other free nations to liberalize their own trade policies and move toward currency convertibility.

On the other hand, our failure to assert such leadership would be interpreted by our allies as a retreat from our present foreign policy.

An increased and freer flow of trade among the free nations would promote the most economical use of our own resources, just as it would promote the most economical use of our allies' resources. It would enable the United States to concentrate on producing those things we make most efficiently, and to exchange a part of our efficient production for the things we need which other people make more efficiently than we can.

It is only common sense for us to trade typewriters or refrigerators for coffee or bananas, rather than try to produce the latter ourselves at exorbitant costs.

The success or failure of America's future in the world depends more than we realize on the final form of this one piece of legislation, H. R. 1. I sincerely hope that we adopt the avenue to a prosperous future, embodied in a liberal trade policy.

In closing, I think that a quotation from the President would be most appropriate: "If we fail in our trade policy, we may fail in all."

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 152)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until tomorrow Tuesday, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a year or so ago the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], stated in effect on the floor of the Senate that he presumed he was one of the last fundamentalists remaining in this body. I do not wish him to think that he stands alone in such a corner. I am there with him.

I have some basic and fundamental objections to the whole tariff and trade program as embodied in H. R. 1.

The Finance Committee has embraced the three specific amendments which I introduced on March 28, 1955, as separate amendments in the Senate. I am glad that the Finance Committee of the Senate in its consideration of the bill has incorporated these amendments in its report of last Friday. In the statement which I submitted to the Finance Committee and in my conversation with individual members of the committee, I have argued for their incorporation in this measure. In so doing, I offer apology to no one. These amendments have been called crippling by some who do not approve of them. They are safeguards, and I will discuss them later.

One fundamental objection I have to the entire tariff-fixing program em-

bodied in this and former bills is that the Congress is delegating a constitutional function solely entrusted to it. We have a Tariff Commission wholly answerable to the President. We set up certain standards to guide the President, but transferring to him a function which the Constitution vests in us in effect results in a total abdication of our own responsibility. It is a desertion of a duty belonging to us. It is a departure from the division of our constitutional powers. We give the President a slide rule with which to raise or lower taxes. We will not let the executive branch of the Government fix the value of our postage stamps; we will not permit the Treasury Department to change the face on a penny or coin a new dime in the absence of legislative authority. Why the President should fix our tariff rates when the Constitution invests the Congress with such power has never been justified.

Buried in the recesses of the State Department and other departments of the Government and maintained by a generous Congress in appropriating annually millions of dollars to sustain them, are many so-called experts, economists, internationalists, and what-nots. We and the American people are victimized by them by night and by day with all sorts of statistics, charts, programs, arguments, and platitudes.

I shall not be confounded nor confused in this major premise; I shall not be hoodwinked nor led astray in the simple concept of my constitutional duty to which I have given my solemn oath. No amount of laborious reasoning, doubletalk, or circuitous thinking, and, I shall add, no amount of detailed labor involved in carrying forward the constitutional responsibility of my office, is able to persuade me that in voting for this bill as amended, reluctantly as I may do so, and with tremendous reserve, I should not now state that the time must soon come when the Congress should take complete stock of itself and determine whither we are going. These so-called experts are responsive, let us not forget, only to the will of their immediate superiors. They are not required every 2 or 6 years to have their charter of authority renewed by the people of the United States. They remain from Congress to Congress. They come before the committees of the Senate with the unique ability to talk smoothly out of both corners of their mouths. I, for one, sometimes become awfully fed up on some of their doubletalk.

Reference was made in the Senate the other day to the many letters that had been received from constituents which may have been inspired by the so-called "special interests." Inspired or not, I wish to assert today that I am happy to have received in excess of 12,000 letters from the workers in the textile industry in my State who fear the consequences of the provisions of H. R. 1. They may not know its detailed provisions or implications; they may not be aware of its far-reaching consequences; they may not be conscious of the fact that the Congress is sidestepping its constitutional duty; they may not know the refinements of the delegation of a legislative power to the President, the power to fix tariff rates and excise and import duties, or to regulate commerce. Their purpose in writing is praiseworthy; their conclusions are sound; their judgment is unassailable; they are right in principle. I shall not desert them, neither shall I scold them for writing to me; nor shall I lead them astray. I shall never make light of their interest in their daily work which means life or death for them and their families. I shall not put them in competition with products resulting from cheap foreign labor.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that at the present time laborers in Japan are paid approximately one-sixth of the amount which laborers in the United States are paid.

The Senate may pardon me as I restate a fact with which many are already familiar; I was myself once a textile worker. I received a part of my education while working in a cotton mill, working 1 week, studying the next week. I knew what it was to work in a cotton mill from daylight until dark. I know the problems of the textile workers; I know their heartaches; I know their fears. I know their wants, and I share their aspirations. If the amendments which I have offered are called "crippling amendments," and the act of submitting them becomes "heresy" on my part, then the devil may make the most of it. I am not going to become scared at the words "special interests" in fighting for the adoption of the amendments. To prevent the destruction of the means of livelihood of hundreds of thousands of Americans is of special interest, of very special interest, to me, as I trust it should be to every Member of this body. Those who would tear down or do harm to one of the basic industries of this country would cause untold human suffering, misery, hardship, and privation to that great segment of our people who know no other way of life.

The textile worker, the manufacturer, and the cotton farmer alike are concerned with full employment, at fair wages, with a market which affords a reasonable return for their labors. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] the other day stated that cotton imports aggregated $83.1 million and that exports amounted to $317.3 million. He stated that fiber imports were $32 million and exports $217 million. Then, in making a comparison, he said that if in his own business he sold a customer eight times as much as he bought from him, he would try to keep that patronage. The Senator from Tennessee left many factors out of the picture. He left out entirely the ratio of costs of production; he left out entirely the relative standards of living of those who produced the $83 million compared to those who produced the $317 million. A true picture must include the fact that the worker engaged in producing the $83 million worth of imports was employed on starvation wages and virtually as a slave laborer.

That picture would also have included, not an 8-hour day as in the United States, but possibly a 12-hour day; it would have included child labor, sweat shops, and other hardships too numerous to mention. The picture, as given, did not include the relatively high living standards nor costs of living here in the United States; it did not include our burdensome taxation, local, State, and Federal. There is a whole lot more to the picture than mere cold figures in terms of dollars and cents.

On April 13, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorial of the Legislature of South Carolina urging me to vote against H. R. 1 in its entirety. Having been a member of that body early in my public life, and having represented two separate constituencies successively in my service there, I shall be the last to say that that body is subservient to anyone classified as a "special interest."

Another great organization, the Daughters of the American Revolution, memorialized the Congress to vote against H. R. 1 and to resume its constitutional functions of levying taxes and fixing the tariffs. I shall be the last one in this body to criticize that organization as being subservient to any but the "best interests" of our country. I have found that group of fine women to be as stanch and as true advocates of Americanism, American principles, institutions, and ideals—the things which have made and maintained us a great Nation—as any group that can be found in the land; certainly more stanch and true than the so-called experts in the motley crew of unidentified specialists who, by night and day, are eating away to the vitals of our form of government, even as termites destroy the structure of a house.

In the passage of H. R. 1 extending to the President the authority to enter into trade and tariff agreements, specific exception is made on page 3 of the so-called executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The country needs to be alerted; the Senate needs to be alerted, and alert; there is no use for us to complain when a situation becomes an accepted fact. Every grant of our authority, every abdication of our responsibility, every transfer of a legislative function, leads us into a wilderness that results in a slow but gradual change of our form of government. When we surrender our constitutional duty of levying taxes and fixing import and excise duties, we invest one man with too much power—a power we have no right to relinquish.

Worker and manufacturer alike must guard against the language found in section 3, subsection D, wherein, on page 4, the Senate Finance Committee has added the language, "or with respect to which notice of intention to negotiate was published in the Federal Register on November 16, 1954."

This embraces, undoubtedly, the smart boys' "escape clause" to accomplish what they wish with respect to the Japanese agreement. Not only is it wrong as a matter of principle for us to delegate a power to the executive branch of the Government to fix tariff rates; that wrong is compounded and made more insidious when we delegate such a power to fix a rate on a basis yet to be computed and yet to be determined. It is not a

crippling amendment to set the date back to January 1, 1955, rather than to advance it to July 1, 1955, knowing not what the rate may be at such a future time. The extent of the injury we have empowered the President to inflict can be measured by having a known date and a known basis for computation.

I am glad the Finance Committee has adopted the amendment which I offered on March 28, striking out subsection (ii) of section D, on page 4 of the bill. I remarked at the time in my brief statement before the Senate that the language contained was so elastic, so uncertain, and so susceptible of distortion that it could mean almost anything the experts would wish it to mean. What may appear normal to me may seem abnormal to another; what is negligible in my judgment may be wholly important in the judgment of another. The use of such loose language and the grant of such elastic powers could very well wreck our entire economy. No guideposts are erected; no standards are prescribed; no safeguards are set up when we use the terms "normal" and "negligible."

I cannot for the life of me vote to submit the very existence of a single cotton millworker in South Carolina to the judgment of some expert operating in secret in Geneva, Switzerland, or in the caves of an executive department in Washington. The waving of the red flag of special interests, textile lobby, or what-not, in my face only angers me and strengthens my purpose to preserve the worker's right to steady employment at fair wages. I do not wish him to be placed in a position where he must compete with the low-wage scales and substandard conditions of living prevailing in Japan, India, or any other country in the world. He is an American, and as a United States Senator my duty to him is clear. I must have a single purpose to ascertain for him, with what light I have, where his best interests may be protected. He sent me here for that purpose, and I shall not, God willing, fail him. It is my conviction that every time we sit in conference with foreign negotiators and particularly where we negotiate in secret, we come out shorthanded. This conclusion is easily proved.

I believe in foreign trade; I believe in exporting our surpluses so long as there are people in the world who can use them; I realize the necessities of trade; I shall not be a party, however, to bartering away at some foreign conference table, in secret, the rights of the American worker in mill or factory here at home in the United States.

Other objections occur to me in respect to the whole program advanced by H. R. 1. At a subsequent hour I may elaborate on them. Suffice it for the moment to say that, in my judgment, it has never and may never accomplish its stated purposes. A year or so ago, while in conference with some friends who were urging me to support some foreign-aid project concerning textiles, I stated to them that they were building a Frankenstein which would destroy them. H. R. 1 is another such monster if all its implications are fully known and all its possibilities are fully explored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further business to come before the Senate?

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I report, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5085) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30 1956, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 261) thereon. I ask that the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When will the Senator from Arizona be prepared to have the Interior Department appropriation bill taken up by the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should say not later than Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is hoped that the Senate may be able to complete action on the trade agreements bill before proceeding to the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill. Now that the appropriation bill has been reported and the hearings are available, I wish to serve notice on the Members of the Senate that it is the intention to call up the appropriation bill sometime this week, if action can be concluded on the bill now under consideration. I had thought that there would be other Senators who would care to speak on the bill today. I am informed that some Senators are now preparing remarks, but will be unable to present them until tomorrow.

Mr. President, it is expected that the Senate will remain in session to as late as 7 or 8 o'clock tomorrow, if there shall be speakers who will need that much time. I am hopeful that tomorrow we may be able to obtain a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the pending measure before the end of the week.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 1—S. 1723—BASIS OF FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION—THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, H. R. 1, the bill extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the 1930 Tariff Act, which would strike out all after the enacting clause and insert my Senate bill 1723.

Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate as S. 1723, amending the 1930 Tariff Act, provides for the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade through adjustment of flexible duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. President, all that the American workingmen and investors of this Nation have ever asked for is an even break in their own American markets.

FLEXIBLE DUTY TO EQUALIZE EFFECTIVE WAGES

They have demanded a flexible duty or tariff to equalize the effective wages and taxes here and in the chief competing country on each product.

DUTY REDUCED AS FOREIGN LIVING STANDARD RAISED

Such a duty would be reduced as the foreign wage standard of living increased and when the cost of production approached our own, then free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

The principle of fair and reasonable competition was the answer of Congress to the low-wage foreign competition for almost a century of time. It established the highest standard of living of any nation in the world.

EQUAL ACCESS TO AMERICAN MARKETS

The principle established equal access to the American market for the American workingmen and investors.

DUTY TAKES PROFIT OUT OF SWEATSHOP LABOR

Such a flexible duty, adjusted on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, simply takes the profit out of foreign sweatshop labor. It does not prevent imports, but brings them in on our wage standard of living basis.

AMENDMENTS TO SAVE INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES

The desperate effort of investors' and workingmen's groups to save their own particular industry or product from annihilation by amending the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is proof enough of the damage the act has done and that it offers for the future.

The amendment provides the flexibility needed, after 22 years, to establish foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and to provide equal access to his own American markets for the American workingmen and investors.

MANIPULATION FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

It is well known that the low-wage foreign nations manipulate their price, their currency in terms of the dollar and subsidize their own exports through grants, multiple rates of exchange and by other methods to defeat any regulation of imports into this country, and to prevent American imports into their own nation.

FOREIGN PRODUCTION COST

The amendment provides that the Tariff Commission may take cognizance of such manipulation in the adjustment of duties or tariffs, and may take into consideration the landed duty paid price, and the offered for sale price in the determination of the cost production of an imported article.

QUANTITATIVE LIMITS

The amendment also provides that the Commission may impose quantitative limits—quotas—on the importation of any article, in its determination of the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my proposed substitute regulating foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, giving to the American working men and investors equal access to their own American markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert certain language, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is declared to be the policy of the Congress—

(a) to facilitate and encourage the importation into the United States of foreign goods and products in quantities sufficient to supply the needs of the United States economy;

(b) to foster and provide for the export of the products of American industry and agriculture in quantities sufficient to pay for the needed imports.

(c) to develop and promote a well-balanced, integrated, and diversified production within the United States so as to maintain a sound and prosperous national economy and a high level of wages and employment in industry and agriculture;

(d) to provide necessary flexibility of import duties thereby making possible appropriate adjustments in response to changing economic conditions;

(e) to assure the accomplishment of these objectives by returning to and maintaining hereafter in the United States the control over American import duties now subject to international agreements.

RESTATEMENT OF EXISTING IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 2. Title I, paragraphs 1 to 1559, inclusive, of the Tariff Act of 1930 are hereby amended by repealing the classifications and rates therein contained and substituting therefor the classifications and rates obtaining and in effect on June 12, 1955, by reason of proclamations of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or otherwise.

ADMINISTRATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. Title III, part II, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by adding after section 331 the following new section:

"SEC. 331A. Administration of trade agreements.

"(a) All powers vested in, delegated to, or otherwise properly exercisable by the President or any other officer or agency of the United States in respect to the foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to section 350 of this act are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercisable by the Commission, including, but not limited to, the right to invoke the various escape clauses, reservations, and options therein contained, and to exercise on behalf of the United States any rights or privileges therein provided for the protection of the interests of the United States.

"(b) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed—

"(1) to terminate as of the next earliest date therein provided, and in accordance with the terms thereof, all the foreign trade agreements entered into by the United States pursuant to section 350 of this act;

"(2) to prescribe, upon termination of any foreign trade agreement, that the import duties established therein shall remain the same as existed prior to such termination, and such import duties shall not thereafter be increased or reduced except in accordance with this act."

PERIODIC ADJUSTMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES

SEC. 4. Title III, part II, section 336, of the Tariff Act of 1930, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 336. Periodic adjustment of import duties.

"(a) The Commission is authorized and directed from time to time, and subject to the limitations hereinafter provided, to prescribe and establish import duties which will, within equitable limits, provide for fair and reasonable competition between domestic articles and like or similar foreign articles in the principal market or markets of the United States. A foreign article shall be considered as providing fair and reasonable competition to United States producers of a like or similar article if the Commission finds as a fact that the landed duty paid price of the foreign article in the principal market or markets in the United States is a fair price, including a reasonable profit to the importers, and is not substantially below the price, including a reasonable profit for the domestic producers, at which the like or similar domestic articles can be offered to consumers of the same class by the domestic industry in the principal market or markets in the United States.

"(b) In determining whether the landed duty paid price of a foreign article, including a fair profit for the importers, is, and may continue to be, a fair price under subdivision (a) of this section, the Commission shall take into consideration, insofar as it finds it practicable—

"(1) the lowest, highest, average, and median landed duty paid price of the article from foreign countries offering substantial competition;

"(2) any change that may occur or may reasonably be expected in the exchange rates of foreign countries either by reason of devaluation or because of a serious unbalance of international payments;

"(3) The policy of foreign countries designed substantially to increase exports to the United States by selling at unreasonably low and uneconomic prices to secure additional dollar credits;

"(4) Increases or decreases of domestic production and of imports on the basis of both unit volume of articles produced and articles imported, and the respective percentages of each;

"(5) The actual and potential further ratio of volume and value of imports to volume and value of production, respectively;

"(6) The probable extent and duration of changes in production costs and practices;

"(7) The degree to which normal cost relationships may be affected by grants, subsidies (effected through multiple rates of export exchange or otherwise), excises, export taxes, or other taxes, or otherwise, in the country of origin; and any other factors either in the United States or in other countries which appear likely to affect production costs and competitive relationships.

"(c) Decreases or increases in import duties designed to provide for fair and reasonable competition between foreign and domestic articles may be made by the Commission either upon its own motion or upon application of any person or group showing adequate and proper interest in the import duties in question: *Provided, however,* That no change in any import duty shall be ordered by the Commission until after it shall have first conducted a full investigation and presented tentative proposals followed by a public hearing at which interested parties have an opportunity to be heard.

"(d) The Commission, in setting import duties so as to establish fair and reasonable competition as herein provided, may, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, prescribe specific duties or ad valorem rates of duty upon the foreign value or export value as defined in sections 402 (c) and 402 (d) of this act or upon the United States value as defined in section 402 (e) of this act.

"(e) In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Commission, is authorized to transfer any article from the dutiable list to the free list, or from the free list to the dutiable list.

"(f) Any increase or decrease in import duties ordered by the Commission shall become effective 90 days after such order is announced: *Provided,* That any such order is first submitted to Congress by the Commission and is not disapproved, in whole or in part, by concurrent resolution of Congress within 60 days thereafter.

"(g) No order shall be announced by the Commission under this section which increases existing import duties on foreign articles if the Commission finds as a fact that the domestic industry operates, or the domestic article is produced in a wasteful, inefficient, or extravagant manner.

"(h) The Commission, in the manner provided for in subdivisions (c) and (f) in this section, may impose quantitative limits on the importation of any foreign article, in such amounts, and for such periods, as it finds necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided, however,* That no such quantitative limit shall be imposed contrary to the provisions of any foreign trade agreement in effect pursuant to section 350 of this act.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'domestic article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of the United States; and the term 'foreign article' means an article wholly or in part the growth or product of a foreign country;

"(2) the term 'United States' includes the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia;

"(3) the term 'foreign country' means any empire, country, dominion, colony, or protectorate, or any subdivision or subdivisions thereof (other than the United States and its possessions);

"(4) the term 'landed duty paid price' means the price of any foreign article after payment of the applicable customs or import duties and other necessary charges, as represented by the acquisition cost to an importing consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, or the offering price to a consumer, dealer, retailer, or manufacturer, if imported by an agent.

"(j) The Commission is authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for carrying out its functions under the provisions of this section.

"(k) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the entry and declaration of foreign articles with respect to which a change in basis of value has been made under the provisions of subdivision (d) of this section, and for the form of invoice required at time of entry."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 337

SEC. 5. Title III, part II, section 337, of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Subdivision (a) thereof by striking out the word "President" and substituting therefor the words "Tariff Commission."

(b) Subdivision (b) thereof is hereby repealed.

(c) Subdivision (d) thereof is hereby repealed.

(d) Subdivision (e) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Exclusion of articles from entry: Whenever the existence of any such unfair method or act shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commission, it shall direct that the articles concerned in such unfair methods or acts, imported by any person violating the provisions of this act, shall be excluded from entry into the United States, and upon information of such action by the Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, through the proper officers, refuse such entry."

(e) Subdivision (f) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) Entry under bond: Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article is offered or sought to be offered for entry into the United States in violation of this section, but has not information sufficient to satisfy it thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon its request in writing, forbid entry thereof until such investigation as the Commission may deem necessary shall be completed; except that such articles shall be entitled to entry under bond prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

(f) Subdivision (g) thereof is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Continuance of exclusion: Any refusal of entry under this section shall continue in effect until the Commission shall find and advise the Secretary of the Treasury that the conditions which led to such refusal of entry no longer exists."

STATISTICAL ENUMERATION

SEC. 6. Title IV, part III, section 484 (e), of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) Statistical enumeration: The Chairman of the Tariff Commission is authorized and directed to establish from time to time, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, a statistical enumeration of imported articles in such detail as he may consider necessary and desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act. As a part of each entry there shall be attached thereto or included therein an accurate statement giving details required for such statistical enumeration. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to make such reasonable and proper digests from, and compilations of, such statistical data as the Chairman requests. In the event of a disagreement between the Chairman and the Secretary of Commerce, as to the reasonable and proper nature of any request the matter shall be referred to the President whose decision shall be final."

REVISED TEXT OF TARIFF ACT

SEC. 7. The Tariff Commission, as soon as practicable, shall prepare and cause to be printed as a public document available for public distribution a complete revised text of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as superseding the provisions of section 101, title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect as of June 12, 1955.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, my proposed amendment would return the regulation of domestic economy and foreign trade to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, through the adjustment of the duties or tariffs in accordance with article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

The Constitution pointedly separates the regulation of the domestic economy from the determination of foreign policy.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution places the regulation of the domestic economy and of foreign commerce in the legislative branch, and article II, section 2, places the determination of the foreign policy in the executive branch.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to adjust the duties or tariffs and to regulate foreign commerce in the executive branch, thus amending the Constitution through a simple act of Congress.

TO DEVELOP THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Abraham Lincoln's platform in 1860 proposed to adjust imports or tariffs—"So as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country."

Nowhere in our Constitution or Bill of Rights is there any power delegated to the executive branch to favor the development of one industry over another, or one region of the Nation over another area of the Nation.

The 1860 principle held, in general, until the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The 1934 act provided, and still provides, that the President may trade any sector of American industry, American jobs, and investments for a fancied concession in foreign policy.

ABANDONED PRINCIPLE FOR INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

The 1934 act for the first time abandoned the principle of regulating foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition for all products produced in appreciable amounts here—and made the domestic jobs and investment pawns in the hazardous game of international politics.

Mr. President, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is a "dead-fall" over the head of American jobs and investments.

The President may at any time trade any sector of the economy—dependent upon a duty or tariff to equalize the standard-of-living wages—for a foreign political adjustment that he may judge to be important. Investors and workers are even required to show their importance in national defense as well as serious injury to be eligible for the "escape clause' 'which even then may or may not be invoked.

Mr. President, under the proposed amendment, the regulation of the domestic economy and foreign trade, through adjusting the flexible duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, would revert to the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress. Rates adjusted by the Commission would become effective within 60 days—that is, within 90 days after the Tariff Commission's decision—and within 60 days after submission to Congress, in the absence of congressional disaproval, through a concurrent resolution.

NECESSARY LATITUDE IN ADJUSTMENT OF DUTIES

Since many of the duties and tariffs have been lowered from 50 to 75 percent under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and since the fixed duties have been lowered at least 50 percent through inflation over the past 2 decades, the provisions of my proposed amendment embodied in Senate bill 1723, already before the Senate, would give the Tariff Commission the necessary latitude to adjust the flexible duty or tariffs to give the American workingmen and investors equal access to the American markets.

Mr. President, let us return to constitutional government, treating alike all industries and areas of this Nation, through adjusting the duties and tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, and withdrawing from the international game of politics the jobs and investments of Americans.

Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment printed, and to have it lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be done.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

A short time ago the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] reported the Interior Department appropriation bill. I am informed that other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee are nearing the end of their hearings on other appropriation bills. It is now less than 2 months before the end of the fiscal year, and during that time the Senate will have to consider more than a dozen appropriation bills, pass them, send them to conference, work out the conference agreements, and act on the conference reports.

Therefore, the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, is very hopeful that some agreement may be reached to have the Senate vote later in the week on the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act.

I shall not propose such an agreement today; but I express the hope that it will meet with the pleasure of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance either tomorrow or at a subsequent time to propose to the Senate that it agree upon a time for taking the final vote on the pending bill.

Today 7 or 8 speeches have been made on the bill, including the very able speech by the chairman of the committee, the very able speech by the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. MILLIKIN], and excellent speeches by a number of other Senators.

I do not wish to call the Senate into session early tomorrow, because such good work is being done in the committees. On the other hand, I hope the Senate will be able to take final action this week on the bill extending the Trade Agreements Act, and also on the Interior Department Appropriation bill, as a minimum for the week.

If the chairman of the committee is willing, I shall propose—after talking further with the minority leader—some time limitation on debate on the pending bill.

Mr. BYRD. That will be very satisfactory to the chairman of the committee, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And on tomorrow we shall continue in session until as late as 7 or 8 or even 8:30 p. m., if there are then Senators who desire to be heard.

Mr. BYRD. That is agreeable to me.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there are no further statements to be made at this time, then, under the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 2, 1955:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

William G. East, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon, vice James Alger Fee, elevated.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 2, 1955:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

William R. Connole, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1960.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John A. Remon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years from March 4, 1955.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to the grade indicated:

To be ensigns

Richard Newton Abrahams
Kenneth Donald Albritton
Gordon George Allen
Donald David Anderson
Joseph Nicholas Andrassy
William John Bickford
Charles Anthony Biondo
Carmen Joseph Blondin
Alan Dorr Breed
Richard Lee Brown
Theodore Gregg Brown, Jr.
Edward Hegeler Carus, Jr.
Arthur Ernest Champagne, Jr.
Daniel Buell Charter, Jr.
Joseph Leo Coburn, Jr.
Robert Lee Cook
Donald Clair Cunningham
Leon Thomas Dankiewicz
Stephen John Dasovich
Kenneth Roy Depperman
John Joseph Dirschel, Jr.
John Martindale Duke, Jr.
James Joseph Dunlop
Gary Benbow Erekson
Ralph Walston Eustis
Joseph Francis Fallon
Charles William Fead
James Edward Ferguson
David Brockman Flanagan
Francis Duane Forbes
Kenneth Wahlin Forslund
Carlos Anthony Garcia
Ronald Nicholas Gaspard
Arthur Edwin Gerken
Charles Bertram Glass
Donald Leroy Gordon
David Lorance Green
Henry Haugen
Frederick Ferdinand Herzberg, Jr.
Bobby Flynn Hollingsworth
Robert Louis Johanson
John Bennett Jones-Bateman, Jr.
Leo Jordan
Martin Jay Kaiser
Robert Allan Knight
Herbert Herman Henry Kothe
Ira Leslie Krams
Alban Landry
Robert Earl Larson
Thomas Stanyer Latham
Charles Leddy
Edward Francis Lewis
Irvin Wayne Lindemuth
Thomas Channing Lutton
Charles Franklin McFadden
Thomas Joseph McKey III
Charles Anthony Mullradt
Edward William Murphy
Richard Nielsen, Jr.
Daniel Carl Olson, Jr.
Robert Henry Overton III
Richard Rounsevelle
John William Sheedy
Ralph Elmer Slater
William Neil Spence
Edmund Joseph Spillane, Jr.
Henry Suski
Joel Richard Swanson
Ira Edward Thompson
Howard Benton Thorsen
Howard Michael Veillette
George Edward Walton
Robert Ireton Welsh, Jr.
Norman Randolph West
Jimmie Dale Woods

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Leonard O. Vittitow, Eloy.

CALIFORNIA

Wyvonne R. Bibb, Alpaugh.
James I. Bailiff, Arcadia.
John H. Shepard, Carpinteria.
Albert B. McVeigh, Eldridge.
Guido Berti, Greenfield.
Bruce L. Hunt, Paradise.
Lawrence W. Elledge, Trona.
Maxine M. Spradling, Vernalis.

CONNECTICUT

Robert A. Chadsey, Middlefield.

DELAWARE

Elwood B. Rickards, Selbyville.

GEORGIA

Mildred B. Pierce, Waverly Hall

IDAHO

David P. Woodard, Sandpoint.

IOWA

Oscar J. Hertel, Burlington.
Paul R. Bender, Monticello.

KANSAS

Gertrude M. Retter, Denton.
Harold H. Bennett, Haviland.
Max R. Donahey, Logan.

LOUISIANA

John E. Bishop, Lacombe.

MAINE

Joseph S. Dinsmore, Bangor.
Elmer C. Davis, Northeast Harbor.
Everett W. Harrington, Winthrop.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph A. Cunis, Ashland.
Alfred G. Davis, Lincoln.
Barbara J. Coombs, South Harwich.

MISSOURI

Perry M. Sprague, Fair Play.
George O. Clarke, Laddonia.
Fred W. Aderhold, Purdy.

NEBRASKA

Louis Kerst, Crete.
Duane M. Vannice, Halsey.

NEVADA

Alice M. Gabler, Zephyr Cove.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Reginald W. Stevens, Wolfeboro Falls.

NORTH CAROLINA

Hugh D. Bradner, Yanceyville.

OHIO

Joseph M. Alcorn, North Lima.

OREGON

Jack R. Bailey, Scio.

PENNSYLVANIA

Arthur C. Tidd, Avonmore.
Norman L. Foust, East Brady.
Roy D. Cunningham, Farmington.
Eugene E. Thompson, Foxburg.
Charles F. Yost, New Holland.

WASHINGTON

William A. Penn, Bothell.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer K. Beitz, Buffalo.
Kathleen M. Fry, East Lynn.
Mary P. Evans, Minden.

WISCONSIN

Robert H. Prideaux, Dodgeville.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Donald Arthur Andrews and 325 other 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, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Donald Arthur Andrews, which appears on page 5027, and ending with the name of Edward John Zaborowski, which is shown on page 5028.

The nominations of Jerry L. Hoover and 134 other distinguished military students for appointment in the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jerry L. Hoover and ending with the name of Daniel R. Zenk, both appearing on page 5026.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Paul L. Abernethy, Jr., and 1,559 other persons' for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 25, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Paul L. Abernethy, Jr., which is shown on page 5028, and ending with the name of Walter N. Yanochik, which appears on page 5031.

This group includes appointments as ensigns in the Navy and second lieutenants in the Marine Corps of this year's Naval Academy graduates, as well as a group of NROTC and Reserve appointments in the Navy and Marine Corps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the God and Father of all mankind, may we begin this new day with an earnest desire to be loyal coworkers with Thee and with one another in the great enterprise of building the kingdom of peace and good will.

Strengthen and encourage us in our endeavors to penetrate and pierce the world's darkness and shadows with the mind and spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee and bring to light its hidden moral and spiritual treasures.

May we be willing and able to break through and break down all the barriers of prejudice and selfishness which keep men and nations from brotherhood and a true understanding and valuation of the worth and dignity of every member of the human family.

Inspire us to make adventures of friendship and may we always try to see the best in others, to believe in it, and to trust it.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1955:

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

On April 30, 1955:

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

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.

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

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

S. 148. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Polk County, Iowa, and described as Camp Dodge and Polk County target range, to the State of Iowa;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

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

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954;

S. 1271. An act 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;

S. 1272. An act 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;

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; and

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55–14.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, MARSHALL, DEANE, NATCHER, CANNON, H. CARL ANDERSEN, HORAN, VURSELL, and TABER.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on 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.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 152)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The establishment of the International Finance Corporation and our participation in it will strengthen the partnership of the free nations. In my message to the Congress, January 10, 1955, on the foreign economic policy of the United States and in my annual economic report transmitted to you January 20, 1955, I stated that I would recommend at the appropriate time legislation to permit United States participation in the Corporation as part of our effort to increase the flow of United States private investment funds abroad.

I now forward to you the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation and an explanatory memorandum approved by the Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing me to accept membership in the Corporation for the United States and providing for the payment of our subscription of $35,168,000 to the $100 million capital stock of the Corporation as set forth in the articles of agreement. The subscription was included in the budget.

The entire free world needs capital to provide a sound basis for economic growth which will support rising standards of living and will fortify free social and political institutions. Action to that end by cooperating nations is essential.

In its own enlightened self-interest, the United States is vitally concerned that capital should move into productive activities in free countries unable to finance development needs out of their own resources.

Government funds cannot, and should not, be regarded as the basic sources of capital for international investment. The best means is investment by private individuals and enterprises. The major purpose of the new institution, consequently, will be to help channel private capital and experienced and competent private management into productive investment opportunities that would not otherwise be developed. Through the Corporation, we can cooperate more effectively with other people for mutual prosperity and expanding international trade, thus contributing to the peace and the solidarity of the free world.

Economic recovery, notably in Western Europe, enables nations other than the United States to participate substantially in furnishing capital to the less developed areas. The International Finance Corporation is an undertaking in which all nations, as members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, will be able to pool some of their resources to spur such investment. All subscriptions to the Corporation will be paid in gold or dollars.

The Corporation, as an affiliate of the International Bank, will serve as an international agency, which will provide, in association with local and foreign private investors, risk capital for financing the establishment, improvement, and expansion of productive private enterprises in member countries when other sources of funds are not available on reasonable terms. This type of risk or venture capital is most urgently needed.

By providing the margin of capital needed to attract other funds, the Corporation will help expand private investment abroad. It will make its investments without guaranty of repayment by the member governments concerned.

Accordingly, it will complement the activities of existing international investment institutions.

The Corporation will not duplicate the operations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, for the investments of the International Bank are guaranteed by its member governments and are of fixed-interest nature in projects not usually attractive to risk capital.

Since the Executive Directors of the International Bank would serve ex officio as Directors of the Corporation, and the President of the Bank would serve as Chairman of the Corporation's Board, effective collaboration between the two agencies and operating economy is assured.

Nor will the Corporation's operations duplicate the work of the Export-Import Bank. That bank, an agency of the United States Government, is an instrumentality of our foreign and trade policy. It is not designed to provide venture capital; its loans are at definite interest rates with fixed schedules of repayment.

The Corporation will not hold capital stock nor participate in operating control but will rely on private management. It will not be a holding company retaining its investments on a long-term basis, but will dispose of its holdings to private investors as opportunity offers so that it can reinvest its funds in new activities. Since its main mission is to supply risk capital where it is needed, its investments will be highly flexible.

In some cases the Corporation may take fixed-interest obligations, in others it may receive obligations bearing a return related to the earnings of the enterprises, and in others its holdings may be obligations convertible into stock when sold by it to private investors. Thus, the Corporation will supplement private investment, and will operate only in association with private interests which are willing to carry a large share of the total investment in each enterprise. In no event will it supply capital for an enterprise which could reasonably be expected to obtain the funds from private sources.

United States participation in the International Finance Corporation will be a step forward in our foreign economic policy in cooperation with the other free nations. It is, however, only one step among several which we must take. In my message to the Congress on January 10, 1955, I outlined other important steps.

These actions—such as extension of the Trade Agreements Act, United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, simplification and improvement of customs valuation procedures, increased tourist allowances, changes in the law concerning the taxation of income from foreign sources and further developments in tax treaties designed to encourage private investment abroad, continued technical cooperation with other countries, and necessary programs of foreign assistance—are essential to a sound and foresighted foreign economic policy for the United States.

I urge the Congress to enact promptly the legislation permitting the United States to join with the other free nations in organizing the International Finance Corporation—an important part of our foreign economic program which will foster more rapid advance by free people everywhere as they strive to improve their material well-being.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 1955.*

POLAND APPEALS TO THE AMERICAN CONSCIENCE

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is the anniversary of Free Poland's Constitution Day, forever reminding us of a friend who is enslaved calling to us for help.

It is hard to believe that the diplomats of the United States Government are annoyed, whenever we remind them of this injustice for which they must share the blame.

One would expect them to work night and day to overcome the mistakes that were made; to speak up courageously for Poland's right to independence; and to work on plans for her liberation.

Even though the ghosts of Yalta will not be stilled, American leadership will not face up to the issue. They defend those agreements, or attack them, on the basis of domestic political expediency.

Even as they regard the fate of Americans who are illegally held as prisoners by the Chinese Reds, as subordinate to the strategy of peace at any price.

How long must we retreat, not only surrending the freedom of others and the respect of those who look to us as their only hope, but giving up, bit by bit, our own honor and integrity?

Leadership that speaks mightily but acts cravenly, in the false hope that 24-hour peace may be extended indefinitely by appeasement, is heading for moral bankruptcy. After that there is nothing left.

Guns and dollars are needed to halt aggression, but they alone will not succeed. Without the backbone of moral courage and unwavering devotion to the principles of freedom and justice, we shall be caught in the web of our own contradictions, which is precisely what the Communists want us to do to ourselves.

In the long run, our greatest weapon is steadfast practice of those truths that offer hope and opportunity to all men of good will.

Confusion in foreign policy, abandonment of friends, and the instability that results from expediency and lack of fearless moral purpose, these will lose us the trust and support that military alliances and economic aid could never win or hold.

The decline of American prestige began with the so-called practical arrangements that were made regarding the amputation of Poland and the setting up of a government without the advice and consent of the Polish people.

The other compromises that developed like a chain reaction from the first surrender of principle have caused hundreds of millions of people who yearned for freedom to lose faith in us. The light that once beckoned to them with hope, and the promise of deliverance, has begun to flicker, as the victory that was won by the faith, and sacrifices, and will of citizen-soldiers and citizen-workers, is being lost by fumbling leaders.

If we are ever to have peace with honor, the American people must be the ones who shall determine our foreign policy.

They must be given the facts before a decision is made—not 10 or 20 years later—or never.

Unless public opinion has a voice in these fateful matters, to replace the one-man verdicts of recent times, then freedom itself is in danger, not only in Europe and in Asia, but right here at home.

The American people have never endorsed the bargaining at Yalta.

They will not be satisfied until the unfortunate train of events that follows has been reversed and the blunders redeemed.

Poll the American people before it is too late.

Give their conscience a chance to make itself heard.

I am certain that they will welcome an opportunity to tell the Polish people that they have not been deserted by their brothers in humanity.

As a faith-bearing message to them, to others who have since been traded into slavery, and to those who even at this moment are in danger of betrayal, that the American people will not rest until the aggressors purge themselves of their crimes.

People of Poland, do not judge us entirely by the seeming inconstancy of our public officials.

The great strength of our free country comes from the conscience-inaction of our people.

Most of the time it is content to let its elected representatives exercise the judgment and the power which it has delegated to them.

But when great issues arise public opinion takes command with an authority based upon what is right and just that has no counterpart in this world.

People of Poland, the American conscience is awakening.

On this anniversary of your constitution day, we can say with greater confidence than ever before that the day of your liberation is coming nearer and nearer as fearful expediency gives way to that mounting moral courage against which communism can never prevail.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PASSMAN. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I observed in the Washington Daily News today that I have been accused of being sanctimonious because I had some friendly suggestions to offer to citizens appearing before the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations several nights ago. Sanctimonious could mean holy or saintly, or it could mean hypocritically pious. Therefore, I do not know whether the News meant to be complimentary or derogatory, but may I say that when you stick a pig, it squeals, and when you molest a skunk, it has a habit of throwing off a very unpleasant odor. This statement is directed only at the warped thinking, in this instance at least, of those responsible for the editorial of the Washington Daily News on May 2.

At the proper time I shall explain to the House just what I had in mind when I suggested to the interested citizens appearing before the subcommittee that the only way they could get the improvements for their schools, recreational centers, and other institutions was to adjust the District of Columbia tax system. I pointed out that the citizens of the District paid only from 34 to 37 percent the amount of taxes on a per capita basis that are paid by the citizens of the average city of comparable size in our Nation. I believe I am approximately correct in my analysis.

It is now crystal clear why certain phases of the educational system of the District of Columbia, the recreational facilities and many other public institutions are lagging so far behind in modernization as compared with public institutions of other cities of a similar size. Why does this condition exist in the city of Washington? A major reason is that when Members of Congress attempt to point out the weaknesses of the District tax system, then they are lambasted and insulted by the local press. If you are going to have improvements, certainly they will require money. Where are you going to get the money? If you pursue the same course that is pursued in other cities, then it will be through increased taxes. Mr. Speaker, just so long as the press of the District of Columbia chooses to lambast a Member of Congress for trying to be helpful, just so long will the city lag behind other cities of the Nation.

I want to be helpful, and when I suggested to the group of citizens appearing before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that they endeavor to create community interest with respect to an adjustment of District taxes, I was accused of being sanctimonious. But until such time as you develop community interest, there will be no particular interest among the city commissioners. A combined display of interest by the citizens and the city commissioners will be reflected in the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, not only am I embarrassed, but I am humiliated over the fact that instead of getting cooperation from the press and the citizens in my endeavor to help them, I get an uncalled for lambasting, or it would be more proper to state, an outright insult. I doubt if any Member of Congress has ever had a more uncomplimentary and sarcastic statement directed at him than was directed at me in the Washington Daily News editorial of May 2, 1955.

Furthermore, I doubt if in the history of editorial writing an editorial has been filled with any more untruths than the one in which the News, in effect, indicted every public official in Louisiana of indecency, dishonesty, and inefficiency. Every citizen of Louisiana, and especially the thousands of public officials, will deeply resent this untruthful attack.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News has a peculiar method of making friends. As a part of my remarks, I am inserting the editorial from the Washington Daily News:

HOT AIR

Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, Louisiana, gave a bit of sanctimonious advice Thursday to some District of Columbia citizens who were at a House hearing trying to persuade Congress to give the District more money.

Like a good father enlightening a stupid but innocent child, Representative PASSMAN told us all that what our town needed was not more Federal money but a "drive to raise your taxes to the level of some of the States."

His own State of Louisiana, he piously pointed out, had a 9-cent tax on cigarettes compared to the District's 2 cents, and an alcohol tax some three times as high as ours.

Also, he said: "Your real estate is not assessed at its actual value. Some is assessed the same as it was 20 years ago."

This newspaper has pointed to the need of modernizing real-estate assessments many times, but before the innocent children rush to pattern their taxes after Louisiana's they might consider a few items Papa PASSMORE overlooked:

Louisiana's big city, New Orleans, has what New Orleans civic groups insist is the worst assessment system in the Nation. If any property there is assessed at anything like its value, it is probably pure coincidence.

Assessments are used primarily as political weapons, with political friends getting low assessments, political enemies high. Assessors are elected. Each is the creature of a powerful political machine. Out-of-office politicians promise faithfully to clean the assessment situation up. It never gets cleaned.

Louisiana has higher taxes than practically any other State—but, we feel this is not altogether a virtue. A great percentage of one major revenue source, the sales tax, admittedly never gets to government but is admittedly diverted into private hands. Louisiana's tax law is so written that it is impossible to ever tell how much money is due the government.

Louisiana has a State income tax which the majority of its citizens simply ignore. No real attempt is made to collect it.

The New Orleans Levee Board has an accumulated fortune in tax money, although it has long since lost its only reason for existence—maintenance of the levee system. The levees were taken over years ago by the Federal Government. The board, which has nothing else to do with the money, uses it in real-estate speculation making more money. It has long been a political truism in Louisiana that if you ever get on the New Orleans Levee Board you're set financially for life.

In spite of the high State taxes, Louisiana over the years has received more in Federal grants and allotments than it has paid in Federal taxes.

All in all, Mr. PASSMAN, we think the District citizens needn't feel guilty because a beer and a cigarette costs more in Louisiana.

INVITATION TO ENJOY WISCONSIN CHEESE

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Members will probably receive in the afternoon mail this announcement, but I wish to read it again to be sure nobody forgets this Wednesday, May 4:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND COLLEAGUES: I am pleased to announce that, through the courtesy of Mr. John W. Wuethrich, Greenwood, Wis., arrangements have been made for a selection of Wisconsin cheddar, swiss, and brick cheeses to be served in the House dining rooms on Wednesday, May 4, 1955.

Donors of this cheese are:

John W. Wuethrich Creamery Co., Greenwood, Wis.

Blue Moon Foods, Inc., Thorp, Wis.

Neillsville Milk Products, Neillsville, Wis.

Clark-Marathon Cooperative, Abbotsford, Wis.

E. Hilfiker, Rice Lake, Wis.

Greenwood Milk Products, Greenwood, Wis.

Stewart Cheese Corp., Greenwood, Wis.

South Alma Cheese Factory, Alma Center, Wis.

Lloyd Dickrell, Junction City, Wis.

I want to invite you to this fine treat arranged by the cheese factories of Wisconsin's Ninth District, and I hope my colleagues will make it a point to eat in the House dining rooms on May 4 and enjoy this fine cheese for which the dairy State of Wisconsin is justly famous.

FEDERAL CLASSIFIED PAY BILL

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, on April 18 I called the attention of the House to Joseph Young's column in the Evening Star in which he stated the fate of the Federal classified pay bill was delayed pending the outcome of the postal pay raise. I drew attention to the unfairness of such a situation and pointed out the parallel with the "no action" of last year. I have since conferred with a number of my colleagues, some of them members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I know that they think as I do—that there should be no relationship between these bills. Last week I was heartened by reports that the committee was swinging around to this viewpoint. However, on Thursday last I find the committee met in executive session to consider a change of policy on this matter, and no action was taken. I am distressed at this, as I know are the hundreds of thousands of loyal Federal classified employees. How long must this large group of fine and conscientious public servants be discriminated against

and used as a political football? How long are we to fiddle while Rome burns? These people by law have no recourse for the legitimate barter and sale of their labors, as do employees in private industry. Their only agent is the Congress of the United States, and I say to the distinguished Members of this House that unless concerted action is taken to persuade the committee to adopt a more liberal view, a grievous wrong is being perpetrated. I have had in mind filing a discharge petition because I know the majority of the Members of this House favor immediate relief for the classified Federal employees, and want an opportunity to express their will.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Members of this House express their sentiments in a mighty chorus that will be heard through the closed door of the committee room, and in this way, maybe, bring the classified Federal pay raise bill to the floor of the House for appropriate and expeditious action.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CAUSES, EFFECT, AND PREVENTIVE TREATMENT METHODS OF DUST STORMS

Mr. AVERY. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, because of the recent drought and accompanying devastating dust storms that have scourged the Great Plains region, I would like to call the attention of the House to a research project that I think is of paramount interest to all Members and especially those Members from the Middle West. Although my district in Kansas is not within the grip of this devastation, probably one of the greatest agricultural colleges in the Midwest is located in my district at Manhattan, Kans.

Since 1947 our college has been conducting scientific research by mechanical devices upon the causes, effect, and preventive treatment methods of these dust storms. I have asked Dean Harold E. Myers, of the school of agriculture, to prepare a brief report on these experiments and research. I would like to point out that the cost of the experiment is one eighty-fifth of the emergency funds allocated to Kansas this year.

THE 82D AIRBORNE DIVISION

Mr. GAVIN. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in company with 23 other Congressmen and a number of Department of Army officials including Under Secretary Charles C. Finucane and Assistant Secretary Chester R. Davis, I went to Fort Bragg on Friday, April 22, to see the airborne troops of the XVIII—18th—Airborne Corps display their prowess. The world-famous 82d Airborne Division demonstrated to us the training, religious, recreational and other influences that go to make up the present-day airborne trooper.

We hear a lot about "morale" and "esprit" in our dealings with the Armed Forces. I was tremendously impressed by the obvious pride of belonging which exists among the troopers at Fort Bragg.

We saw demonstrations of the rugged physical training that goes into the making of a paratrooper and noted the stress on mental alertness which permeates all phases of training. We were shown how, in the 82d's basic airborne course, the swinging harness was used to simulate the oscillating of a parachute as it comes to the ground; troops executed landing falls from a 4-foot platform; the 34-foot tower from which the trooper actually leaps into the air, riding a cable to the ground some 150 yards distant was utilized; wind machines blew the troopers along the ground in the process of teaching them how to collapse a parachute in high winds.

The light aviation and helicopter elements of the XVIII—18th—Airborne Corps Artillery and the 8th Helicopter Battalion showed us their versatility in equipment drops, wire laying, and message pickups. The "Whirly-Birds" demonstrated their specialty of troop movement and evacuation, as well as the hauling of supplies.

We saw the Army's giant atomic weapon, the 280-millimeter gun. We were also impressed with the 155-millimeter gun, the 8-inch howitzer, and the 240-millimeter howitzer.

Saturday morning, April 23, at exactly 9:00 a. m. more than 1,000 troopers from the 504th Airborne Infantry Regiment and the 456th Airborne Artillery Battalion parachuted into simulated combat before our gathering. Fifteen tons of heavy equipment—jeeps, three-fourth-ton vehicles, artillery pieces, and resupplies—were dropped within moments of the initial assault landing.

Later on in the day, 504th Airborne Infantrymen teamed with troopers of the 44th Tank Battalion and the 456th Airborne Field Artillery Battalion to demonstrate the shock power of the coordinated infantry-artillery-tank team. Their regimental exhibits were excellently presented.

The 2-day visit was climaxed with a review of the entire 82d Airborne Division and elements of the XVIII (18th) Airborne Corps Artillery, a thrilling sight which graphically depicted the power, might and mobility of the United States Army.

I was greatly impressed with the physical demonstrations which I witnessed. The Army is doing a magnificent training job at Fort Bragg. The demonstrations we witnessed were awe-inspiring in their sheer tactical impact.

Capt. Paul W. Hamblin, headquarters, 82d Airborne Division, gave our group a short narration on the mission of the infantryman. I cannot remember ever having previously heard a more lucid or succinct explanation of the role of the fighting soldier. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD Captain Hamblin's talk titled "The 82d Trooper—Epitome of Fighting Men." I recommend that you not only read it, but that you retain it for future use. It will properly orient you on the individual soldier's role in warfare.

THE 82D TROOPER EPITOME OF FIGHTING MEN

(Narrated by Capt. Paul W. Hamblin, headquarters, 82d Airborne Division, at Field House on April 22, 1955)

The mission of the 82d Airborne Division is destruction of the enemy on the ground. The only effective way to completely destroy the enemy and his will to fight is to seize and hold his real estate. And the only way to completely accomplish this mission is by the use of the ground combat soldier—the infantryman. The advancement in arms and machines has exceeded man's wildest expectations. The modes and methods of warfare, for all services, have been greatly changed by these advancements. With each successive development of these arms and machines, man has had to adapt himself in order to survive. That we, as a race, do survive, is proof that it is man, not the machine, that constitutes the force for final success. For ultimate victory it is the individual soldier, with his skill, his courage, and his mental strength that we must look.

The infantryman's mission is threefold: First, to carry the fight to the enemy on the ground. Second, to close with the enemy and destroy him. Third, to hold what he has seized and force the enemy to his knees. This is the infantryman's task.

Basically, an infantryman is a soldier trained, equipped, and organized to fight on the ground. He is a dismounted, close-in fighter. His advances are characterized by relentless pushing, elbowing, and clawing inch by inch, yard by yard, mile by mile. He hangs on to his gains with bulldog tenacity. On the battlefield he moves in small, hard-to-see formations, taking advantage of routes which provide concealment—at times only enough for a single man.

No war has been won until the infantryman imposes his will on the enemy infantryman. No land is conquered until the man on foot plants his muddy GI boot on the enemy's homeland and holds it.

The sole purpose of all the marvelous machines of war, regardless of whether they travel on the water, in the air, or on the ground, is to enable the infantryman to come to grips with the enemy and to support him in this effort.

The men who fly over him, the tankers that thunder by his side, the sailors who buck the seven seas, the men who build bridges in the face of enemy fire, the artilleryman firing

his missions, these and his many other comrades-in-arms sweat only in support of the infantryman fulfilling his mission. Every weapon, from the awful awe-inspiring new ones to the blackjack and trench knife, is conceived in his behalf so that, with the guts and skill that are his, he can carry the fight to the enemy, destroy him, seize the ground, and hold it.

It is an irrevocable fact that our most precious commodity is the individual trooper. We—you and I—are derelict in our duty if we do not do all within our power to insure that he is the ultimate fighting man.

Here, this evening, our displays stress the many activities and functions needed to satisfy the requirements—mental, physical, and psychological—of the fighting infantryman. All that you will see this evening—the equipment for training, the supplies, the supporting elements—all have as their sole reason for existence, the development of the individual soldier into the fighting soldier.

PROPOSED TREATY WITH AUSTRIA

Mr. FLOOD. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking this time is to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the provisions of article 16 of the proposed treaty between the allies and Austria and to give hope that the Secretary of State will direct the American conferees that under no circumstances will another blot be placed upon the escutcheon of this Nation in returning to Soviet Russia refugees or persons who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. The massacre after the war of thousands of such persons, when the United States agreed to such a return, was a disgrace from which we have never recovered.

I feel certain that with this attention directed to the language of article 16 as it now exists, before such treaty can be agreed to, the wording will be such that this horror can no longer be perpetrated and that security can be assured to these people who have escaped and sacrificed many things, endangering their lives once to come to freedom and seek the aid of the United States of America and her western allies.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his sound and able remarks. It would violate the time-honored policy and principles of our country. Furthermore, it would seem to be inconsistent with the great principle we fought for when we insisted that none of the North Koreans or those who served with the Chinese Reds would be compelled to go back against their will. It would be most unfortunate, expressing myself mildly, to those thousands of persons who escaped from Communist-controlled countries if they were compelled against their will to go back to basic imprisonment and possible death.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5089) to extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes," enacted October 20, 1951 (Public Law 187, 82d Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The benefits provided in this act shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 5 years after October 20, 1951, or within 5 years after the date of the veterans' discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after October 20, 1951; except that in the case of any veteran whose loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or permanent impairment of vision, as specified in section 1, shall have occurred subsequent to his discharge or release from active service, application may be made within 3 years after the occurrence of such disability. Notwithstanding the foregoing time limits, no otherwise eligible veteran shall be denied the benefits of this act who makes application within 1 year from the date on which his entitlement to compensation for loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or permanent impairment of vision, as specified in section 1, shall have been determined."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of said act is hereby renumbered 7 and said act is further amended by inserting immediately following section 5 the following:

"SEC. 6. Any person in the active service who has a condition as specified in section 1 which was due to disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service during one of the periods specified in section 1, and who has remained in the active service since sustaining such disability, shall be entitled to the benefits of this act subject to the other applicable provisions, except that application under this section must be made within 1 year after the effective date of this amendment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR HOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 735) to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3092) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I intend to object, I think the attention of the House should be called to the fact that a similar bill was vetoed last year. It still has opposition from the Department of Justice. It would seem that a bill that has gone through that procedure certainly should not pass the House on the Consent Calendar. So, I do object.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. It is not the identical bill that was vetoed by the President. Since the veto the Court of Claims has entertained a number of these claims by these prison workers, and the Committee on the Judiciary thought, in view of the fact that the Court of Claims had so acted, that in order not to have an imbalance whereby some claims would be recognized and others not, the jurisdiction should be conferred on the Court of Claims to hear and determine all these cases.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to criticize the Committee on the Judiciary. It may be a very meritorious bill. The only question, Mr. Speaker, is whether a bill that has had that history should be considered on the Consent Calendar. I therefore object.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF AUGUST 18, 1941

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3878) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of the bill as to what this does to section 5 of the Flood Control Act. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1954, PERTAINING TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER AT BONNEVILLE, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3879) to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1954, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg., is hereby amended by striking out the amount "$50,000" and substituting in lieu thereof "$185,000."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL PROVISION OF SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3123) to repeal the provision of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, which requires recoupment of certain Federal funds spent for school construction.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of the last paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs" in title I of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), is hereby repealed, effective July 1, 1955. This act shall not affect recoupments made prior to July 1, 1955.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "Effective on July 1, 1955, the recoupment requirements of the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), shall become inapplicable to the unrecouped balances of funds expended pursuant to such acts.

"SEC. 2. In order to permit the granting of privileges to the public school board at Walker, Minn., that are consistent with those granted other public school boards pursuant to the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 999), the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), is hereby amended by striking out the following: '*Provided*, That in consideration of the amount heretofore appropriated and the amount which may be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section, all Indian children residing in such district shall be admitted to the schools of the district without further cost to the United States for instructional, operation, and maintenance purposes.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211) with respect to the recoupment of certain public school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459) relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the public school board of Walker, Minn."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT OF 1955

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4753) to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this bill before I approve it; I object.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS TO AND WITHIN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 948) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1956, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO SALT RIVER AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND POWER DISTRICT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1602) 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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means to the State of Arizona and to the town of Tempe, Ariz., so much of the right, title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to the following described property, formerly constituting a part of the Papago Saguaro National Monument in Arizona, which was transferred in part to such State and in part to such town pursuant to the act of April 7, 1930 (46 Stat. 142), as supplemented by the act of July 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 646), on the condition that it be used for park, recreation, public convenience, or municipal purposes, as may be necessary to enable such State and town to convey to the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, a political subdivision of such State, such property as a site for an office building (including facilities and improvements related thereto) to be used by such district:

All that portion of the north half of section 9, township 1 north, range 4 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, bounded on the north by the south right-of-way line of Van Buren Street, on the east by the right-of-way of the State of Arizona at the intersection of Washington Boulevard and Van Buren Street, on the south by the north right-of-way line of Washington Boulevard and on the west by a line parallel to and fifty feet east of a line described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the center line of East Washington Boulevard from which point the north and south midsection line of said section 9 bears south 81 degrees 52 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 554.5 feet; thence north 21 degrees 37 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 1,116.12 feet to a point; thence on a curve to the right, having a radius of 655.73 feet, a distance of 198.57 feet, as measured along the arc of said curve, to a point; thence north 38 degrees 58 minutes east a distance of 96.74 feet to a point; thence on a curve to the left having a radius of 221.5 feet a distance of 153.51 feet, as measured along the arc of said curve, to a point; thence north 00 degrees 44 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 210.2 feet to a point on the center line of East Van Buren Street from which the point of intersection of said center line of East Van Buren Street and the north-south midsection line of said section 9 bears north 33 degrees 51 minutes west a distance of 160.98 feet.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROTECT SCENIC VALUES ALONG OAK CREEK CANYON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2679) to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 75; 16 U. S. C., 1952 edition, 482n and the following), is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act are extended to the following-described lands within the Coconino National Forest, Coconino and Yavapai Counties, Ariz.:

"Sections 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and the southwest quarter of section 25, township 18 north, range 4 east;

"Sections 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and the east half of the east half of section 29, township 18 north, range 5 east;

"Sections 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, and 32, township 18 north, range 6 east;

"Sections 1 to 36, inclusive, township 17 north, range 5 east;

"Sections 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and all of section 8 except the southeast quarter, township 17 north, range 6 east;

"Sections 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, and 24, township 16 north, range 5 east;

"Sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, township 16 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River Base and meridian: *Provided, however*, That as applied to any lands described in this section, the word 'hereinafter' in sections 1 and 2 of this act, and the words 'date of the enactment of this act' in section 3, shall be deemed to relate to the date of the enactment of this section 4."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3948) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, S. 1094, and substitute it for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), is amended by striking from the first sentence thereof the words "existing on the date of enactment of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3948) was laid on the table.

FURNISHING SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS TO EMPLOYEES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4936) to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of March 5, 1928, employees of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, engaged on floating-plant operations may be furnished subsistence and/or quarters on vessels without charge whenever messing and/or quartering are determined to be equitable to the employees and to be necessary in the public interest in connection with such operations. Any such subsistence and quarters shall be furnished in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES' BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department, contractors with the Post Office Department, mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note the presence on the floor of the author of the report, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I have one question I should like to address to the gentleman. In his opinion does this in any way make possible favoritism to be shown by the Postmaster General in the new authority which it gives to him?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, answering that inquiry, it does not. That question came up in the hearing of the subcommittee and we checked into it. We found that existing law requires advertising for competitive bids in matters of this kind. Inasmuch as it is already in the law, we decided there was no point in putting a provision in this bill merely to confirm an existing provision of law. We did refer to it in the committee report, on page 2, in the paragraph which is headed "Statement." The last sentence in that paragraph reads as follows:

Such purchases will be subject to existing requirements of law governing official and penal bonds (title 6, U. S. C.) and to the standard requirement of advertising for public purchases (41 U. S. C., sec. 5).

Mr. Speaker, I understand, however, that there is a member of another committee who wanted to ask that this bill go over without prejudice this morning in order that his committee might make some study of the entire question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very appreciative of the explanation just given by the gentleman. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this matter go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF MONEY ORDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4817) relating to the payment of money orders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 4 of the act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107), as amended and codified in section 730 of title 39, United States Code.

(b) That part of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 416), as amended and codified in section 731 of title 39, United States Code.

(c) Section 12 of the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1229), as codified in section 725k of title 31, United States Code.

(d) Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1883, as amended and codified in section 718 of title 39, United States Code.

SEC. 2. No money order heretofore or hereafter issued shall be paid after 6 years from the last day of the month of original issue. Claims for unpaid money orders shall be forever barred unless received by the Post Office Department within such 6-year period. Any excess of funds accrued because of money orders remaining unpaid may be transferred to postal revenues at such times and in such amounts as the Postmaster General shall determine. The records of the Post Office Department shall serve as the basis for adjudicating claims for payment of money orders after 1 year from the last day of the month of issue of such money orders.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of this act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month beginning after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "6" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "6-year" and insert in lieu thereof "20-year."

Page 2, beginning with line 15, strike out "after 1 year from the last day of the month of issue of such money orders."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF AN INEQUITY IN THE PAY OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4659) to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat.

632; 39 U. S. C. 876c), is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof a sentence to read as follows: "On and after June 30, 1952, postmasters, officers, and employees covered by this act may be paid the compensation prescribed for their grade and position."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed or interpreted to reduce the pay of any employee.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1952" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING PERMANENT THE INCREASE IN RETIRED PAY TO FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3486) to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over for the moment, and that we pass to the next calendar number and take up S. 37, which is similar to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 878), is amended by deleting the following: "*And provided further*, That the increases provided herein shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on July 30, 1955."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill (H. R. 3486) was laid on the table.

ELIMINATION OF OATHS ON INSPECTION DOCUMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4646) to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirements as to certifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4421 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 399), is amended to read as follows:

"4421. When the inspection of a steam vessel is completed and the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating approves the vessel and her equipment throughout, he shall make and subscribe a certificate to that effect. He shall deliver such certificate to the master or owner of the vessel to which it relates, shall keep one copy thereof on file in his office, and shall deliver one copy to the official who is performing the duties of the collector or other chief officer of the customs of the district in which such inspection has been made, who shall keep the same on file in his office. If the Secretary refuses to grant a certificate of approval, he shall make a statement in writing and sign the same, giving the reasons for his disapproval. Upon such inspection and approval the Secretary shall also make and subscribe a temporary certificate, which shall set forth substantially the fact of such inspection and approval, and shall deliver the same to the master or owner of the vessel and shall keep a copy thereof on file in his office. The said temporary certificate shall be carried and exposed by vessels in the same manner as is provided in section 4423 for the regular certificate, and the form thereof and the period during which it is to be in force shall be as prescribed under the authority of section 4405. And such temporary certificate, during such period and prior to the delivery to the master or owner of the regular certificate, shall take the place of and be a substitute for the regular certificate of inspection, as required by this section and by section 4426, and for the purposes of said sections. Such temporary certificate shall also be subject to revocation in the manner and under the conditions provided in section 4453. No vessel required to be inspected under the provisions of this title shall be navigated without having on board an unexpired regular certificate of such inspection or such temporary certificate: *Provided, however*, That any such vessel operated upon a regularly established line from a port of the United States to a port of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States whose certificate of inspection expires at sea or while said vessel is in a foreign port or a port of Hawaii may lawfully complete her voyage without the regular certificate of inspection or the temporary certificate required by this section, and no liability for penalties imposed by this title for want of such certificate shall be incurred until her voyage shall have been completed: *Provided*, That said voyage shall be so completed within 30 days after the expiration of said certificate or temporary certificate: *Provided further*, That no such vessel whose certificate of inspection shall expire within 15 days of the date of her sailing shall proceed upon her voyage to such port of a foreign country not contiguous to the United States without first having procured a new certificate of inspection or the temporary certificate required by this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT BETWEEN ARKANSAS AND OKLAHOMA

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 208) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the development and protection from pollution of the water resources of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment among them of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries flowing between such States, and for matters incident thereto, upon the condition that one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sufficient sum to pay the salaries and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States while so employed, shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, before the word "Congress" insert "President of the United States and the."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS MAY BE DEFINED OUT OF EXISTENCE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions Congress has passed laws setting out our national policy on the Government's business dealings with small firms. Public Law 413, 80th Congress, 2d session, which sets out the methods by which the military departments may award defense contracts and purchase supplies and services, declares that small business shall be awarded a fair proportion of such contracts and purchases. This is the act which authorizes the military departments to negotiate contracts in about any way they please, rather than awarding contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids. Similarly, the Administrative Services Act of 1949 sets out the methods by which the General Services Administration and the other executive agencies may purchase goods and services and by which they may dispose of excess or surplus Government property. This law likewise declares that small business shall receive a fair proportion of the purchases of goods and services and that it shall be given fair consideration in the disposal of Government properties.

Finally, the Small Business Act of 1953 repeats these declarations of policy, and

it goes further: It declares that small business shall be aided, counseled, and assisted to certain ends, and it places upon the Small Business Administration the responsibility for seeing that small business receives fair treatment from the executive agencies, in their procurement, disposal, and other activities.

TINY LENDING PROGRAM OF SBA

This policy as to business dealings between the executive agencies and private firms refers to no small matters. The way in which these dealings are carried out can have, and are having, terrific impacts upon the competitive structure of American business. The Department of Defense alone is spending between $15 and $20 billion a year with business firms. Government disposal of excess and surplus property frequently runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars a year. There is a tiny lending program carried on by the SBA for the purpose of aiding small business in obtaining financing. In addition, there may be other Government activities which directly affect competitive relationships, such as the granting of tax-amortization certificates, the allocation of production materials released from the GSA inventories and the stockpile, and many others.

Obviously the question whether the policies toward small business and toward preserving the competitive enterprise system are carried out hinges upon the question whether there is a definition of small business, and more particularly whether there is an intelligent definition of small business which is reasonably designed to accomplish the objectives which are intended by these laws. These laws do not define small business except in an extremely general way. On the contrary, the Small Business Act of 1953 places squarely upon the Small Business Administration the responsibility for making a definition of small business within each industry, so that the policies of Congress can be carried out. Today Mr. Wendell Barnes, the head of the Small Business Administration, announced that he is now about to carry out this responsibility and issue a definition of small business. This definition, if and when it is issued, will then determine how the policies declared in the laws affecting the military departments and the other executive agencies will be carried out. This is a step which should have been taken at least a year and a half ago. The definition which Mr. Barnes makes, if it is a sound one, will go a long way toward stopping the trend to monopoly which is being caused by the way in which the executive agencies are favoring big business. It is to be hoped therefore, that Mr. Barnes' definition will be a good definition and not one which merely defines small business out of existence; and it is to be hoped that this definition will be forthcoming promptly.

Insofar as the small business lending program is concerned, SBA is already using a definition of small business which agreed at least in principle with the definition in the Small Business Act. I cannot at the moment appraise this definition in all its particulars. It may be too restrictive in certain respects. For example, the SBA will not make a loan to a business firm having more than a thousand employees, no matter how small a firm may be in its particular industry. As we know, in some industries a firm with a thousand employees is indeed a very small firm, both from the standpoint of its competitive strength and the access which it has to private capital. It was in recognition of the great differences from one industry to another, in the number of employees which a small firm may have, that the Small Business Act sets out the general definition of small business as one which is independently owned and not dominant in its field of operation. Moreover, the House Report accompanying the Small Business Act of 1953 described how the Small Business Administration was to make its determination of small business as follows:

> The determination must take into consideration the general size structure within the industry or commercial group to which the particular concern belongs. For instance, a given volume of sales or number of employees for a concern considered small business in one industrial group, if applied to a concern in another industrial group might well place that concern in the big business category of its particular group. It would be impractical to include in the act a detailed definition of small business because of the variation between business groups. It is for this reason that the act authorizes the administration to determine within any industry the concerns which are to be designated small-business concerns for the purposes of the act.

In contrast to this clear requirement of the law, most of the executive agencies, including the Department of Defense, are using a definition of 500 employees or less as small business, irrespective of line of business or the industry involved. It is for the purpose of correcting this matter that Mr. Barnes now announces that he has appointed a task force, made up of representatives of the various executive agencies, to work out a definition which accords with the law. I hope that this task force will act promptly and come up with a definition which will force the executive agencies to conduct their procurement and disposal activities in ways which are reasonable and equitable to all classes of business, and not in ways which favor just big business.

BOUQUETS TO GSA AND AEC

Now, I would like to pass out some bouquets. I have been told that in the past I have sometimes been too critical of the executive agencies for their failures to carry out congressional policy toward small business. In the past when some of the executive agencies have taken half measures toward carrying out these policies, or have announced some pretentious step which would really accomplish nothing, I have on occasion been critical of these half measures. And recently I have been told that my criticisms are sometimes too severe, that I should compliment the heads of the executive agencies and thank them for taking steps that are at least in the right direction, although these steps may not go far enough.

Today, therefore, I want to pass out some compliments, not for half measures, but for some genuine progress and accomplishments. I want to compliment and congratulate particularly Mr. Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator of the General Services Administration, for the prompt and intelligent manner in which he has put procedures into effect to carry out the GSA's obligations to help maintain the competitive-enterprise system. In carrying on the GSA procurement programs, Mr. Mansure did not wait for SBA to prescribe a definition of small business. He did not, like the Department of Defense and most of the other executive agencies, allow his procurement programs to go along willy-nilly while waiting for a definition from the Small Business Administration.

Recognizing that a given number of employees which might be defined as small business in one industry would make a nonsensical definition in another industry, Mr. Mansure adopted a formula which depends upon a firm's size within its industry. Furthermore, Mr. Mansure has simplified his buying standards and has had established 12 procurement stations over the country, so that small-business firms wishing to deal with the GSA may deal simply and at places not too far distant. In other words, a small-business man wishing to sell to the General Services Administration does not have to get bogged down in a lot of unintelligible papers and forms and then make a trip all the way across the country to see the procurement officer in order to find out how he can do business with the Government.

The statistical reports showing the results of GSA's new program are not out yet, and we cannot yet say how much of this agency's procurement business has been placed with small firms in each industry, nor how the results compare with the proportion of civilian business that small firms normally account for in each industry; but I feel sure the results will show up well. Mr. Mansure has told us that in the first half of the fiscal year 1955 the results show that, in total, 62½ percent of the value of all GSA's business went to small firms.

The GSA negotiates only about 22 percent of the purchases made through its general supply fund, which purchases are for the other executive agencies. In contrast, more than 85 percent of the purchases made by the Department of Defense directly are awarded on a negotiated basis. This contrast, I think, tends to confirm the judgment of Congress in passing the Federal Property and General Services Administration Act of 1949. One of the primary purposes of this act was to centralize in the GSA the procurement of civilian-type items which had previously been procured directly by the military departments and other executive agencies.

Now, I should congratulate also the Atomic Energy Commission for its small-business program. Mr. George C. Taylor, Assistant Director for Supplies of the AEC, has given the Small Business Committee a most promising account of the small-business program they have in progress at the AEC. The AEC has likewise gone ahead and adopted a sound

method of defining small business without waiting for the Small Business Administration to prescribe a definition. The AEC's definition also takes account of a firm's size within its industry, and the AEC makes an active effort to see that a fair share of its procurement business is placed with small firms. The AEC's prime contracts are mostly very large contracts and they are substantially all placed with big firms. But the AEC has set up a staff of about 10 people who are devoted to the effort of making their big prime contractors place subcontracts with small businesses. Mr. Taylor has told us that about half—49.5 percent—of the subcontract work awarded by the AEC's prime contractors is placed with small business.

MILITARY SMALL-BUSINESS PROGRAMS

I wish that I could also congratulate the Department of Defense on its treatment of small business. While the amount of contracts placed by the General Services Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission are important, they are only a drop in the bucket compared to the military department's spending. And while the Atomic Energy Commission, the General Services Administration, and the other executive agencies spend a few billions of dollars, the Department of Defense spends many billions of dollars. The Department has, however, certain small-business programs.

For example, the Department has a great number of people which it calls small-business specialists. These small-business specialists try to advise and counsel small-business men who come into the Department trying to find out how they can participate in the military's procurement programs. They also help to explain the Department's red tape and help the small-business man in making up his bids and in preparing his contract when he succeeds in getting a piece of defense business. In this way the small-business specialists take the place, to an extent, of private agents who would normally negotiate with the military departments on behalf of small business. As we know, small-business firms normally transact business in civilian markets through a variety of sales agents, brokers, factors, and business specialists of one kind or another who do this kind of work for a percentage fee. It appears to take a great deal of specialized talent to do business with the military departments, and the small-business man does not have the time, even if he had the ability, to act as his own salesman, his own lawyer, and his own engineer, in negotiating for a defense contract. But, as we know, the law prohibits small-business men from employing agents on a fee basis to negotiate defense contracts for them. The Armed Services Procurement Act forbids the military departments from entering into any contract which has been negotiated and involves a contractor's paying a fee to anybody else. The big corporations have, of course, all kinds of specialists on their permanent payrolls to negotiate contracts with the military departments. The law does not apply to agents who are on the payroll of a corporation. More than 85 percent of the value of all defense contracts are negotiated.

The Department of Defense is also carrying on a joint operation with the Small Business Administration which is known as the joint-determination program. The Small Business Administration has a representative in a number of military procurement offices, and these small-business representatives are given an opportunity to look at certain of the proposed contracts and to recommend which of these contracts are suitable for small business. If the military accepts the SBA's recommendation, the contracts are then reserved for competition among small firms.

The Small Business Administration does not have a representative in all of the important procurement offices, and even where it does have a representative, the representative does not have a chance to see all of the proposed contracts. The Department of Defense's regulation on this subject requires that the small-business representative be given an opportunity to see only those contracts which are not of an emergency nature and those which are not of a classified nature. Contracts which are classified as "confidential," or which carry some more secretive classification, are usually for research or development work. Through these contracts the Government pays business firms for trying to work out improved production techniques or improved products. The Department hands out more than a billion dollars a year for such purposes, and the distribution of this money is, of course, extremely important in determining which firms will have the long-run competitive advantages.

The defense contracts which are called emergency are those which are awarded by negotiation rather than by advertised competitive bids. Substantially all of the military's contracts are awarded in this way. Some of the military procurement offices have, however, gone beyond the Department of Defense's regulation on this subject and are more generous in their treatment of the SBA representatives than the regulation requires. Some of these offices, particularly in the Navy, are allowing the SBA representative to see proposed contracts which will be negotiated, and a few of the offices even allow the SBA representative to make recommendations on the placement of research and development contracts.

THE MILITARY FAVORS BIG BUSINESS

In spite of all this effort however, the Department of Defense uses a definition of small business which limits the SBA representatives' recommendations to firms with 500 or less employees, irrespective of all other considerations. The illogical result of such a definition has been illustrated for the benefit of the Small Business Committee by my colleague, Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington. Mr. PELLY pointed out the case of a small firm out on the west coast which is mostly a jobbing firm but which operates a small soap plant. The soap plant is really a converted malt plant which went out of operation because of the dry laws. All told, this firm employs 700 employees, and for that reason the Department of Defense treats it as a big business along with the big international soap companies, such as Lever Bros., Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, the Procter & Gamble, each of which has well over 10,000 employees and each of which has assets running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Examples of this kind can be multiplied in industry after industry. For instance, the Newport Steel Corp., which is located down in Kentucky, produces only a fraction of 1 percent of the steel sold in the United States. Compared with 20 or 30 of its bigger competitors, it is infinitely small, yet it has more than 4,000 employees.

Reo Motors and the White Motor Co. produce, I am told, very fine motor-trucks. They produce only a small fraction of the trucks General Motors produces. Yet they have about 4,000 and 8,000 employees, respectively. In the field of rubber tires, we find that all of the manufacturers with up to 2,500 employees produce only 7 percent of the tires. Similarly, in rubber footwear all of the manufacturers with up to 1,000 employees produce only 12 percent of the total output. All of the manufacturers of steam engines and turbines with up to 2,500 employees account for only 11 percent of the production.

On the whole, when the executive agencies aim at placing a fair proportion of Government purchases with small business, their sights are much too low. But no matter what number of employees might be chosen as a standard of small business, no single standard can be successfully applied to all segments of business and to all industries. There are, for example, several industries in which every firm has less than 500 employees. Mr. Barnes has stated that the SBA staff has pointed out about 20 such industries. We find for example, that a very large percentage of all of the vinegar and cider, the natural cheese, the gum naval stores, the woodworking machinery, the paints and varnishes, and others, are made by firms having fewer than 500 employees.

It is not enough that the Department of Defense award a large volume of contracts among small firms in, say the garment-making and food-processing fields, while it allows the small auto and truck companies to be squeezed out. Yet the joint determination program which the Department is carrying on with the SBA has largely this effect: It reserves for competition among small firms those types of purchases which would go to small firms anyway, and it allows the Department to negotiate and place the big contracts with the top corporations in their fields.

If we are really serious about having the Government distribute its purchases among firms in such a way as to avoid further distortions of the competitive structure of business, it is not enough that we be concerned merely with the small firms in certain industries. Steps must be taken to see that Government business is distributed proportionately among the medium-sized firms, the small-medium firms, and the small firms as well, as at present, the tiny firms.

I hope that the Department of Defense will cooperate in this new concern evidenced by Mr. Barnes, and that it will

take steps to see that its huge spending programs are distributed fairly among all-size classes of business.

THE BILL DIGEST

Mr. SCHENCK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration, of which I have had the honor of being a member since I first became a Member of Congress, has many important functions.

Among the functions of the Committee on House Administration are those in connection with the Library of Congress and among the very important services rendered to Members of Congress by the Congressional Library are those performed by the Legislative Reference Service. The Legislative Reference Service has been of great assistance to all Members of Congress by the research they have done on legislative matters and which, in turn, has been of great service to the entire Nation. I want to sincerely commend and thank Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, Director, and his associates in the Legislative Reference Service for the fine job they have been and are doing.

Recently the Committee on House Administration approved a survey of the present usefulness of the Bill Digest and ways for its improvement. Most of us received a communication in our office last Friday, April 29, with which was enclosed a 2-page questionnaire relating to the Digest of Public General Bills, and I sincerely hope each Member of the House will take the time to answer this survey fully and completely.

It has been brought emphatically to my attention recently by several of our colleagues, the importance of this Digest in our everyday legislative responsibilities and as a great assistance in the answering of inquiries from constituents.

I am sure that my own experience has not been unique. In fact, I am persuaded that my own experiences have been repeated almost daily by practically every Member of the House.

A number of constituents who have the same interests and problems are informed through their friends or organizations to which they belong that certain legislation affecting them personally has been proposed to the Congress and they are urged to immediately write their Congressman and express their point of view. Other constituents request specific information on the proposed legislation. They want to know sometimes why was the legislation proposed—what are its provisions—what is its status—and when will it be considered, along with a lot of other questions. Such inquiries are entirely right and proper. Such inquiries also encourage each of us to keep well informed so that we can make proper replies rather than just a form type reply.

Often times the office staff of the Member must use an unreasonable amount of time and a number of telephone calls to secure the information on which the Member can base his reply. This occurs because the Bill Digest published by the Legislative Reference Service, in spite of all the helpful information it contains, is nevertheless from 30 to 60 days behind current dates.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 29, Members received issue No. 3, of the Digest of Public General Bills for the first session of the 84th Congress. This Digest included information on legislation introduced in the 84th Congress for the period of January through March. A quick look at this issue of the Digest which is cumulative will show that 6,050 legislative proposals of all kinds were introduced in the House and 1,782 were introduced in the Senate for a total of 8,832 legislative proposals. This is all very fine and helpful, Mr. Speaker, except for the fact that when we received this Digest it is still 30 days behind being current.

I am told, Mr. Speaker, that although issue No. 3 of the Digest includes only those measures proposed up to April 1, it was nevertheless not until approximately April 15, that it was sent to the Government Printing Office for printing.

Naturally it takes some time for the GPO to print and bind this material together and, hence, we did not receive it until April 29.

I am also told, Mr. Speaker, that during the month of April a considerable number of important legislative measures were proposed. All of us will be receiving inquiries on these proposals and our only way of obtaining the necessary information on which to base our replies will be to do a lot of telephoning and thus disturb a considerable number of busy people.

It is, therefore, my earnest hope that a considerable improvement in the publishing of the Bill Digest will result from the current survey. It is my hope that those who prepare the copy for this Digest will complete their work each day so that it can be prepared promptly for printing. This preparatory work should all be completed within not more than 2 days from the close of the period. If the GPO is given the copy each day as this preparatory work is done they also will be enabled to reduce the time required for printing and binding. This could easily reduce the publishing time to a week or 10 days instead of the 30 days as now required. Careful consideration should also be given, Mr. Speaker, to publishing this Digest of Bills at least each 2 weeks during the session. This would result, Mr. Speaker, in considerable time saving, increased efficiency, and would be in the public interest.

No doubt there are some proper economies which could be installed and which would also be in the public interest.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on House Administration, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office will collaborate fully in making this study so that proper improvements will result. It is also my very sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that each Member of the House will give this matter his serious prompt consideration and will return the completed questionnaire immediately.

Each of us, Mr. Speaker, is dedicated to rendering the best possible service to our constituents and to the Nation. Proper improvements in the Bill Digest and more up-to-date information will help each of us achieve this goal.

CONSTRUCTION OF ANOTHER LARGE CARRIER OF THE "FORRESTAL" CLASS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been requested to approve the construction of another large carrier of the *Forrestal* class. As in previous years, this has aroused controversy. There are those who feel that the expenditure cannot be justified. But there are many others who believe that a well-rounded defense requires the additional carrier. I am an advocate of the large carriers and I believe the need for the one now proposed is fully justified. The basic questions involved may be translated in this manner:

A. Will United States carrier forces be necessary in the 1960's?

B. Should we start construction of a carrier in 1956?

The purpose of the United States Navy is to fulfill its part in providing for the security of the United States and to support our national policy throughout the world. The primary means by which the Navy does this is by gaining and maintaining command of the seas, to use the seas for our own purpose and that of our allies, and in time of war, to deny these seas to an enemy.

If we command the seas we can—

First. Project our military power overseas and sustain it there.

Second. Support our allies.

Third. Maintain our own economy and industrial base.

Fourth. Insure that much of devastation and ravages of war is in enemy territory and not in our own.

In order to maintain our control of the seas we must have the ability to defeat any threat to that control. These threats are:

Enemy air: The Soviets will contest the control of the sea by use of their air power. In order to defeat this threat we must have a strong air arm which moves with and is an integral part of naval forces. This is the carrier task force, the heart and backbone of modern naval forces and the principal offensive power of a navy.

Enemy submarines: Our carrier forces play a vital part in elimination of this threat by providing defense of convoys, conducting hunter-killer operations, and destroying the submarines at their bases.

Enemy surface: These forces are present and are growing. The Soviets are building destroyers and cruisers in considerable numbers. They are weapons which must be destroyed, and this will involve the effort of carrier air and our own submarines.

Carrier task forces are the principal mobile offensive power of a navy. They are employed against any forces which threaten our supply lines, and are used to provide direct support of amphibious operations and for defense of our forces after landing. In many cases they are the only air cover available—Inchon-Tachens. They also can be employed on collateral duties—Korea. They are not in competition with SAC. The might of carrier air power is directed at enemy forces and bases rather than the industrial heart of an enemy, which is SAC's job.

In the foreseeable situation it is most important that the retaliatory striking power of the United States be preserved from enemy attack, this means dispersion, defense, and deception. The carrier task force has great potentiality in these aspects and should be exploited to the maximum.

We hear suggestions that future wars will be decided quickly by thermonuclear weapons and no naval power, land power, and air power as we know them will be required. There are many reasons why naval power will be essential in the future.

First. Let us concede that there will be a nuclear exchange. What happens after this is over? Tough people can and will carry on, and fight with what they have left. Also, unless an enemy gained sea control he could not invade our land and take control of our Government. Naval power remains an elemental consideration in the follow-through phase of all-out nuclear war.

Second. We know we will need naval power in event there is a war in which there is no initial nuclear exchange between continents. Possibilities of a long war are evident. We are building at highest priority the means of deterring nuclear attack. The carriers are an important part of this deterrent. Also we know we will not start a nuclear war. Further the Soviets have embarked on an extensive naval building program. The conclusion is inescapable that we must maintain the ability to control the seas in future wars of any type.

The question may now be asked whether the aircraft carrier will continue, through the 1960's, to be the backbone of naval power.

We can foresee no substitute for the versatility of the small piloted aircraft as a general purpose weapon for attacking the great variety of fixed and moving, airborne, seaborne, and ground targets within the naval missions. The carrier airplane and pilot can attain the precision required and can make prompt evaluation and decision in a fast moving situation.

The carrier is the one naval vessel usable alternately or simultaneously against submarines and their bases, surface ships and their yards, aircraft and their airfields, and for support of amphibious, land and air operations as well. The carrier is never without employment—the type of high utilization which spells high efficiency for any capital investment.

The question of vulnerability is sometimes raised. Carriers are not invulnerable; neither is anything else on the face of the earth to nuclear attacks. But the carrier's defenses will be as good if not better than anything existing. And if a weapon hits, we have a dispersion not always possible ashore, such that no more than one major ship will be seriously damaged. Further, moving ships are not suitable targets for ballistic missles.

In addition to the primary naval missions for which carriers are required, there is another important function which they play. This is the carrier contribution to deterring an all-out nuclear war, and the part played by the carriers in the nuclear-retaliation phase should this war take place. This highly mobile striking force is powerful and difficult to locate. They cannot be eliminated by surprise attack.

NEED FOR ORDERLY REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

All the carriers now in commission were designed prior to and during World War II for the operation of propeller-type aircraft. With the advent and rapid introduction of jet aircraft, and their high rate of fuel consumption, the carriers had to be modernized to accommodate the large, heavier, and faster aircraft with their higher takeoff and landing speeds. Such a program has been underway for several years. However, the limit for substantial improvement of these carriers by modernization has been reached. Accordingly the Navy designed a new type carrier, the *Forrestal*, which has the following aeronautical features:

First. Angled deck for greater safety and consequent economy;

Second. Increased catapult capacity;

Third. Increased arresting gear capacity;

Fourth. Large elevators; and

Fifth. Higher hangar deck overheads.

This new carirer does not represent an abrupt changeover in the concept of carrier aviation but rather is a logical and orderly step in the development of a proven weapon in the overall program to keep our forces superior to those of prospective enemies.

The construction of major naval vessels poses a requirement for anticipating the future to an extent not comparable with other types of weapons. The reason is that it takes almost 4 years to build such a ship, and thereafter we must expect this investment to yield a first-line combat usefulness for at least 10 years and other roles for 10 more. Unless we are willing, in the case of ships, to look 15 years ahead, and make decisions as to our requirements over that period, we will virtually have to forego maintaining a Navy. It is obvious we should have a program which anticipates future needs and provides for them on a pay-as-you-go basis. Unless we continue to build at an average rate of not less than one carrier each year, incorporating the latest changes available, we will not have an adequate carrier force in the 1960's, and we will rapidly fall below the force level requirements for carriers approved by the JCS, the NSC, and the President.

Lacking adequate naval striking power we will lose control of the seas and will be throwing away a valuable weapon which we alone possess. The preservation of modern seapower is essential to the survival of the United States and fulfillment of the role it is destined to play in world affairs.

WE SHOULD AMEND THE CAPPER-VOLSTEAD ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, for several years, I have introduced in each Congress a bill to correct an antiquated provision of present law regarding the prosecution of certain monopolistic practices. At this session, the number of my bill is H. R. 141. It is now before the House Committee on the Judiciary. It is designated as "A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith."

I bring this bill to the attention of the House at this time, Mr. Speaker, because the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws has recently submitted a lengthy report in which it voices conclusions with regard to the inadequacy of the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 which are very similar in thought to those that first impelled me to suggest the amendment that is now before the Judiciary Committee.

In 1922, when the Capper-Volstead Act was adopted, cooperative associations were small and unassuming; their competitive position in the economy was hardly conducive to price-fixing or monopolistic practices. Congress gave them what amounted at the time to a rather unnecessary immunity from prosecution as monopolies, thereby demonstrating the same evident desire to help the farmer that it had in 1913 when it gave farmer cooperatives exemption from payment of the then 2-percent Federal income tax on earnings.

There was no way of knowing, thirty-odd years ago, that the little cooperatives of that day would expand on their tax-free earnings to the multi-million-dollar tax-dodgers that they have become, or that they would achieve monopolistic size and arrogance, as many of them have.

And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the designation of the Secretary of Agriculture as the complainant against any cooperative that might be accused of attempting to become a monopoly seemed a normal procedure to Senator Capper and Representative Volstead. The little co-ops of 1932 were, in effect, the wards of the Department of Agriculture and if they were naughty and needed to be spanked it may have seemed proper that a friendly hand should lead them to the woodshed. But like all young people who have been pampered too much, many of the co-ops have grown into overbearing and insolent adults, because unfortunately the policy of all 9 of the Secretaries of Agriculture since 1922 has been to "spare the rod and spoil the child."

The Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws states that—

The failure of the Secretaries of Agriculture over 2 decades to institute a single proceeding against an agricultural cooperative at least suggests that enforcement responsibility be put elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, that was exactly my thought when I first introduced a bill to substitute the Attorney General for the Secretary of Agriculture as the proper Government official to deal with cooperatives that got too big for their britches—in other words, co-ops that had picked up the notion that because they were favored taxwise they could also get away with violation of our antimonopoly laws.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, it might be informative to look for a moment at the 1948 case of the United States against the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association—one of the very few attempts that has been made to punish a cooperative that appeared to have monopolistic intentions. That case fell apart when the attorney for the cooperative pointed out to the court that under the Capper-Volstead Act "elimination of competition is a perfect legal right of a cooperative" and " the very end and purpose of a cooperative."

I understand that further action is now being instituted by the Department of Justice against this same milk cooperative, and that a Federal grand jury in Boston has returned an indictment against two cranberry cooperatives. In each case, it is alleged that the cooperative conspired with outsiders to restrain interstate trade, to monopolize business, to fix prices and to drive competing concerns out of the market—all of which is in violation of section 1 of the Capper-Volstead Act though apparently not of section 2 of that act.

Inasmuch as the Attorney General now appears to be looking with some concern at the monopolistic tendency among cooperatives, it undoubtedly would be well to give him the authority that is suggested by the Antitrust Committee and by H. R. 141, namely to supervise and police cooperatives when they try to engage in activities in restraint of trade for the purpose of controlling market prices.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when these overgrown, arrogant, economic giants, known as cooperatives, must be treated as economic giants and not treated as if they were still weak, puny children that need coddling and pampering because they are unable to stand upon their own feet and make their own way in a competitive world. Let us be realistic in this matter. Let us treat these economic giants in the same way we treat all other economic giants, let us give the Attorney General the authority and the police powers over cooperative corporations that he now has over all other corporations. Mr. Speaker, we should pass H. R. 141 and do it without further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIGLEY (at the request of Mr. FLOOD).

Mrs. KEE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. TUCK (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia) and include a speech.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas.

Mr. SHELLEY and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATTHEWS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. AVERY and include a statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT and to include correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture in respect to flexible and rigid price supports.

Mr. MOLLOHAN (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include an address by Majority Leader McCORMACK.

Mr. BARRETT.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills, joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 14. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located in Austin, Travis County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 933. An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of deceased members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1271. An act 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; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1272. An act 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; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution directing a study and report by the Secretary of Agriculture on burley tobacco marketing controls; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution relating to the importance of hospitals and the appropriate observance of National Hospital Week; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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 Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 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:

744. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of aliens. This letter is supplemental to one dated April 12, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

745. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the 19th Semiannual Report, covering the period July-December 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

746. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1952, and 1953, 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.

747. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo or Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, requesting the case of Fu-Juan Fang, A-6271451, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

749. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, requesting the case of Carlos Aravantinos, A-1431996, involving suspension of deportation be returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

750. A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, relative to a proposed disposition of approximately 7,818,272 ounces of totaquine now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

751. A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, relative to a proposed disposition of approximately 60,000 pounds of pyrethrum (20 percent) extract now held in the national stockpile, pursuant

to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 208. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; with amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 245. A bill to amend the act approved January 27, 1905, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 322); with amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 603. A bill to amend the act of January 21, 1929, which relates to the grant of additional land for the support and maintenance of the University of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 625. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5166. A bill relating to a constitutional convention in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 5860. A bill to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; with amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. 899. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 5936. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1956, and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before July 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 5937. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the period during which wage credits are provided under title II of the Social Security Act for military service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the time for filing noncorporate income-tax returns shall be May 15 in lieu of April 15, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5939. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5940. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5941. A bill to promote the preservation of the history of the United States as recorded in pioneer weekly newspapers and as currently published in weekly newspapers of the United States by the establishment of the National Library of Weekly Newspapers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5942. A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation improvement of agricultural soil and water resources, to stabilize farmers' income, to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5943. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 5944. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 5945. A bill to establish the Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5946. A bill to further extend the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories; to facilitate the procurement of physicians and dentists for the Armed Forces by establishing scholarships; to provide for the continuation of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (by request):

H. R. 5947. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain unfair methods of competition in connection with the sale of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5948. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by prohibiting the acquisition of assets of other banks by banks, banking associations, or trust companies when the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the winter Olympic games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the issuance of a commemorative 10-cent piece to commemorate the discovery, by Dr. Jonas Salk, of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and to honor the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for its sponsorship of the March of Dimes campaign which provided funds to make such discovery possible; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 226. Resolution ordering the printing of 1,000 additional copies of Study of Newsprint Expansion: Part II, Newsprint Production From Hardwoods; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the construction and improvement of highways necessary for civil-defense purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing the legislative research committee of the State of North Dakota to make a study of the laws of the State of North Dakota relating to mill storage practices, and to recommend improvements in such laws and the enforcement thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5949. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall issue posthumously in the name of Robert F. Tomaszewski a commission as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 5950. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5951. A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Arroyo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5952. A bill for the relief of Adel Khalil Raffoul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 5953. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Ethel Hoff; 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:

223. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Kenosha, Wis., Taxpayers Inc., that the Congress of the United States work for the preservation of national solvency and desist in attempts to extend Federal control into local schoolrooms under the guise of aid for school construction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

224. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Transport Workers Union, CIO Local 260, Houston, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of legislation to raise the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

225. Also, petition of the president, Holy Name Society of Church of St. Francis of Assisi, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

226. Also, petition of the grand knight, Woodhaven Council No. 1866, Knights of Columbus, Woodhaven, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

227. Also, petition of the grand knight, Bishop McDonnell Council No. 2324, Knights of Columbus, Babylon, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

228. Also, petition of the grand knight, St. Kilian's Council, No. 2204, Knights of Columbus, Farmingdale, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

229. Also, petition of the grand knight, Patchogue Council No. 725, Knights of Columbus, Patchogue, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Moundsville, W. Va., April 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a forceful, factual and memorable address made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner held on the evening of April 30, 1955 in Moundsville, West Virginia, under the auspices of the Marshall County Democratic executive committee.

In a dramatic and challenging presentation of the administration's many failures to practice what it preaches and to perform what it promises, Mr. McCORMACK documented for a spellbound audience, each broken campaign pledge and disavowed promise made to the American people since the Republican administration took office.

With merciless logic, Mr. McCORMACK turned the spotlight of fair and objective criticism upon the administration's lack of direction and uncertainties in foreign affairs; upon its dangerous tampering with the national security through the reductions it has ordered in our armed strength; and upon its cynical catering to the wishes of its big corporation supporters and their high-powered public relations representatives at the expense of the American worker and the average American taxpayer.

His audience loved every word of it and the press has given widespread coverage to the majority leader's speech. It should, I believe, become recommended reading for all members of this Republican administration. They would do well to take heed of this great American's just indictment of their mismanagement of the Nation's affairs. They might also do well to borrow a page from his sterling record of unstinting, unselfish, unbiased, and devoted service to his country:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the clergy, my valued friends and colleagues in Congress, Senator MATTHEW NEELY, Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN, and Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, distinguished and invited guests, ladies, and gentlemen, with more than one-half of the present administration over, we now have an opportunity of appraising it objectively, whether or not it has kept its promises, of evaluating its policies, as well as the kind of government the present Republican administration has given to our country and our people.

In connection with the conduct of the Government, we must always bear in mind that the first domestic duty of our Government—as so eloquently stated in the preamble of the Constitution—is to establish justice.

This means that the powers of government are dedicated and should be utilized to bring about justice to our people.

With the depressed economic conditions of West Virginia, with the large number of unemployed in your State, do you think the present Republican administration is performing the constitutional mandate of our fathers and bringing justice to the people of West Virginia?

Despite the efforts of the high-powered public relations representatives of the big corporations of the country who are operating in Washington for the Republican Party in an effort to sell President Eisenhower and the Republican Party to the people, in the same manner as they sell coffee, cigarettes, or some other commodity, the people are commencing to catch up with the broken promises of the present administration, of its control and domination by big business, and of its failures.

The record of the Republican administration, for which President Eisenhower is responsible, is such that I predict with confidence the election in 1956 of a Democratic President—of a Democratic Congress—and convincing Democratic victories in the several States and political subdivisions of the Nation. For there are millions of Americans who voted for the Republican candidate for President in 1952 who now wish they had Harry S. Truman, or some other Democrat in the White House.

Despite the efforts of the high-powered public relations representatives of the big corporations to pressure the American people by organized propaganda, that President Eisenhower occupies a lofty, elevated position, immune from criticism of any kind or of unfavorable comment; and thereby to attempt to create in America a political vacuum—the people are awakening and are properly holding President Eisenhower, as the leader of his party and as Chief Executive, responsible for the policies of the present administration—and properly so, because President Eisenhower is responsible—and should be held responsible by the people.

As the President claims credit for any good policy, so is he responsible for any unwise and harmful policy.

In the last campaign in a speech in Boston, Vice President NIXON, whose political shifts are well known, said, "a political party is to be judged by the promises it keeps."

I agree with that statement, Mr. Vice President, but I go one important step forward—that a political party is also to be judged by the promises it does not keep.

And the Republican record of broken promises—for which President Eisenhower must accept full responsibility—is one that is subject to justifiable severe criticism.

Let me refresh your memory and call the roll of some of the broken promises.

1. To balance the budget.
2. To reduce the national debt.
3. The great crusade.
4. Instant and massive retaliation.
5. The new military look.
6. The liberation of enslaved peoples.
7. Cooperative peace.
8. Peaceful coexistence.
9. Peace through trade.
10. Agonizing reappraisal.
11. Trade, not aid.
12. To unleash Chiang Kai-shek.
13. To meet the problems of distressed labor areas.
14. To assure equitable distribution of Government contracts to small and independent businesses.

And there are many others.

On the question of lack of coordination—and of confusion and irresponsibility on a high level—all any one has to do is read the newspapers of the past few days.

It is only a few days ago that the Under Secretary of State, Herbert Hoover, Jr., after a telephone talk with the President—issued a statement that our Government would not negotiate with the Chinese Reds unless four conditions were met—one of which is the release of American prisoners—and another that Chiang Kai-shek's government would have to participate in any negotiations.

A few days later, Secretary Dulles indicated our willingness to negotiate without Chiang Kai-shek or his representatives being present.

These two statements clearly indicate that they are inconsistent with each other.

Prepared by the Republicans was a complete compilation of our military strength, directly in violation of the position and wishes of President Eisenhower and Secretary Wilson. It is the most complete compilation that I have ever seen. While not so intended, it is a most valuable document for any potential enemy of ours to possess, such as the Soviet Union or Red China.

If this document had emanated from Democratic sources, the Democrats would be accused of everything under the sun.

And yet, while it violates the position of Charles Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, and also of General Motors fame, as well as other fame—as Charles Wilson, the Republican, he undertook to defend the publication, which he knew, or ought to know, was not for the best interests of our country.

It was so bad that even the President, at his press conference a few days ago, termed this compilation as a blunder.

Is this evidence of coordinated and responsible leadership? It clearly shows lack of coordination, which leads to irresponsibility.

And that has been the situation that has existed quite generally throughout the past 2⅓ years.

These two happenings of current nature clearly show the lack of leadership of the Republican Party in Washington.

You will remember that last year we were told that the Navarre plan to save Indochina from the Chinese Reds was foolproof, and that it could not fail. In other words, that the Communists could not win in Indochina. We know, to our sorrow, the results.

We know that a good part of Indochina is now lost to the Communists; that Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are threatened; in fact, all of southeast Asia.

In the national interests of our country, we cannot afford to see all of southeast Asia dominated by the Communists, for this could result in our own Far Eastern defenses being outflanked.

In other words, one statement one day, and the opposite the next day or the next month.

It is no wonder that the people are commencing to catch up with such inconsistent and irresponsible leadership.

It is not difficult to understand why the people last fall again turned to the Democratic Party in Congress, and in many States of the Union, for leadership.

Is it any wonder that the people are going to turn to the Democratic Party again for complete leadership in 1956 by the election of a Democratic President, and the reelection of a Democratic Congress.

In dealing with the gang of international brigands in the Kremlin and in Peiping we must realize that we are dealing with Communist leaders who are possessed of the minds of world killers. They are dedicated to world revolution and world domination.

Until they renounce such objectives, despite their soft talk from time to time, they are determined to conquer and enslave the world.

For the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear; and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

We cannot negotiate or deal with them on a moral plane, for they have no spiritual values. They not only deny God, but they are fighting Him by attempting to conquer and enslave peoples throughout the world who believe in Him and His law. They know that as long as there is any place in the world free from Communist domination, where people believe in God, His law, and His word, that the Communist ideology will be constantly threatened. They are the prisoners of an ideology that, in order to succeed, forces and compels them to attempt to conquer and dominate the entire world.

We cannot negotiate with them on any idealistic level, for they have no ideals. But, there is one level on which we can deal with them, and that is on the basis of the law of self-preservation.

For even the Communists cannot deny the existence of the law of self-preservation, that it applies to them and their country—just the same as it applies to all others and their countries.

And it is only through military strength, which they respect through fear; that negotiations on this level can be conducted with them.

It is only military strength which they fear, that can deter them, because of the fear of the consequences to themselves.

And yet, despite the opposition of General Ridgway, we are sharply reducing our Army, with reductions in our Navy and our Marine Corps.

In the world of today it is better that we have too much military strength, and not need it, than to have too little, and need it.

When one talks as I do the stock-form answer one receives is that President Eisenhower is a great military leader, and that he knows better than anyone else what military strength we should have.

Respecting as I do his military knowledge and experience, my judgment tells me that it is dangerous to rest the safety and security of our Nation on the judgment of one man, for he is human, and it is human to err.

Suppose the President guesses wrong?

Let me remind you that he guessed wrong in 1953, when he ordered the Truman air program of 143 air wing groups reduced to 120 air wing groups.

We Democrats opposed it. We were ridiculed, despite the fact that the late General Vandenberg, Chief of the United States Air Force, took the same position, for putting our judgment against that of President Eisenhower.

And yet, one year later, in 1954, President Eisenhower recognized that he had erred; and changed his mind, and recommended appropriations for 137 air wing groups. He could not be right both years.

He erred only 2 years ago on the strength of our Air Force. He could be wrong now in the reductions he has ordered in other military components. And if he is wrong, and a conflict comes, the consequences could be dreadful to all of our people.

In Washington, we know that at least three of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a majority of the National Security Council have recommended against the reductions of our Armed Forces. So we have plenty of competent military leaders, who have led armies in time of war, differing from the President.

In any event, to the Communists this is evidence of weakness and not of strength.

And remember—there is only one thing they heed and that is military strength and its relationship to the laws of self-preservation.

If they are afraid of us they will not attack.

If they are not some day they will.

The lack of direction and the uncertainty of the Republican administration in the field of foreign affairs is most noticeable. A reader of the newspaper can detect that fact.

Is there any one of you who can tell me what the foreign policy of our country is? We started out with (1) "The Great Crusade," (2) liberating of enslaved peoples, (3) agonizing reappraisal of our foreign policy, (4) massive and instant retaliation, (5) threatening utterances. And in less than 2 years we ended up with (A) peace through trade, and (B) peaceful coexistence.

In other words, we have gone from one extreme to the other.

But in this crisis the country was fortunate that last year it elected a Democratic Congress. For in the field of foreign affairs the Democratic Party is united. The Republican Party is badly split with bitterness existing in their ranks.

And frequently in recent months it has been the Democratic Party in Congress, under the leadership of Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and of Congressman JAMES P. RICHARDS, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—both Democrats, speaking with logic, wisdom, and experience—who have saved our country from serious embarrassment.

When the Republican administration does not know what to do and is manifesting uncertainty bordering at times on confusion—when the Republican administration appears to listen to the voices of both the appeasers and those who would hurl the world into another world conflict—it has been the logic, the judgment, and the voice of these two legislator-statesmen speaking out with firmness and strength in the national interest of our country that has led the way.

The leadership of the Democratic Party in Congress, as a minority party during the past 2 years, and in this Congress as the majority party, has been one of supporting and fighting for all measures, both in the field of foreign and domestic affairs, that are in the best interests of our people.

Might I say that our people need have no fear of the united Democratic Party cooperating in the field of foreign affairs in a real, effective, bipartisan manner. The problem of President Eisenhower on bipartisanship is not with the Democratic Party—it is with his own Republican Party in Congress.

In this respect the President's problem is to try and establish bipartisanship between himself and the conflicting and fighting factions of his own party.

In his efforts to harmonize the differences within his own party, the President has had to frequently compromise his views—based on political considerations involving the different factions of his own party.

The Nation is witnessing the inability of the President to get the support of his own party in Congress. In the field of foreign affairs this could result in great harm to our country.

For the record indisputedly shows that President Eisenhower does not command the support and allegiance of at least one-half of the Republican Members of Congress.

Another matter of concern to the people of the country is the big-business control of our Government, as well as the giveaways of the resources of the people by this administration to certain vested interests.

As we view the Dixon-Yates contract; as we view the change in the wise public power policy of the past 20 years; as we view the intense concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, through giving to some corporations far more than their share of defense contracts, through an inequitable tax bill of last year, through lax enforcement of the antitrust laws, it is well that the people of America might feel gravely concerned about what the present Republican administration has done and is doing.

Outside of the few beneficial pieces of legislation, such as increased social-security coverage, and which was saved by the Democrats because they were extensions of Democratic measures, every action done by the present administration has been to give preference to big business and the big bankers.

Under this administration the situation of the small and independent businessmen, who are the backbone of our economic strength, has weakened tremendously. Very little consideration has been given to protective and strengthening this important segment of our national economy. When the present administration terminated the RFC, which had done a lot of good for small and independent businesses, it established in its place the Small Business Administration. But the Republican Congress put limitations into the law which makes it difficult for any real benefits to flow to this important element of American business.

In the extending of this law, which expires in a few months, the Democratic Congress will strengthen it so that real service will be rendered to our small and independent businesses.

One thing is also certain, that so far as the Democratic Congress is concerned, the passage of legislation for the benefit of big business and big bankers will not take place, and under a Democratic Congress there will be no more legislative giveaways.

So that despite the efforts of the press to cover up, the people are commencing to realize that the present administration is not representative of the people, but essentially is representative of big business.

In 1954 the people returned in part, through the election of a Democratic Congress, our Government to the people.

In order to stop further damage which is taking place through Republican administrative action, not by legislation, the people will have to complete the job in 1956 and return the Government to the people. For a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress means a people's Government.

On the cold record of this administration, of its broken promises, of its failures, of its domination by big business for the benefit of big business, of its inability to be a party of responsibility, all of which comes under the leadership of President Eisenhower, the people of the country are again turning to the Democratic Party for that leadership in which the Republican Party has failed.

There is no question but what the Democratic Party would win if we had had a Presidential election in 1954.

There is no question but what the party of stability and responsibility is the Democratic Party. With the bitterness existing among the Republicans in Congress, it is most fortunate for our country that the Democratic Party is in control of the Congress. With the constructive record of the Democratic Party—dedicated to the national interests of our country, and the inability of the Republican Party in Congress to assume responsibility, I confidently predict that the people in their wisdom and in their sound judgment will again turn to the Democratic Party in 1956 for leadership in both the White House and in the Congress.

In conclusion, I want to pay my special tribute to the delegation from West Virginia in the Congress, both in the national House of Representatives, and in the Senate of the United States. The delegation from West Virginia in both branches is one of the ablest and strongest, the most respected delegation of any of the States of the Union. West Virginia has sent to Congress a solid delegation of Democrats. Each and every one of them is truly a people's representative. The people of West Virginia and of the different congressional districts are justified in feeling proud of the members of their districts in both branches of the Congress.

I am particularly proud to see my good friend, Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, here tonight. I deeply respect him. He is one of the most courageous Members of our national legislative body.

I am particularly pleased to come here at the invitation of Congressman ROBERT MOLLOHAN. In his second term in the National House of Representatives, Congressman MOLLOHAN has already made an outstanding record for himself. He is a member of the important Committees on Government Operations and Armed Services. Both Speaker RAYBURN and I have profound respect for him. Like Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY and the other Members of the House and Senate from West Virginia, Congressman MOLLOHAN enjoys the confidence of the Speaker and myself.

As you well remember, our "Mr. Democrat," who is Speaker RAYBURN, of the national House of Representatives, addressed you last year. I know that you will always remember his visit to your midst. When I told him I was coming to Moundsville to address a Jefferson-Jackson Day rally he asked me to particularly convey to you his highest regards and fond recollections of his visit here last year.

Causes, Effect, and Preventive Treatment Methods of Dust Storms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, dust storms in the Great Plains recently attracted national attention and prompted Secretary of Agriculture Benson to tour the area for first-hand information. The Secretary and our United States Congress have recognized the gravity of wind erosion to farmers and to other industries of the Great Plains. I should like to point out that there are great hopes for controlling this damage in the future.

Eight years ago the Federal Government, working with the Kansas agricultural experiment station, starting studying this problem scientifically. At that time, Austin W. Zingg, engineer, and W. S. Chepil, a soil scientist, were brought to the Kansas station to seek scientific answers to the problems of dust storms. Zingg was given larger responsibilities with the soil and water branch of the Agricultural Research Service. Dr. Chepil has remained in Kansas on a cooperative basis between the United States Department of Agricultural and the State experiment station. (Incidentally, the United States Department of Agriculture, I am convinced, is wise in using existing State experiment stations. We get a lot more mileage from the tax dollars by using these existing facilities. Dr. Chepil and his coworkers, stationed in Kansas, have had the cooperation of land-grant colleges in Colorado, Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and California in their studies. Using these great land-grant institutions speeded the work and saved money.)

Research is slow and tedious, so we could not expect the scientists to have the dust storm problems solved by now. However, they have made remarkable progress in their research and already can make some definite recommendations on how to reduce dust storms.

In the 8 years, the researchers have found scientific proof that farmers can apply in the Great Plains to reduce dust storms:

First. Vegetation and/or vegetative cover are the best protection against soil erosion from wind.

Second. Strip-cropping will reduce erosion by trapping soil near its origin.

Third. There are different tillage practices suitable for different soils to roughen the surface, to bring up clods, and to maintain stubble, straw, or other residue on the soil.

Soil particles most easily blown are about the size of fine sand, sugar, poppy seed, or salt. That is one-tenth of a millimeter in diameter. Tests in a wind tunnel at Kansas State College and in a portable wind tunnel taken into fields have shown that these particles are bounced along the surface of the ground and start the soil eroding. These bouncing particles also start the dust to lifting in the air. Tillage and crop practices that do not get the soil in a loose, finely granulated condition keep the land from blowing.

The scientists have found that dryland sands require at least 4 tons per acre of wheat stubble to "tie it down" during strong winds. The sands—as opposed to sandy soil—normally will not produce that much wheat stubble, so the sands should be "tied down" with permanent vegetation, Dr. Chepil said.

Sandy soils require from 1 to 2 tons per acre for almost complete protection from the high plains winds. Nearly always this amount of wheat or sorghum stubble and straw can be produced.

From one-half to 1 ton per acre of stubble will almost always protect hard lands from soil erosion during high winds.

The USDA researchers, working with their wind tunnels, derived a formula that indicates how to reduce the erodibility of a field to an insignificant amount. With the formula the scientists, studying three major factors, can predict quite accurately what is needed to prevent erosion. For example, if land has no vegetative cover, its surface must have 60 percent or more clods to resist wind erosion. If the land had 1,000 pounds of wheat stubble and straw—about the amount from a 6-bushel crop—it would resist strong winds with only 30 percent to 40 percent of its surface composed of clods.

Likewise, roughening the soil's surface with ridges will prevent wind erosion. Lister ridges 10 inches high will prevent soil erosion by wind, even if the surface of the soil has only 20 percent to 30 percent clods with virtually no vegetative cover. In practice this means that almose any soil that is not pure sand can be "tied down" against the wind. Exploratory tests with V-blade cultivators have been highly successful in the dry soils of the high plains area. The V-blade works beneath the surface, undercutting and killing weeds, but it leaves the stubble standing to protect the surface from winds.

A recent discovery by the USDA scientists at K-State is that a farmer can make his soil more erodible to wind by pulling his "chisel" either too fast or too slow. N. P. Woodruff and Dr. Chepil recently found in tests that speeds 1 and 2 on a caterpillar are too slow and that speed 5 is too fast. Soil "chiseled" in speeds 3 or 4 resisted the wind considerably better.

I should like to emphasize that all this scientific information has come from the work of only a few scientists. At present two are on the wind project at Kansas State College. The cost of obtaining this information is now less than $25,000 a year.

Kansas' share of the emergency funds recently allotted this year to alleviate dust and drought conditions is 85 times that amount—$25,000 compared with $2,125,000.

The point I wish to emphasize is that the Government could wisely invest more in research and education aimed at per-

manently controlling the dust, stabilizing great plains economy, and reducing the frequency of such emergencies.

More research is needed to determine the effects different tillage implements have on different soils and under different moisture conditions. Information on this subject is fragmentary and inadequate.

Whether deep plowing is beneficial or not needs to be determined scientifically.

More information is needed on the influence of type, quantity, and position of crop residue.

Virtually no information is available on the relative effectiveness of standing stubble compared with stubble that has been knocked down by tillage.

An expanded research program is needed dealing with climatic factors. We need to know more about wind velocity and direction, temperatures, and rainfall. They are the principal factors that influence erosion. Many of the presently unsolved mysteries of winds, temperatures, and rainfall as they apply to farming conditions in the Great Plains and elsewhere can be solved in research laboratories and fields.

The Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, of Ohio's 11th District, has called my attention to a series of timely articles on world events written by Robert C. Dix, publisher of the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier, and his wife, Helen, who have just returned from an extensive tour of Europe and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, has been ill for the past several weeks. I am happy to report that he is now feeling much better and it is expected, by his physicians, that he will soon be back with us again carrying his full share of our important responsibilities in his usual able and conscientious manner. His illness was caused and precipitated by the complete and full way in which he dedicated himself to the service of his congressional district and our entire Nation. We will all be glad to welcome him back and wish for him a lifetime of good health and opportunity for service. In the meantime, I consider it a privilege to join with Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON and in his behalf to point out the following to the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, these stories, exceptionally well written by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Dix, out of their own personal and keen observations furnish us, as Members of Congress, extremely helpful information in our quest for knowledge about the threat of communism. They prove all over again, Mr. Speaker, that it may well be much later than we think and that it behooves all of us to leave no stone unturned to protect the rich heritages, the freedoms, and the rights of all our American citizenship that have been gained for us by the clear thinking, hard work, dedicated service, patriotism, and even the supreme sacrifice of life itself by our forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, Robert C. Dix and his wife, Helen, have written many stories for their newspaper as a result of their extensive tour of Europe and Russia. Each of these stories is well worth reading. I am happy to join my good friend and colleague, Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, in requesting unanimous consent that the attached three stories by Publisher Robert C. Dix and his wife, Helen, be printed herein for the information of the Members and also as illustrative of their keen observations of these important situations.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of April 7, 1955]

CZECHOSLOVAKIA UNHAPPY LAND UNDER TIGHT COMMUNIST RULE

(By Robert C. Dix)

PRAGUE, March 29.—I am writing this article in the seclusion of my room here at Hotel Alcron and I shall not mail it until I am outside the Iron Curtain area. As it unfolds, you will see why.

This is an unhappy land. Everybody eats here. Everybody works. But the standard is low in this one-time high standard country and hope of better things, a little economic independence perhaps, has all but faded away.

People can listen to Voice of America and Radio Free Europe in spite of the rather complete jamming. And the police don't object if you do listen, but they do object if you talk about it or in any way pass on the information. But many have quit listening anyway. It's like passing in front of a candy store every day with no money in your pockets. Finally you come to the deadening realization that the candy is not for you. Then you quit looking. Finally you go to the other side of the street. Maybe some day you'll even forget that it's there.

Political control is complete. If you're young and coming up in the world, it doesn't take long to learn that getting ahead means playing the game. And if you really want to get ahead, it means getting into or close association with the party somehow.

But membership in an area already taken over is low and exclusive. If you have any kind of a record—like if your parents were bourgeoisie—it's almost impossible.

Leaving the country now is exceedingly difficult. Some do. Some die trying. Others are just sitting it out, making the best of it and trying to get along. On them the heavy propaganda is, if it isn't penetrating, at least anesthetizing in its effect.

Travel is, of course, restricted to Czechoslovakia. A person can't travel even between the satellites. He must remain within his own "concentration camp," as one person described it to me.

Some day, perhaps, everybody will be sufficiently conditioned to be trusted.

What effect the latest turn to heavy industry will have on this little satellite, no one knows. At present consumer goods are fairly plentiful, by Iron Curtain standards, but nowhere close to the standards that this once highly developed area knew. Prices are high. But since there is no incentive to save anything, people spend what little they have.

Book stores, carrying their propaganda message, stand out in the downtown shopping district. There were at least 6 or 8 within a 4-block area.

The people converse in Czech. They all know German. A large percentage understands and speak English. But it may not be many years until Russian is the second language here. It is a "must" in the schools. And it is a language that a person will have to learn if he wants to get anywhere in this particular sphere under present conditions.

All trade that amounts to anything is with the East. Skoda at present is making a large number of powerplants, big and little, for Red China. Grains are coming back in return.

All of America's 48 States are making their contributions to our fine foreign service. I met a person, Albert Sherer, here with a Wooster, Ohio, background.

He came to the foreign service from the Air Force after the war and has specialized in the satellite countries. All of these career men know the language of the area in which they are to serve before they go there.

Rather descriptive of the situation here was the way in which we held a conference with our ambassador at the embassy. We all entered the spacious living room. Aides closed the doors and stood guard in front of them. And then, just before we began to talk, another aide turned on a sound jamming machine that would negate the effectiveness of any listening device that might be planted there.

All of the native employees at the embassy come from a central source. And they all are approved by the Communist government before they are permitted to work there.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of March 30, 1955]

ALONG THE WAY

(By Helen Dix)

ATHENS. — Gracious Queen Fredericka winked at my husband, and like any tactful woman, probably though "how I love that man for changing the subject." The subject was "Cyprus" a red-hot but embarrassing question here in Athens and one which this editor's tour, having been, as they say, "brain-washed," wished it could forget.

All this happened during the most exciting moments of my life or, as other members of the party agreed, the most exciting moments of the trip so far. Those moments stretched to more than 1 hour and 15 minutes while we were being received by their royal majesties "King Paul and Queen Fredericka, rulers of the Hellenes."

The wink, now famous especially in the Dix family, was a result of Bob's quick thinking in changing the subject from Cyprus when one editor blundered into the subject in a conversation with the queen. Her wink betrayed her gratefulness to my gallant husband for saving her from the Cyprus situation.

What does a mousy little midwestern housewife do when she goes "to visit the queen"? First she has misgivings about her clothes * * * but assured that street attire is correct she dons her best "party-go-to-PTA-meeting gown," makes sure gloves are white and spotless, takes a couple of doubtful extra glances in the mirror, then because her husband screams she is late, rushes from her hotel room convinced this whole trip is a mistake.

With the 28 other tour members (seven women) the housewife walks past the gaily dressed guard at the palace gate for about 200 feet. Here is the palace entrance, unassuming door, tiny vestibule where we deposit our coats and cameras. Up one flight of blue carpeted circular stairs, across a formal marble hall to an anteroom, also carpeted with royal blue and furnished in lovely beige Americanish furniture.

The little tinkling chimes of a clock had not completed their twelfth stroke when the

"master of ceremonies" beckoned to the Queen's lady-in-waiting, the King's naval attaché, United States Ambassador and Mrs. Cannon, then our group to follow. Across the white marble hall, up the broad blue carpeted stairs to the first landing. There we were literally overcome by the most heavenly fragrance I ever expect to smell * * * the hall is apparently kept perfumed and we seven women couldn't sniff enough.

At the door of the royal apartment stood Ambassador Cannon, who shook our hand then eased us to the Queen. We had been instructed to shake hands with their Majesties (don't curtsey, you might fall) then state your name, hometown, and State, verly clearly. I took a deep gulp of air as I took the Queen's hand and my name came out beautifully but with the King I didn't get the deep gulp of air and it just squeaked out. (The Illinois editor's wife in front of me later confessed that nothing came out of her mouth to the King * * * the saliva just stuck, she wailed.)

From then on it was a lark, many uniformed waiters served a delicious little beverage and trays and trays of heavenly tidbits, the King and Queen moved with ease from group to group and within seconds we were all old friends, laughing, chatting and loving their Majesties.

The Queen is all charm, beauty and brains. She is thinner than pictures in the United States showed her, due no doubt to the two severe ear operations she has undergone this winter. Both were successful.

Her stories, her humor, her timing * * * all were excellent. She has a most eager and exciting catch to her voice as she tells of "kidding" the doctors about her "thick skull" during her ear operations, or telling of the wonderful work done by Boy Scouts during the war or talking of her three children or of America.

Both she and the King hope to bring their children to America for a summer vacation tour soon.

What did the Queen wear? Her dress was a simple green jersey with a small black leather cord detail at the neck held by gold buckles at each side. She wore black alligator pumps. Around her neck was a single strand of large pearls which held a large diamond-studded pendant and an uncut ruby. She wore 4 bracelets, 2 gold and jade on the right arm, 2 gold and diamond, matching her necklace on the left. She wore 5 rings, 2 matching her necklace. Her hair cut informally is black and brushed into a short mass of curls.

The King, a handsome man (tall enough to come from Texas, one Texan in the party told him) wore a uniform with five rows of decorations and a large gold cross hung midway on his coat. He talked of sports and good times in America and sorrowfully of communism.

When after more than an hour and 15 minutes elapsed the King and Queen walked down the stairs with us to pose for pictures and when the photographer motioned us closer the Queen chuckled, "Shall we sing for you, too?"

As we filed past to shake hands again in goodby Their Majesties repeated time and again, "Do come back to see us," and we, like next-door neighbors, begged them to come to America to see us all, too.

[From the Ravenna-Kent (Ohio) Record-Courier of April 11, 1955]

RUSSIAN PEOPLE LIKE AMERICANS—KREMLIN HAS TIGHT GRIP

(By Robert C. Dix)

STOCKHOLM.—It's a relief to leave Russia. And that's nothing against the Russian people. Individually, so far as the ones we met are concerned, they're just ordinary human beings like you and me. Same hopes and same fears.

It's the system. And even that is difficult to put into words. Perhaps the best way to understand it is to use their own words.

Government, to them, is a thing, an institution, apart. At Leningrad on the way out we picked up a couple of American students who had had a better opportunity to talk to the average Russian than we had. Always the Russians expressed affection for the American people. Too bad, they would always say, that our Government is so warmongerish and so imperialistic.

They would always look bewildered and unbelieving when a person would try to explain that our Government was the people.

At Intourist one day, I was trying to explain to Mr. Rogov, the head of that department, that we would like to meet some Russian officialdom, that we would like to see something besides a works project, something human. We got onto the same subject. Too bad, he said, that our Government was delaying on an exchange of farm experts.

The American people wanted the exchange, he was sure. But the Government would never permit it.

I told him that if the American people wanted it, the exchange would take place. The Government is the servant of the people, I tried to explain.

But the thought didn't make a dent. Thirty-seven years of obedience and conditioning in a complete public opinion vacuum leave their mark. They have resulted in the evolution of a tremendous human force under the unchallenged authority of nine men in the Kremlin.

No other place does human history record so much power in the hands of so few.

Those were almost the exact words of our Ambassador, Mr. Bohlen, who briefed us himself on the country.

If you can imagine a group of nine men in the United States running everything here, including the United States Steel Co., the auto factories, all of the other great industries, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the newspapers and the radio, all Government functions and everything else, you might come close to some comprehension as to the power, the aloofness and the necessary ruthlessness of the government.

There is also nowhere a tighter security in the world than at the Kremlin. There are no leaks there.

Their Achilles heel so far is their agriculture. They have industrialized their country at the expense of the peasantry. They are trying now to get agriculture back on its feet. One of their biggest gambles is putting to the plow 66 million virgin acres of prairie land, which in size is as large as all of the arable land in France and Italy.

If their gamble works, look out.

Russia has a dictatorship without a dictator. The experts seem to think that a new one will, in time, emerge. Probably Khrushchev.

Something like this takes a lot of policing. That they have. One of the highlights of my visit in Moscow was meeting Joyce Marshall, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Leon Marshall. An old hand at being arrested, she was detained once for several hours. She told me she would show me what a member of the police force looks like. So we went for a walk in some of the little streets away from the wide boulevards. It wasn't long until our follower was visible to the discerning eye.

He stopped when we stopped, always about a half a block behind. She is often followed when she goes out. Most embassy people are. They get used to it.

But if a person is inclined to let things like that worry him, he ought not to accept an assignment in Moscow.

Whether or not any of our newsmen were followed, I don't know. We were mostly shepherded around in a group anyway. We probably were not.

One thing I kept looking for was some evidence of civil defense. War, if it ever comes, will obliterate a populace that has no civil defense program.

There may have been some. I didn't see it. But, of course, the Moscovites have their subway system. It's over 65 kilometers long and is as much as 200 feet below the surface at points.

Besides being a good transportation system and having civil defense possibilities, it's also sort of an art gallery.

Each of the 41 stations tell a story. At the Station of the Revolution, the entire struggle of the Russian people is told in pictures on the ceilings.

What are my conclusions to all this? Even the fuzziest of thinkers must have a few after an adventure of this type. They are:

1. On the possibility of change, nothing at the people's level. At the palace level, changes will continue until power gravitates to one person again.

2. The future? Well, the system holds close to a billion persons within its iron grip. Only Tito has successfully broken away. He did so because he had the strength to ward off an initial blow and because we stepped forward to provide him with needed assistance.

Other satellites do not have the strength or the will of a Tito. And all of the means of implementation of any such ideas are within the control of the faithful.

Unlike the absolute authorities of old, these modern ones don't ignore the people completely to the point that they will face guns with pitchforks. They try to mold the force, keeping it above subsistence level and then working constantly on its mentality, winning it over completely or deadening it to the inactive stage.

3. What about war? It's on now. It's at the propaganda stage. Very hot there. They will try hard to win it at that level. We must not only counter but try to win it there, too. There's also the economic phase. They would like to break us by developing all the world's resources and people. That we can't allow to happen either.

4. The length of the struggle? A long one.

Seventh Anniversary of Israel's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, the State of Israel proclaimed its independence, and today, April 27, 1955, her people are celebrating this momentous event.

I am proud to count myself among the many American supporters and well-wishers of Israel who join on this occasion in felicitating its people upon attainment of another milestone in their thrilling history.

In an area no larger than the State of New Jersey, Israel's 1,600,000 inhabitants, surrounded by enemies on three sides and the sea on the fourth, have written in these 7 years an epic of indomitable courage and inspiring ingenuity that parallels the early struggles of our own Republic.

There, at the ancient crossroads of the Old World, men women, and children

who fled from tyranny, persecution and concentration camps, have made new headway in their mighty efforts to build a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

From the streams and mountains of Galilee, through the stony hills of Judea and the arid area of the Negev, to the fertile coastal plain these pioneer people have labored to wrest a living from soil which yields mainly citrus fruits, but nothing of mineral wealth or fuel.

It has been well said that Israel's greatest natural resource is its people. They have developed industry where none flourished before, utilizing the mechanical and inventive skills of craftsmen from all parts of Europe. Industry and crafts, indeed, have become the leading economic factor; agriculture second.

But the new nation's greatest need—its exports boycotted by its immediate neighbors—is for trade abroad to bring an inflow of dollars to buy raw materials for its own necessities and for processing and resale to others.

The progress Israel has made so far, be it remembered, has been achieved in the midst of an uneasy truce with the Arab nations which, after all these years, are still unreconciled to its existence.

It is to be fervently hoped that the United Nations, which is struggling with the issues, may yet find a solution that the contestants may ere long agree upon the proposal for harnessing the lifegiving waters of the Jordan.

Then Israel would not need to work with one hand and a gun in the other; peace would indeed settle upon the Holy Land; once more would milk and honey flow there, and the vision of a Promised Land, now spiritually and politically fulfilled, could become an economic fact.

This is my anniversary wish for Israel.

Loyalty Day, May 1, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address on the occasion of the observance of Loyalty Day, a day set aside by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States to enable Americans everywhere to rededicate themselves to the fine ideals and spiritual values inherent and practiced in the greatest Nation in the world—the United States of America. Moreover, it is a day designed to offset the May Day rallies held under Communist auspices.

The address follows:

LOYALTY DAY, MAY 1, 1955

(By Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD)

The Congress by joint resolution has designated May 1, 1955, as the date for the observance of Loyalty Day here in the United States. In so acting, Congress is giving recognition to a custom which has become prevalent in recent years throughout almost the entire Nation. Every year since 1950, the governors of 47 of the 48 States have officially designated May 1, or a day very near to it, as Loyalty Day.

Patriotic organizations from time to time have urged an even more wide-spread recognition of this day. In many places throughout the United States, May 1 has been chosen as the particular day for the celebration of Loyalty Day to offset the many May Day rallies held on May 1 under Communist auspices.

The real purpose of Loyalty Day, it seems to me, is to provide an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the American way of life, to reaffirm for all the world to see our devotion to the principles underlying that way of life, and to deepen our loyalty to the principles set forth in the American Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

Seldom if ever in the history of the United States has our way of life been as seriously threatened by an alien philosophy from beyond our shores. This alien philosophy, of course, is world communism. It is the sworn enemy of every principle which has undergirded our national life in all of our history. It is implacable, malevolent, and unrelenting in its determination to destroy us. The United States is at one and the same time the greatest objective in communism's program of world conquest and the greatest barrier in its path to domination of the world.

What are some of the qualities and principles which characterize the American way of life and the American Bill of Rights—qualities and principles to which I urge every citizen to rededicate himself this year on Loyalty Day?

Our American way of life rests on two fundamental principles which guide our day-to-day thoughts and actions, and which clearly distinguish our system from all totalitarian systems, whether they be Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or any other.

The first of these principles is the importance of the individual, the foundation of all our other beliefs. It guarantees to each person the undisputed right to personal freedom and dignity, and to equality before the law. In the words of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable right, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These ringing words leave no doubt as to how the Founding Fathers felt about the worth and the dignity of the individual.

Since the drafting of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution, the American people have been wise enough to realize that although under our system the worth and the dignity of the individual are fully recognized, certain rock-bottom rules must be established to give life and meaning to the concept of the individual's worth and dignity. Accordingly, in the Bill of Rights to our Constitution, and in other important documents as well, there are laid down certain basic rights to accomplish this purpose. These rights are the mainsprings of our American way of life. They can be summarized briefly in the following paragraphs.

Every person is free to worship according to the manner dictated by his conscience.

We enjoy freedom of speech and freedom of the press, including the right to criticize our Government and our public officials.

The right of the people to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances, whether fancied or real, is guaranteed.

We have the right to keep and to bear arms, though this right is frequently limited by Federal, State, or local laws and regulations.

We are protected against unreasonable search and seizure of person and property by the Government without proper authority and good cause.

No person shall be held to answer for any major crime without review and indictment by a grand jury.

No person shall ever be placed in double jeopardy for the same crime.

No person shall be compelled to act as a witness against himself in any criminal case.

If a person is accused of crime, he has the right to a speedy trial; the right to the help of a lawyer; the right to trial by jury, impartially selected; and the right to call witnesses in his favor.

No wife may be required to testify against her husband, or vice versa, in any criminal proceeding.

Private property may not be taken for public use without just compensation and due process of law.

Excessive bail may not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

Every person is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty.

The right of the individual to vote, and to vote secretly, cannot be abridged.

Every person has the right to the protection of habeas corpus, which gives anyone who claims to be unlawfully held by an officer or private person the right to have a hearing at once so that he may know the reason why he is being held. This means that the Government of the United States cannot either secretly or openly arrest persons as individuals or groups, throw them into prisons or concentration camps, hold them there indefinitely and do what it pleases to them.

Congress can pass no ex post facto law. This means that in our daily living and thinking we can enjoy the liberty of doing and saying all that the existing law permits. Even if at a later date our Government makes these things illegal, it cannot date back the law to make illegal anything that was done before the law was passed.

Treason against the United States consists only in levying war against our country, adhering to her enemies, or giving them aid and comfort. No person can be convicted of treason except on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or upon confession in open court. This precise definition in the Constitution prevents any possibility of the slightest criticism of the Government being branded as treason, as well as prohibiting secret trials and giving accused persons no opportunity to confront witnesses.

These then are the rights which we enjoy as citizens of the United States and which are part and parcel of our American way of life. It is altogether right and proper therefore, that we should review their significance in the observance of Loyalty Day. A discussion of our rights as individuals, however, of necessity must take into account our responsibilities to the group, and these responsibilities are the second fundamental principle which guide our day-to-day thoughts and actions.

In a large society such as we have here in the United States, the interests of individuals are bound to clash from time to time. It is at this point that responsibility to the group enters the picture. The individual, while exercising his own freedoms, must not deprive others of their freedoms. Freedom does not imply unrestrained or irresponsible action. Group responsibility requires that no individual be permitted to bring harm to other people. Freedom of speech, for example, gives no one the right to shout "Fire" in a crowded theater or restaurant.

Group responsibility means giving full obedience to the laws under which the individual lives, since they were made by duly authorized representatives of the group. If a particular person dislikes a certain law, he can criticize it and make every effort to

change or repeal it by constitutional means. But while that law remains in force, no person can break it without expecting to incur whatever penalty is involved.

Group responsibility means that each man is responsible for his family and loved ones. He must provide for them and ensure their well-being. It means, furthermore, that the individual bears responsibilities to his community, his church, and other groups which work for the good of all. Lastly, but perhaps of paramount importance, group responsibility means the willingness of all of us to bear arms in the defense of our country.

These, then, are the rights and responsibilities which are the warp and woof of the American way of life. They are the bulwark which protects our way of life from such abuses and totalitarian excesses as are suffered by the oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain by governments imposed upon them by force.

Loyalty Day presents a splendid opportunity for all American citizens once again to pledge themselves to the principles which have made our Nation the finest example of freedom, justice, and opportunity the world has yet seen. If we do pledge ourselves and continue to do so, we, as our Founding Fathers did in 1787, will also "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The Late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of an address I delivered at Hargrave Military Academy, Chatham, Va., on April 23, 1955, at the unveiling of the portrait of the late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford.

Dr. Sanford was a devoted and consecrated churchman, an outstanding educator of great note who wielded a wide and wholesome influence in Virginia. For more than one-half century he was prominent in the work of the Baptist denomination and distinguished himself in the ministry. He was an alumnus of the University of Richmond, where his athletic prowess, his manly traits, and nobility of character are the source of legends and will ever be appreciated. Under his leadership Chatham Training School, at Chatham, Va., was established in September 1909. It later became and is now known as Hargrave Military Academy. It is a fine Baptist institution, and I was privileged to be a student there while Dr. Sanford was president. He enjoyed the high admiration, the confidence, and the esteem of all who knew him. I had for him the warmest personal affection.

Col. A. H. Camden succeeded Dr. Sanford as president of Hargrave Military Academy and served eminently in that capacity for approximately 40 years. He is now connected with Hargrave on an emeritus basis. Colonel Camden is an outstanding southside Virginia educator, a solid, substantial, and dependable citizen. Upon his retirement, Col. Joseph H. Cosby became president, and he is carrying on in the finest and highest traditions. I take this opportunity of publicly commending the services of these distinguished Virginians as well as those who are now and have been associated with them.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK DELIVERED AT HARGRAVE MILITARY ACADEMY AT THE UNVEILING AT THE PORTRAIT OF THE LATE DR. T. RYLAND SANFORD APRIL 23, 1955

Colonel Cosby, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for the invitation to be here today and to have the privilege of participating in this merited tribute to the late Dr. Thomas Ryland Sanford, the founder of Hargrave Military Academy. I have come in obedience to that invitation to pay this public tribute of respect to one who has answered that final summons to which every ear shall some day harken and all mortality obey, a beloved schoolteacher and preacher to whom I am greatly indebted, and a long-time friend whose memory I shall ever cherish.

Dr. Sanford was born 75 years ago in Westmoreland County, Va., near Montross. His unfortunate and untimely death occurred on April 8, 1952.

Although I had first met him at my home in Halifax County where he had come to enroll me as a student in this institution, it was here at Hargrave Military Academy (then Chatham Training School) that I first knew him.

From that time on, until he delivered his last sermon after more than one-half century in the Baptist ministry and came to the end of his labors here on earth, I was among the many thousands who held this devoted educator and consecrated churchman in the highest esteem and affection. Few men in the history of Virginia have wielded a wider and more wholesome influence over the lives of their contemporaries. It was a high privilege to have come under his beneficent influence and guidance, and to have the opportunity of basking in the warmth of his great mind and radiant personality on many occasions through the course of the long years which intervened during our acquaintance.

Dr. Sanford was the son of the Reverend and Mrs. Millard Fillmore Sanford. His father was a distinguished consecrated Baptist minister, and his mother was a lovely lady of the highest character and attainments. I likewise had the privilege of taking classes under both of them and through those and later associations came to know, understand, and appreciate the sterling qualities so characteristic of the entire Sanford family.

Early in his boyhood, he left the Northern Neck when his father moved to a pastorate in Burkeville, and it was only in the sunset of life that he finally came back to reside in the midst of the memories he had nurtured from childhood. During the long interval, he frequently returned for visits and the fishing trips which he enjoyed to the fullest. But he once remarked he never would have gotten back to stay had it not been for the affliction which forced him into partial retirement. However, that affliction never diminished his interests or dimmed the broad horizon, encompassed by his exceptionally active mind.

Much of his colorful career and certainly many of his principal interests were associated with this academy, the University of Richmond, and the Baptist Church. His athletic prowess at the University of Richmond is the source of legends which rightfully should never fade. But it was not as an athlete alone that he won the hearts of his fellow students, his teachers and the thousands who came to know him. It was primarily the spiritual magnetism of the man, the exuberant spirit that shown in his countenance, in his handclasp, and in his every word.

Like many a student since, he took delight in healthy competition—and no doubt tremendously enjoyed contributing to the 42–0 football victory over my alma mater, William and Mary, in his first game back in 1899. He had the same enthusiasm for baseball and basketball, in which he also excelled.

In fact, there was no activity in which he engaged that he was not enthusiastic and intensely interested. But the underlying theme of his life early became apparent and he was still a student when he began preaching at Branch's Church in Chesterfield County. He solved the transportation question by commuting between campus and church by bicycle—another typical example of his self-reliance and ingenuity in meeting problems as they arose. Dr. Sanford was ordained in 1902 and left school to serve three Chesterfield churches—Branch's, Gill Grove, and Second Branch. Needless to say, the salary of the pastor was not excessive. But Ryland Sanford knew his economics as well as his religious teachings and saved enough to complete his education. Dr. Sanford possessed in a preeminent degree all of the qualities of a successful businessman. Had he turned his attention in that direction no doubt he would have also made a splendid success in that field.

He was a lifter, not a leaner. He believed in giving, not receiving. He believed in honest pay for a day's work, and vice versa. He was not spoonfed or pink pilled. His powers came from struggle, effort, and determination. He was reared in the atmosphere of that period of our history known as the "tragic era" when our southland had been overrun by an overpowering army; our fields impoverished; our resources exhausted; and our manpower depleted. Despite the handicaps imposed by such conditions and others unspeakably horrible, men of his generation rebuilt Virginia and made it the great Commonwealth it is today, standing as she does—proudly at the top of the sisterhood of States—able to chart its own course, unencumbered by bonded indebtedness and contributing its full share to the support and maintenance of the national structure. It is worthy to note, too, that this was accomplished without the aid of any Marshall plan, Federal aid, giveaway programs, or technical assistance.

In 1903 he accepted a pastorate in Buckingham County where he first became widely known, having conducted a great revival at Old Sharon Church. In addition to his other outstanding qualities, Dr. Sanford was blessed with an impressive and commanding personal appearance. He was tall and strong and robust. He was handsome. His face radiated those intangible but incalculable values which constitute courage, character, and manhood. He looked and acted the part of a leader. He had a complete knowledge and use of the English language. He enunciated clearly and beautifully. His words flowed freely and with facility and ease. He was a speaker of great force and when he released the full powers of his oratory, which seemed at times to be unbounded, he could stir, move and control his congregation. These were natural talents and blessings with which he was endowed and which enabled him to be such an effective influence for good in every community in which he labored.

From Buckingham County he moved to the Memorial Baptist Church at Hampton, and then to Chatham in 1908. It was here that he contributed 10 fruitful years to his church and the people of Virginia.

When he heard the Warren Training School might close, Dr. Sanford with his customary energy and enthusiasm, decided that the Baptists should have a school of their own. Under his leadership they established

one and in September 1909 Chatham Training School opened its first session with 18 students and Thomas Ryland Sanford as founder and first president. Mr. J. Hunt Hargrave, a deacon in the Chatham Baptist Church, and his father were coleaders in this undertaking and it was the younger Hargrave's great contribution to the school which led to the change in name in 1925 to Hargrave Military Academy.

Dr. Sanford, who saw the school grow from that modest beginning to essentially its present status, was more than president. He was a teacher, coach, and companion to his boys, of whom I was privileged to be one. He supervised and worked with the boys—in those early days in clearing the 28-acre site for the expansion which he was sure would come.

I shall never forget the experience of my student days here. I learned many valuable lessons the hard way. In those days demerits were positive, tangible things, and some of the most lasting lessons I have ever learned came about by the impartial and firm discipline dispensed by this great man who recognized that knowledge and character were not to be instilled and cultivated by association alone, but by hard work, discipline, self-denial, and determination. These principles were inculcated by the methods he applied and the example which he set.

South Boston, Fredericksburg, Norfolk, and Luray were subsequent pastorates for Dr. Sanford before arthritis seriously handicapped him in 1941. Six years later he returned to his beloved Northern Neck to serve four more churches and finally to conclude his more than 50 years of outstanding service to his fellow man.

It was characteristic of the man that he never considered himself, but only those he was in position to help, whether in spiritual guidance, educational development, or physical health. Often he preached three times a Sunday, paid many visitations to the sick and those shut it, and still found time for a rich family life and a myriad of other activities.

His stature in church and educational affairs was such that he yielded much of his time to the demands upon him. He served as a member of the board of trustees of Hargrave and of the University of Richmond, the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Virginia Baptist Board of Missions and Education, and held various district and State offices in his church. The University of Richmond awarded him the degree of doctor of divinity in 1922 in recognition of his many contributions not only to the institution but to Virginia generally.

While participating in these extensive activities, Dr. Sanford was guiding his own family to fruitful maturity. I need not recount for this audience the story of the Sanford boys whose athletic, academic, and postgraduate accomplishments are in themselves a dramatic and entrancing story. Hargrave Military Academy has shared the benefits of this younger generation of Sanfords.

Such leaders as Dr. Sanford are responsible for the strength and durability of our free institutions in America. Our Nation was built on the foundation stone of respect for the rights of man and the dignity of the individual. Education has been an important factor in building and perpetuating this great heritage. Dr. Sanford exemplified the characteristics that thoughtful and patriotic citizens admire and shall ever champion, because he represented in wisdom, vision, and action the epitome of good citizenship. He not only was a minister, educator, and leader; he was a man steadfastly devoted to making the world a better place in which to live—and he went about this task by seeking to elevate the thoughts and aspirations of the people themselves.

It is highly appropriate that his portrait should be hung here, the scene of so much of his valuable labor, and from whose sheltered walls so many young men have gone forth with unbounded hope and opportunity to meet the challenging problems of life made strong and confident because of the principles instilled in them here. A great philosopher once said that the founding of an institution is like the well spring of a stream—the small beginnings of which are indeed plain to all, but the full, ultimate and expansive powers and influence only the omniscient can discern. We know that Hargrave Military Academy has deepened and expanded its influence everywhere, and it is the fervent hope and prayer of many that it may never wane.

Joy and sorrow are closely intermingled in this busy world of ours. Sometimes the happinesss incident to the birth of a precious baby is shadowed and saddened by the death of its mother. And frequently on the highway of life the bridal procession must tarry while the funeral train passes by.

Today we come with grief and sorrow that a life fraught with so much good should be so suddenly cut off from amongst us, but in our chastened reflections we can discern echoes of counsel and encouragement because we are filled with gratitude and appreciation for the example of such a life as that of Thomas Ryland Sanford, which should animate us all to a higher and renewed consecration to worthy and unselfish devotion to the principles which he espoused and for which he stoutly stood.

Through the lives of many individuals who came within the great expanse of his influence, the people of Virginia have reaped an enormous benefit. And through them and the unnumbered generations to follow his magnificent contribution to his people and to the general advancement of mankind will live forever.

At such a time as this when our thoughts are turned to a loved one or a friend to whom the grim messenger with the inverted torch has beckoned onward, it is good to have the sweet assurances of our religion that though dead, he yet liveth.

"He is not dead, but sleepeth, well we know.
The form that now lies mute beneath the sod
Shall rise when time her golden bugles blow,
And pour its music through the courts of God."

Willis W. Bradley and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the finest memories of my congressional career are associations, during the 80th Congress—1947 to 1949—and subsequently, with the late Representative Willis W. Bradley, of California. His stature as a statesman, naval officer, and Government administrator has been extensively portrayed in the annals of the Congress by others and requires no emphasis from me.

There is, however, one facet of his congressional career that I feel ought to be described in greater detail. This concerns the Panama Canal of which he was a discriminating and objective student. As qualifications for his inquires in this field he had the background of a lifetime of study, an extensive naval experience, and a wide knowledge of the merchant marine. Moreover, it was through Representative Bradley that I first became seriously interested in the canal subject, for which service I shall always be grateful.

As a fellow member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, we worked in close association. Early in 1947, he became keenly aware of the Isthmian Canal studies under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, then in progress. In his search for information he did not restrict himself to routine officials temporarily serving as administrators of the canal enterprise, but sought advice from all responsible sources. For example, he arranged with Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal for a presentation on the operational problems of the Panama Canal held in the Navy Department on March 14, 1947, for the entire Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Later, as a leading member of a congressional visitation in the Canal Zone in April of that year he was most effective. Thereafter, he rapidly assumed the status of congressional spokesman on canal matters, and had the opportunity of consulting many independent experts.

Among the most comprehensive treatments of the interoceanic canal problem in the records of the Congress is a notable address by Representative Bradley before the Cosmos Club of Washington on April 19, 1948, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?" Published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, April 21, 1948, page A2449, this address, by its forthright and objective clarification of key issues, contributed materially toward preventing hasty action by the Congress on a then pending report of the indicated investigation and formed a solid basis for much that followed in the consideration of the canal problem. The principal sections of this address of Representative Bradley are still applicable.

In the course of his membership of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, its distinguished senior minority member, the late Honorable Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, and Representative Bradley became close friends and collaborators, with a great common interest in the Panama Canal. Thus, these two leaders formed an effective nonpartisan team in securing proper consideration by the Congress of important canal issues before acting on recommendations of administrative agencies—a policy that the Congress has continued to follow.

Toward the end of the second session of the 80th Congress, Representative Bradley published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, page A3890, an extensive bibliographical list on the Panama Canal question—the first time, as far as I can determine, such a list was ever published in the RECORD. Since then I have prepared additional comprehensive lists, the last having been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 3, pages 3601–3616, under the title "Isthmian Canal Policy of the

United States—Documentation." For this effort Representative Bradley's original contribution in 1948 was my inspiration.

With the convening of the 81st Congress in January 1949, Representative Bland resumed his chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, over which he had presided so long before the 80th Congress. One of his first official actions was to secure authorization for an inquiry into the financial operations of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, 81st Congress. For this task, he appointed me as chairman of a special subcommittee.

As part of his preparations, Chairman Bland conferred as to procedure with Captain Bradley, who in 1949 left the Congress. Captain Bradley suggested that the chairman of the subcommittee visit the Panama Canal exhibit in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy Department.

With the authority of Secretary of the Navy John L. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, I visited this exhibit on February 10, 1949, and was accompanied by Captain Bradley, and Gen. James G. Steese, distinguished engineer and former Engineer of Maintenance—Chief Engineer—of the Panama Canal. We were received by Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, who, at the time, was Panama Canal liaison officer and Coordinator of Isthmian Canal Studies of the Navy Department.

Using terrain models of the canal and other exhibits in that office dealing with its marine features, Captain Bradley explained the problems of operations; and General Steese, those of engineering.

The explanations by these two authorities gave me a deeper insight into the nature and magnitude of the principal problems involved in the canal question. They started me on a search for knowledge that has never ended.

Later, on the evening of February 24, 1949, in company with Representative—now Senator—THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa, I attended a comprehensive presentation by Captain Bradley before the Engineers' Club of Washington in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce, entitled "The Why's of the Panama Canal."

The proceedings of that evening, which I included in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, March 4, 1949, page A1303, were a further important contribution of Captain Bradley toward the increased understanding of the canal problem, especially in legislative and executive circles.

At this point, it is pertinent to mention that at each of Representative Bradley's notable canal addresses, he was introduced by the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, a former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and later a Member of Congress, lifelong student of Panama Canal problems and an early and long-continuing advocate for the creation of an unbiased and independent canal commission representative of all the major interests involved as offering the best means for their resolution.

At the present time adequate means for the objective handling of the canal question do not exist. To supply such means, Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN and I, early in the present session, introduced identical measures, S. 766 and H. R. 3335, respectively, to create an Interoceanic Canals Commission. These bills are modeled after a measure introduced in the 80th Congress by Representative Bradley.

In the perspective that is now possible, the constructive leadership of Representative Willis W. Bradley with respect to interoceanic canals, in and out of the Congress, firmly establishes him as one of most outstanding authorities on this gravely important subject. His statements in regard thereto are accordingly indispensable sources for study not only for students and historians but as well, and more particularly, for engineers and navigators, and all the legislators and administrators charged with direct responsibility for operation, maintenance and improvement of the Panama Canal.

No one who has attempted to make an objective study of the problems of interoceanic canals can fail to note how intensely the proponents of various plans defend their ideas. They have reached their conclusions and they are apparently unwilling to consider any deviations. Sometimes they are even unwilling for Congress to appoint a commission to report on all phases of the controversy. To these partisans, each one of whom is an able and patriotic man, I suggest that if his program is sound, he need not fear to have it carefully scrutinized by an independent commission. To refuse to submit it to such an impartial group is to suggest that perhaps it lacks the merit which would insure its approval by such a group.

Foreign Aid Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, when "G. Washington, Thos. Jefferson, Benj. Franklin" and those other patriarchs of the long lost days of America were writing America's genesis in the early history of this new Nation, no one ever thought about setting up a constitutional authorization about taxing American citizens to aid foreign lands around the world. But somehow we drifted into that unique practice under New Deal radicalism and now the foreign-aid rut seems to be still holding us tight. Down in southeastern Kentucky, Jeff Abbott, the coal miner, works hard in the blackness of the underground caverns and has little above cornbread and occasional chuck roast for his meager table. Yet Jeff, as an American, pays some of the necessary tax that goes forth to aid Turkey, Belgium, and Brazil. Then there is Cora Bunch, a mountain schoolteacher, and Jim Meadors, a country merchant, and neither knows aught but consistent hardship and normal scarcity. Yet Cora and Jim, as Americans, pay some of the necessary tax that goes forth to promote Germany and Spain under our various foreign-aid schemes.

As the emerging picture of this present enlightened hour takes form, it would now be sheer folly to grant more aid to these various countries in far-off places. Why does this statement make sense? Surely our past experience with foreign aid since 1945 is ample enough proof of this observation. Since the inception of the Marshall plan in April 1948, it will be remembered that about $35 billion has been spent for economic and military aid abroad—about $20 billion for military and $15 billion for economic assistance. A complex labyrinth of economic-aid programs has existed since the end of World War II, but each has had the same purpose—to give away some of the hard-earned substance of Jeff, Cora, and Jim. During World War II we gave away billions of dollars worth of goods as lend-lease. That program was justified, as we all concede, since we and our allies were engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the force of tyranny. It might be said that we gave our wealth and substance rather than suffer the devastation befalling other parts of the world.

But since the end of World War II we have continued to finance one aid program after another. And let the average man question one proposal for aid or try to reduce the amount of aid in any proposal and someone proclaims that communism will be aided. The big, bad Russian bear has been a handy whipping-boy to make us toe the line for more foreign aid. And while it is not to be denied that the Soviets are out to do the free world all the harm possible, yet little evidence has emerged that our aid to other countries has made any difference in the behavior or accomplished ends of the Soviets. In fact, they regard such aid, which are sacrifices for us, as only further evidence of our so-called imperialism.

And now we are confronted with a current demand for still more aid. This year the emphasis is on Asia. This latest request is for $3.53 billion for economic and military aid in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Two-thirds of this sum, $2.14 billion, is for aid to Asia. Only $712.5 million of this total is for economic aid.

It seems that Miss Europe does not now need further aid. In 1954 her trade within Western Europe was 128 percent above that of 1948 and 69 percent above that of 1938. Imports from the outside world were 24 percent above those of 1948 and 11 percent above those of 1938. Exports were 83 percent above those of 1948 and exports to the dollar area were 130 percent above 1948, while imports from that area were 7 percent below 1948.

Consumption per capita in Western Europe reached the 1938 level by 1950. By 1953 it was 7 percent above that level, and in 1954 it jumped to 12 percent above prewar. The United States was 45 percent above the 1938 level.

Industrial output was about 50 percent higher than in 1938. Agricultural production was 30 percent greater.

In 1951 the countries of Western Europe planned for an annual increase of 4.5 percent in gross national product during the next 5 years. This increase was not realized in 1952, but it was realized in both 1953 and 1954.

Granted that foreign aid did promote the economic progress of some of the countries of Western Europe, it is soundly logical that any such aid anywhere has now outlived its usefulness. Countries receiving aid have become less and less reliable as allies. We need only to point to the Korean war and the fiasco of the European Defense Community to realize that our allies are little interested in a genuine attempt to unite for common defense. Selfish interests have either killed or emasculated most attempts at collective defense. Obviously the change from Marshall plan to mutual security shows little relationship of the one to the other. There is no mutual security unless we finance it. Our insistence on some compliance with promised objectives has caused United States popularity throughout the world to reach an alltime low. Despite our bungling attempts to become the big brother of the world, the mere spreading of dollars has not and will not bring popularity or good will. The sooner our Government realizes this simple truth the sooner have we reached maturity in our contemporary statesmanship.

Perhaps the most patent result of foreign aid has been the enforced postponement or rejection of necessary social and economic projects here at home. It is a well-known fact that our highways are inadequate; that new hospitals and schools are needed; that reclamation and flood-control projects have been postponed for lack of funds. How can we justify spreading money abroad for aid when we do not have sufficient funds to undertake such programs at home? We must wake up to the fact that we cannot carry the financial burdens of the free world on our backs. Why should an American shrink from being called an isolationist when his desire has been to make his own country a better place in which to live? Our neglect of highways, to cite one example, has contributed materially to 38,000 traffic deaths a year and has cost much time in travel. The disastrous floods of our river valleys could be eliminated by correct methods of flood control.

Continuation of our program of broadcasting billions will cause us eventually to face one of these two "ins"—insolvency or inflation. Who then is likely to come forth to bail us out? Certainly no European government will come to our aid. It should be considered that our Federal debt was 74 percent of our gross national product in 1953. But let us take a look at the debt of those nations we are aiding; the relationship of debt to gross national product of selected countries was as follows: Norway, 53.3 percent; Spain, 26 percent; Belgium, 67 percent; France, 37.5 percent; Germany, 32 percent; Turkey, 22 percent; Japan, 12 percent; the Philippines, 10 percent; Brazil, 7 percent; and Mexico, 4 percent. Truly we are burdened when compared with nations who are receiving our largesse; yet they claim that they cannot finance their own economies.

Foreign aid has not contributed to an increase in our real wealth. As one author has said:

> Admittedly the foreign-aid program, financed by the United States taxpayer and purchaser of Federal securities, has contributed to the striking postwar growth of this country. Yet it is a fair question whether the expenditure of equivalent resources on domestic development might not have led to an equal growth, even though of a different type. For it can hardly be argued that the export of very large quantities of goods for which the United States has not been compensated has increased this country's real wealth.

The French and Italian tax structures seem hopeless to American eyes. They fall heavily on consumers and permit flagrant violations by the wealthy. Yet little has been done toward remedying these conditions. True, at American insistence, new and more stringent tax laws have appeared on statute books, but they appear to have been evaded. Numerous disinterested persons who have traveled abroad have attested to the fact that wealthy people pay for less taxes than we do in the United States; yet that they refuse to invest in the economic development of their own countries. Why should American citizens be taxed to aid foreign nations when their own wealthy people evade taxes?

Much of the foreign aid money expended in other countries has gone to help export industries which now compete in world markets with our industries.

Communism has not been stopped by foreign aid. About 1 Frenchman in 4 is a Communist despite our expenditures of billions of dollars in rebuilding France. In Italy parties of both the left and the right have grown in power despite Marshall plan aid. Yet we are told whenever we question increased subsidies to European nations that they will fall to communism unless we continue to finance them.

Other examples of the folly of foreign aid could be cited. But it should suffice to say that our aid program has been used to finance socialistic governments in Europe and is now suggested as a bulwark of socialistic governments in Asia. That is a facet of the aid program that deserves special treatment, and so there will be no more than mention of it here.

The foreign aid program has been characterized by a proliferation of conflicting offices in many countries. Departments of our Government have worked at cross-purposes, frequently denying each other and working directly contrary to each other. In Paris until recently there were four individuals with the rank of Ambassador. In many European and other overseas areas, American Ambassadors must work with representatives of the United States Information Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, and Foreign Operations Administration. What a field that creates for misunderstandings and difficulties. Congressional committees have called attention to this anomalous situation and let us hope it is now on the way out.

These are some of the reasons why further foreign aid is futile. Certainly, such a program will not now contribute to anything like substantial furtherance of the economic rehabilitation of the world.

As of December 31, 1954, net foreign aid had cost each individual in the United States $298.52. If one were to consider the figures on a gross basis it would probably have cost each person in the United States far more than that. For my native State of Kentucky that would mean a contribution to foreign countries of about $904 million. How much improvement could be undertaken within the borders of Kentucky with a sum of that size. Truly, we could make it a far better State that it is today. This latest request for $3.53 billion more for the next fiscal year would increase each person's contribution by $21.51, or about another $65 million from Kentucky. This means that Kentucky has contributed nearly a billion dollars for aiding foreign countries. It seems to me that we have already done far too much. Considering the aid we have given since 1940, it is no wonder that we are regarded as an impractical Santa Claus of immature judgment.

James Haskell really hit the nail on the head in reciting what we could do with the money which has been expended and is to be spent for foreign aid through June 30, 1957. He believes that by that date our postwar foreign aid to Europe alone will have totaled $60 billion. Graphically, he shows what could have been done with that tremendous sum:

> 1. It could have saved the average American taxpayer $1,000 in taxes.
>
> 2. It is 2½ times the total amount of the United States farm program in a decade.
>
> 3. It is nearly 4 times as much as the Government spent for public works during the New Deal.
>
> 4. It could have paid for all the new highways that America needs; also schools, hospitals, and other institutions.

Henry Hazlitt aptly expressed the contrast between foreign aid and assistance for needy domestic programs when, in discussing point 4 above, he stated:

> The Government has nothing to give or lend to anybody that it does not first of all, or ultimately, take from its own taxpayers. By at least as much as it adds to the purchasing power of Paul, it must reduce the purchasing power of Peter.

Charity and mercy are admirable, desirable qualities of the human heart, but that is not so of a political machinery which should have only the function to govern for its own people and not a semblance of any function to tax those same people to further Formosa or promote Pakistan. Wake up "G. Washington, Thos. Jefferson, and Benj. Franklin" and see what we, the people, have been doing to your country through foreign aid folly. Wake up Jeff, Cora, and Jim, write your Congressmen, tell them how well you like being taxed for Turkey.

Flexible and Rigid Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 19, 1955.*

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am interested and concerned about matters that affect all, and of course, the farmers of my district. You will recall that in the 83d Congress it was my privilege and honor to be chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives and that at that time it was our responsibility to examine into and devise the increase of the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation in order that it could play its part in the mechanics of commodity support which is a part of the law.

I am no longer burdened with the responsibility of the chairmanship of this important committee, but I am still the ranking minority member of this committee which has jurisdiction over Commodity Credit Corporation authorizations of the House of Representatives. However, I am concerned about the situation in support prices that may or may not affect the farmers in my district and in other areas of the United States.

I would appreciate your informing me at your earliest convenience of the following:

(a) What is now the commitment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in dollar valuation for all agricultural goods, either by purchase or by loan?

(b) In the judgment of you and your experts, what will be the commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation for purchase or loan in the forseeable future in dollar volume, based on the present law?

(c) Will you please give me your best estimate of the commitments by Commodity Credit Corporation under the projected situation if the law should be amended to give to the basic commodities 90 percent of parity as is contemplated under H. R. 12?

Believe me, Mr. Secretary, I ask these questions because it seems to me that the farmers of my district and others should be fully familiar with the situation as it now exists and as it may exist if H. R. 12 should become law. I am,

Yours most respectfully,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 22, 1955.

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLCOTT: I appreciate your interest in the financial operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, expressed in your letter to me of April 19.

We have made projections showing by months the status of our statutory borrowing authority, based on economic assumptions set forth in the 1956 budget estimate of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Using these projections, I shall do my best to answer your very pertinent questions.

(a) Currently (April 1955), we have in use approximately $8,400,000,000 of our $10 billion statutory borrowing authorization. This includes funds invested in commodities owned and under loan, as well as the investment in accounts and notes receivable, fixed assets and the unrestored capital impairment of the capital of the Corporation.

February is normally the seasonal peak in the commitment of CCC funds. In February 1955 we had $8,396,000,000 in use. This amount is very close to our estimate of last July, when Congress was considering the proposed increase in the borrowing authority of the Corporation from $8.5 to $10 billion. At that time we estimated our use of CCC borrowing authority in January and February of 1955 at $8.4 billion.

(b) Based on the present law, we expect to have in use in February of 1956 approximately $9,465,000,000 of our $10 billion borrowing authorization. This estimate assumes average yields, some rise in the level of economic activity, present price levels, some increase in exports, and acreage allotments for the basic crops. It is believed that these projections represent conservative rather than liberal projections of the volume of price support activity.

Based on present law, we would expect the peak in CCC of borrowing authority to be reached in February of 1956. Thereafter, we would expect CCC financial commitments to decrease as a result of reduced acquisition and increased disposal.

(c) H. R. 12 would make price support for the basic crops mandatory at 90 percent of parity. We estimate that the enactment of this law would increase the peak use of the Corporation's borrowing authority in the fiscal year 1956 by $247 million. On the basis of assumptions indicated in (b) above, this would put us within $300 million of our $10 billion statutory borrowing authorization—a margin of safety that could easily be wiped out by better than average yields, a drop in exports, or a decline in prices and economic activity.

I share the concern which your letter expresses about the increase in financial obligations which will result if H. R. 12 or other such legislation is passed by Congress. Even without a return to mandatory high rigid price supports the present $10 billion borrowing authorization may not be adequate.

I enclose a brief report which gives some of the above data in tabular form. This statement does not reflect the probable effects of H. R. 12 if it were to be enacted.

The Crop Production Report for July 1955 will contain the first most reliable source of information regarding production from 1955 crops. At that time the Department will be in a better position to appraise the potential use of the Corporation's borrowing authority and whether or not any legislative action need be proposed.

Sincerely yours,
TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes for the week of April 28, 1955, on the subject of our Capitol Building:

KEENOTES

(By Hon. ELIZABETH KEE)

The Capitol of the United States is much more than a building; to every American, it is a strikingly beautiful symbol of our Nation's strength.

Probably no architectural feature in all of the United States is as well known as the Capitol dome rising majestically above the Washington horizon—visible from almost any part of the city, a thing of breathtaking splendor when lighted at night.

The clean, straight, vertical lines of the main portion of the structure, when topped by the gentle, graceful curves of the huge dome, provide a picture of deep serenity in the midst of national controversy—of solidity and calm and reason no matter what the issue which might divide us in debate.

So it is only natural that our Capitol is everyone's business—that what happens to it inside or outside is a matter of national interest and personal concern. Therefore, I know there will be general interest among West Virginians in the newest proposal for "completing" the Capitol—for, literally, giving it a "face-lifting."

Former President Truman once said the dome would fall someday if the east central front of the building were not extended outward. Others have said the dome sits on top of the main structure like a derby hat without a brim. Architects say the facade is incomplete, because the central portion was not brought forward in keeping with the two wings which were added to the original building to provide the present House and Senate Chambers.

The architects may be correct that extension of the facade is an "architectural necessity" but I'm sure that most of us who are not architects would have gone right on thinking the building beautiful indeed just as it is.

Nevertheless, the space requirements of the Congress have provided a practical stimulus to accomplish an architectural objective which has been discussed since 1863. The House has finally approved—after many years of refusing to act on the matter—a resolution calling upon the Architect of the Capitol to draw up plans for the "completion" of the facade.

The additional space added to the east central front of the building, besides bringing it closer into line with the House and Senate wings, will provide much-needed space for committee rooms, for restaurant and other facilities, and for a through-passage on the gallery level between the House and the Senate sides of the building.

The decision to proceed with the planning of this improvement came shortly after a very significant improvement was made inside the building—the opening of an impressive, nonsectarian prayer room to which Members of the House and Senate can go at any time for quiet meditation.

Before a beautiful stained glass window depicting George Washington kneeling in prayer, Members can find inspiration in the Bible, or in our own quiet prayers as we seek Divine guidance in carrying out our heavy responsibilities. It is good to have this tiny chapel available in the Capitol. And, best of all, it is being used every day.

The Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Significance of Thomas Jefferson For Our Day," delivered by me, on Friday afternoon, April 29, 1955.

The meeting at which the address was made was held on the steps of the beautiful Jefferson Memorial, in a setting befitting the occasion. It was held under the auspices of the Washington Pilgrimage, ably assisted by Dr. and Mrs. Harold Dudley. Gen. Willard Paul presided, and the occasion was favored with selections by the Oxen Hill, Md., High School Band, and a wonderful chorus from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.

The Washington Pilgrimage is an organization of clergy and lay church people dedicated to the preservation of our Nation's religious heritage. Annually they select and present awards to the outstanding clergy churchman, the lay churchman and churchwoman of the year. This year the awards were as follows:

Clergy churchman of the year 1955—Dr. Ralph W. Sockman:

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Nation, as an eloquent preacher of God's word, the minister for more than 20 years of the National Radio Pulpit, a valiant guardian of world peace, the director of the Hall of Fame, an inspiring teacher, and the author of many volumes of practical religious truth.

Lay churchman of the year 1955—President Dwight D. Eisenhower:

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Nation in his leadership for peace, spiritual devotion, and inspiring example of steadfast attention to religious values as President of the United States.

Churchwoman of the year 1955—Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON:

In recognition of her outstanding service to the Nation as a spiritual interpreter of public life in the Halls of Congress, in the field of international affairs, the ministry of nursing and public health, and the advancement of educational institutions and values.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE, JEFFERSON MEMORIAL, 4 P. M., FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1955

Mr. Chairman, we meet here today to remind ourselves of our goodly heritage. As we stand here before the great Jefferson Memorial, we can also see the monuments of Washington and Lincoln. They remind us again of not only our great heritage, but the fact that religion has played a vital part in the development of our great Nation.

They remind us, too, that religion is not only necessary, but is vital to the existence of a virile democracy. It would be a sad day indeed for our Nation should our people forget the basic fundamental principles of the Christian religion, which, after all, is the foundation stone of this great democracy—a democracy that is on trial at the present time in the conflict of the ideologies of Christianity and paganism.

Our Nation has been blessed by having leaders with a Christian faith and a firm conviction in the continued welfare of this Nation and the preservation of its ideals.

I am pleased today to read to you a telegram from the President of the United States:

"The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

"Please convey my greetings and good wishes to all participants in this year's Washington pilgrimage. I am glad that on April 29 you will speak on 'The Significance of Thomas Jefferson for Our Day.' I hope that everyone in the pilgrimage will return from his visit to Washington with increased knowledge of Jefferson's life and thought and increased determination to uphold the principles of liberty in which Jefferson believed.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

Thomas Jefferson may well be called the apostle of liberty. He expressed his attitude emphatically when he declared: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." His life was the fulfillment of this vow.

Jefferson was given the supreme opportunity to express his dedication to the principles of freedom when he was asked to draft the Declaration of Independence. Those memorable words will ring forever in the hearts of men through every age and clime, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Some petrified minds and withered hearts have tried to demonstrate their superiority by libeling Jefferson and labeling this statement a lie. They remind us that some men are born weak and sickly and others are born strong and rugged, and some are born morons and others are born geniuses—as if Jefferson didn't know this too, or was referring to any of this!

No. Jefferson's statement must not be taken from its literary and historical context. His declaration, in the only sense that it can be understood, means that all men stand equal before the law.

The wealth of the rich shall not shield him from the same penalty a pauper would suffer for the same crime. Priests are not to be tried by a different code or before different courts than laymen. The accident of birth does not automatically make a man the ruler of his fellow men, whether he is a Tudor, a Stuart, a Hanover, or a Roosevelt. This equality is predicated on the fact that all men receive their life from the same Creator, who endows them also with the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

These benefits flow reasonably from belief in a Creator, and it is only what might be expected that those who are atheists are the foremost in denying to their fellow men "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The contrast between countries dominated by atheistical communism and those countries blessed by faith in God is an existing proof. Jefferson's concern was that abomination called the "divine right of kings" and that other abomination, a fixed and immutable social and economic stratification.

Even here, in God's America, Jefferson's ideals have not met complete fulfillment, but to the extent that they have, this has been, and still is, the land of opportunity for the oppressed of earth.

Perhaps no other statements made by Jefferson demonstrate his right to be called "Apostle of liberty" as do those selected for the marble memorial in the Capital of our Nation. Of religious liberty he wrote:

"Almighty God hath created the mind free. All attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens * * * are departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion * * * no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship or ministry or shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief. But all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion."

This is from an Act Establishing Religious Freedom in Virginia. Its authorship is one of the three things which Jefferson wanted to be remembered by and asked to have mentioned on his tombstone.

Jefferson was against slavery of all kinds, whether of body or mind, and he believed in education for all as a bulwark of freedom. In the stately marble memorial erected to his honor by a grateful nation one may read his words:

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slave is despotism. Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free. Establish the law for educating the common people. This it is the business of the state to effect and on a general plan."

Jefferson was in France when our Constitutional Convention was meeting. He approved in general of the work done by the Convention, but greatly deplored the absence of a Bill of Rights. He wrote to Washington, Madison, Monroe, and others, earnestly advocating a Bill of Rights. To Madison he wrote:

"I will now tell you what I do not like. First, the omission of a Bill of Rights, providing clearly, and without the aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force of the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land, and not by the laws of nations. Let me add, that a Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference."

Many others agreed with Jefferson, and the Bill of Rights, comprising the first 10 amendments, was quickly adopted. The putting of these essential freedoms on an undeniable legal basis owes much to the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the bill for establishing religious freedom in Virginia.

Jefferson's service as our Minister to France during the several years just before the outbreak of the French Revolution, extended his influence as an apostle of liberty to that land also, and increased the already strong effect which our own successful Revolution had upon the French.

Throughout his long life, whether as Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet, as President for two terms, or as the retired sage of Monticello, Jefferson ever and always was able to say as an apostle of liberty, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

We who are privileged to gather here today can well take to heart the admonitions of our third President and rededicate ourselves to the preservation of the Christian principles that must guide this Nation if we are to be the Nation that God intended us to be.

Voting and Attendance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the first session of the 82d Congress.

The record indicates all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

(Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District, Michigan, 82d Cong. 1st sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
1	Jan. 3	Call by States	Present.
2	do	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn, 231—Martin, 192.)	Martin.
		H. Res. 7, providing that the rules of the House of Representatives will be the same as those of the 81st Cong.:	
3	do	On previous question. (Defeated, 179 to 247.)	Yea.
4	do	On substitute repealing the 21-day discharge rule which permits chairmen of legislative committees to bypass the Committee on Rules in bringing up legislation. On adoption. (Adopted, 244 to 179.)	Nay.
5	Jan. 17	H. R. 1001, authorizing the construction of 500,000 tons of modern naval vessels, conversion of 1,000,000 tons of existing vessels and the construction of an aircraft carrier. On passage. (Passed, 365 to 0.)	Yea.
6	Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.
7	Jan. 23	H. R. 1724, providing for the creation of a 5-member board to renegotiate contracts that are made by certain Government agencies exercising functions in connection with the national defense. On passage. (Passed, 377 to 0.)	Yea.
8	Jan. 24	H. R. 1, authorizing the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service. (GI insurance bill.) On passage. (Passed, 390 to 0.)	Yea.
9	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
10	do	do	Present.
11	Feb. 7	do	Present.
		H. R. 1612, extending for 3 years the authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreements:	
12	do	On amendment providing for congressional notification by the President prior to any reduction of tariffs below a level determined by the Tariff Commission to be perilous to domestic industries. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 168.)	Yea.
	Mar. 5	H. R. 2615, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, relative to peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas:	
13	Mar. 7	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 174 to 212)	Yea.
14	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 13	do	Present.
16	do	H. R. 1545, amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 to authorize emergency reorganizations. On passage. (Defeated, 170 to 227.)	Nay.
17	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
18	do	H. Res. 142, rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951, relative to the RFC. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 197, not having received a constitutional majority of 218.)	Yea.
19	do	H. Res. 166, providing for the consideration of H. R. 2988, a bill to provide housing and community facilities and services in connection with national defense. On adoption. (Defeated, 170 to 219.)	Nay.
20	Mar. 21	On amendment cutting $22 million from the money provided for postal operations. On adoption. (Defeated, 136 to 138.)	Yea.
21	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
22	Apr. 4	do	Present.
23	Apr. 5	do	Present.
24	Apr. 9	do	Present.
25	Apr. 10	H. R. 2612, authorizing District of Columbia Commissioners to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia. On passage. (Passed, 278 to 116.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriation for certain Government agencies for the remainder of fiscal year 1951:	
26	do	On amendment reducing the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $750,000. On adoption. (Defeated, 159 to 250.)	Yea.
27	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 12	do	Present.
29	Apr. 13	do	Present.
		S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service, and amending Draft Act:	
30	do	On motion to recommit. (Defeated, 121 to 296)	Nay.
31	do	On passage. (Passed, 372 to 44)	Yea.
32	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
33	do	On amendment permitting covered agencies to fill only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 208 to 145.)	Yea.
34	do	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 25	do	Present.
36	Apr. 26	do	Present.
37	May 1	do	Present.
38	May 2	do	Present.
		H. R. 3790, appropriating funds for Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1952:	
39	do	On amendment deleting language providing $3,400,000 for Southeastern Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 149.)	Yea.
40	do	On amendment reducing by $550,000 the funds for construction by the Southwestern Power Administration. On adoption. (Adopted, 222 to 173.)	Yea.
41	do	On amendment preventing the use of funds for developing the western Missouri project. On adoption. (Adopted, 247 to 152.)	Yea.
42	do	On amendment cutting $5½ million from funds allotted for Bonneville Power Administration construction. On adoption. (Adopted, 225 to 167.)	Yea.
	1951	H. R. 3790—Continued	
43	May 2	On amendment cutting $800,000 from funds allocated for management of lands and resources and to earmark $1,200,000 for use in soil and moisture conservation. On adoption. (Adopted, 249 to 148.)	Yea.
44	do	On amendment reducing by $10 million the funds provided the Bureau of Reclamation for construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 160.)	Yea.
45	do	On amendment preventing use of funds to construct duplicate power transmission facilities where wheeling service contracts have been entered into. On adoption. (Adopted, 226 to 165.)	Yea.
46	do	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department of Interior in 1952 with certain exceptions. On adoption. (Adopted, 224 to 169.)	Yea.
47	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
48	do	H. Res. 220, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 220 to 159.)	Yea.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952:	
50	do	On amendment limiting to 5,000 the public dwelling units to be started in fiscal year 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 181 to 113.)	Yea.
51	do	On amendment fixing the emergency fund for the President at $1 million, plus certain unexpended funds from 1951. On adoption. (Adopted, 160 to 128.)	Yea.
52	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 9	H. R. 3576, amending the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 by extending program for 6 months to Dec. 31, 1951, with no increase in number of authorizations for admission and no extension of the term of office of Displaced Persons Commission. On passage. (Passed, 312 to 63.)	Yea.
54	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 15	do	Present,
56	May 17	do	Present.
		H. R. 3096, requiring congressional approval relative to certain defense land transactions by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
57	do	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 312 to 68.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1952:	
58	do	On amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in Department in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 216 to 153.)	Yea.
		On passage. (Passed, voice vote.)	
59	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 23	do	Present.
61	May 24	do	Present.
62	do	H. R. 3791, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On passage. (Passed, 293 to 94.)	Yea.
63	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
64	do	do	Present.
65	do	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 9 to 224.)	Nay.
		H. R. 4141, providing more effective prevention, detection and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia:	
66	do	On motion that House resolve itself into Committee of Whole to consider bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 231 to 3.)	Yea.
67	do	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 5	do	Present.
69	do	do	Present.
70	June 6	S. 872, furnishing grain for relief assistance to India. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 250 to 82.)	Yea.
		H. R. 314, providing for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans in Franklin County, Va.:	
71	do	On motion to strike enacting clause. (Adopted 223 to 117.)	Yea.
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	do	S. 1, authorizing universal military training and service and amending Draft Act. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 339 to 41.)	Yea.
74	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
75	June 13	do	Present.
		H. R. 4386, appropriating funds for Department of Army civil functions for fiscal year 1952:	
76	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate amendment permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies that occur in 1952. On adoption. (Adopted, 170 to 165.)	Nay.
77	June 15	On motion to adjourn. On adoption. (Defeated, 75 to 161.)	Nay.
78	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
79	do	S. J. Res. 70, suspending application of certain Federal laws with respect to employment of attorney by Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. On adoption. (Defeated, 120 to 164.)	Nay.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
80	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
81	do	do	Present.
82	June 21	do	Present.
		H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951:	
83	June 22	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 171 to 220.)	Yea.
84	do	On passage. (Passed 233 to 160)	Yea.
85	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
86	do	H. R. 4431, extending rent control in the District of Columbia until Mar. 31, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 171 to 120.)	Nay.
87	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
88	do	S. Con. Res. 11, reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 351 to 6.)	Yea.
89	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
90	do	H. R. 3283, amending the Agriculture Act of 1949 relative to recruitment of agricultural workers from foreign countries on the mainland of the Western Hemisphere. On passage. (Passed, 240 to 139.)	Yea.
91	do	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 28	do	Present.
		H. Res. 287, a closed rule providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills:	
93	do	On ordering the previous question. (Adopted, 196 to 192.)	Nay.
94	do	On adoption. (Adopted, 195 to 191.)	Nay.
		H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills:	
95	do	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate certain amendments to effect a 10-percent reduction in funds of departments and agencies. (Defeated, 190 to 200.)	Yea.
96	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
97	do	H. Res. 294, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 278, on adoption. (Adopted 297 to 85.)	Yea.
		H. J. Res. 278, extending the Defense Production Act of 1950 through July 31, 1951; the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; and certain import control authority:	
98	do	On amendment preventing roll-backs or the lowering of price ceilings below those on enactment date of resolution and prohibiting any new price ceilings on materials or services during the period of the temporary extension, except for the placing of price ceilings on agricultural commodities if they exceed their parity price. On adoption. (Adopted, 232 to 159.)	Nay.
99	do	S. 1590, extending rent control in the District of Columbia for 1 year. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 242 to 126.)	Nay.
100	June 30	H. J. Res. 277, making temporary appropriations through July 31 for Government departments pending enactment of 1952 appropriation bills. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 256 to 12.)	Yea.
101	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
102	do	do	Present.
103	do	do	Present.
104	July 6	do	Present.
105	July 9	do	Present.
106	July 10	do	Present.
107	July 11	do	Present.
108	July 12	do	Present.
		H. R. 3709, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security agencies for fiscal 1952:	
109	do	On motion to recommit to committee on conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952 in the offices, bureaus, etc., covered by this bill. On adption. (Adopted, 223 to 170.)	Yea.
110	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
111	July 16	do	Present.
112	do	do	Present.
113	do	do	Present.
114	July 17	do	Present.
115	July 18	do	Present.
116	July 19	do	Present.
117	July 20	do	Present.
		H. R. 3871, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
118	do	On Andresen amendment restricting until June 30, 1953, imports of fats and oils, cheese, dairy products, peanuts and rice. On adoption. (Adopted 266 to 147.)	Nay.
119	do	On Davis (Wisconsin) amendment establishing 1 Government agency through which all claims of municipalities for materials, etc., would be channeled. On adoption. (Defeated, 164 to 251.)	Yea.
120	do	On Hope amendment preventing the placing of quotas on livestock slaughtering. On adoption. (Adopted, 249 to 167.)	Nay.
	1951	H. R. 3871—Continued	
121	July 20	On Wolcott amendment deleting language enlarging the President's authority to acquire property, including facilities, and to erect plants, factories, etc., and to engage in the marketing, transportation, and storage of such critical materials necessary to national defense; but authorizing installation of additional equipment, facilities, etc., in Government-owned plants and the installation of Government-owned equipment in privately owned plants. On adoption. (Adopted, 233 to 184.)	Yea.
122	do	On Hardy amendment deleting authority to create new Government corporations by Executive orders. On adoption. (Adopted, 250 to 167.)	Yea.
123	do	On amendment authorizing a roll-back of 10 percent below the May 10, 1951, prices of agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 234 to 183.)	Nay.
124	do	On Cole amendment providing a fair and equitable margin for each species of livestock processed to insure a fair profit to all segments of the industry on each species. On adoption. (Defeated, 166 to 249.)	Yea.
125	do	On Davis (Georgia) amendment providing that for a period of 120 days following enactment of bill prices and wages, salaries, and other compensation shall not be raised above the levels prevailing on July 7, 1951, except that agricultural products may not be prevented from reaching parity. On adoption. (Defeated, 172 to 243.)	Nay.
126	do	On Poage-Cole amendment to set up a formula, including parity costs, for arriving at ceiling prices for all commodities to insure a reasonable profit. On adoption. (Defeated, 181 to 233.)	Nay.
127	do	On amendment exempting strategic metals and minerals from ceiling prices when in short supply. On adoption. (Defeated, 200 to 216.)	Yea.
128	do	On adoption of amendment deleting from the bill language authorizing the licensing of and suspension of licenses of certain businesses covered by the scope of the bill. On adoption. (Adopted, 333 to 82.)	Yea.
129	do	On amendment deleting from the bill language relating to control of commodity speculation. On adoption. (Adopted, 242 to 172.)	Nay.
130	do	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 117 to 299.)	Nay.
131	do	On passage. (Passed, 323 to 92.)	Yea.
132	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.):	
133	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference. On adoption. (Adopted, 188 to 186.)	Yea.
134	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
135	do	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to reduce appropriation for the international information and educational activities of the State Department by $15 million. On adoption. (Defeated, 142 to 245.)	Nay.
136	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
137	do	H. J. Res. 289, terminating the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany. On adoption. (Adopted, 378 to 0.)	Yea.
138	do	H. Res. 335, providing for the consideration of H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Tidelands.) On adoption. (Adopted, 270 to 92.)	Yea.
139	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
140	do	S. 1717, amending and extending for 1 year the Defense Production Act of 1950. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 294 to 80.)	Yea.
141	do	H. R. 4484, confirming and establishing the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters. (Tidelands.) On passage. (Passed, 265 to 109.)	Yea.
142	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3790, making appropriations for Department of Interior for fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report.)	
143	do	On motion to recommit to committee of conference with instructions to insist on House provision barring the filling of more than 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952. (Recommitted, 189 to 170.)	Yea.
144	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
145	Aug. 1	do	Present.
146	Aug. 2	do	Present.
147	Aug. 8	do	Present.
148	do	do	Present.
149	Aug. 9	do	Present.
150	Aug. 9	H. R. 5054. On passage. (Passed, 348 to 2.)	Yea.
151	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 13	do	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1951		
153	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
154	do	H. R. 4914, authorizing certain construction at military and naval installations. On passage. (Passed, 353 to 5.)	Yea.
155	do	H. Con. Res. 140, expressing indignation at the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis by the Czechoslovakian Government. On adoption. (Adopted, 363 to 1.)	Yea.
156	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent offices. (Conference report):	
157	do	On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House provision relating to public housing. On adoption. (Defeated, 169 to 207.)	Yea.
158	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 290 to 80.)	Yea.
159	do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 349, providing housing and community facilities and services in connection with the national defense:	
160	do	On amendment fixing the termination date of the act of June 30, 1952, instead of June 30, 1953. On adoption. (Defeated, 184 to 188.)	Yea.
161	do	On amendment striking out provision for acquisition of sites for development in connection with isolated defense installations. On adoption. (Defeated, 175 to 199.)	Yea.
162	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3193, increasing and extending pensions to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities:	
163	Aug. 17	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 318 to 45.)	Nay.
		H. R. 3973, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year, 1952. (Conference report):	
164	do	On motion that House concur in an amendment providing additional $1 million for fighting spruce bark beetle infestation. (Passed, 222 to 138.)	Nay.
165	do	On motion to recommit to Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to reduce funds for economic aid by $350 million. On adoption. (Recommitted, 186 to 177.)	Yea.
166	do	On passage. (Passed, 260 to 101.)	Yea.
167	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
168	do	do	Present.
169	Aug. 21	do	Present.
170	Sept. 13	do	Present.
171	do	do	Present.
172	Sept. 14	do	Present.
173	do	do	Present.
174	do	H. R. 1005, providing for the free importation of baler twine. On passage. (Passed, 210 to 41.)	Yea.
175	Sept. 18	Quorum call	Present.
176	Sept. 19	do	Present.
177	Sept. 20	do	Present.
178	Sept. 24	do	Present.
179	do	H. R. 4419, authorizing the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ up to 15 retired members of the armed services as teachers of military science and tactics. On passage. (Passed, 238 to 53.)	Yea.
180	do	Quorum call	Present.
181	Sept. 25	do	Present.
182	do	S. 2006, increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and extending its life 5 years to June 30, 1958. On passage. (Passed, 259 to 69.)	Yea.
183	do	H. Res. 429, providing for the consideration of H. R. 39, a bill for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. On adoption. (Adopted, 211-112.)	Yea.
		H. R. 39, providing for the development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities:	
184	Sept. 26	On motion to recommit to committee. On adoption. (Recommitted, 180 to 162.)	Yea.
185	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
186	do	H. Res. 430, providing for the consideration of H. Res. 82, relating to the unification of Ireland. On adoption. (Defeated, 139 to 206.)	Nay.
187	do	Quorum call	Present.
188	Oct. 4	H. R. 5118, amending the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees. On suspension of the rules and passage. (Defeated, 197 to 140.)	Nay.
	1951		
189	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
190	Oct. 5	do	Present.
191	do	H. R. 5113, the Mutual Security Act of 1951. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 235 to 98.)	Yea.
192	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
193	do	H. Res. 436, authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction. On adoption. (Adopted, 284 to 15.)	Yea.
		S. 1959, amending the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to validate union-shop elections held prior to time of taking of non-Communist oath by labor-union leaders, and to dispense with the requirement of existing law that an election be held before a labor organization and an employer may make a union-shop agreement:	
194	Oct. 9	On motion to recommit. On adoption. (Defeated, 22 to 304.)	Nay.
195	do	On passage. (Passed, 307 to 18.)	Yea.
196	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 5650, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year, 1952:	
197	Oct. 11	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to strike out funds for Grandview Air Terminal, Missouri. On adoption. (Defeated, 127 to 183.)	Not voting.
198	do	On passage. (Passed, 301 to 19.)	Not voting.
		H. R. 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for fiscal 1952. (Conference report):	
199	do	On motion the House recede and agree to a revision of the language of the House bill relating to United States contributions to international organizations. On adoption. (Adopted, 200 to 126.)	Not voting.
200	do	H. R. 5684, making appropriations to carry out provisions of Mutual Security Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. On passage. (Passed, 222 to 99.)	Not voting
201	Oct. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
202	do	H. R. 5411, amending Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Cong. with respect to schools in critical defense housing areas. On passage. (Passed, 257 to 55.)	Not voting.
203	Oct. 16	Quorum call	Present.
204	do	do	Present.
		H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951:	
205	do	On adoption of conference report. (Defeated, 157 to 204.)	Yea.
206	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
207	Oct. 18	H. Res. 463, providing for the consideration of H. J. Res. 285, authorizing appropriation of $95,000 for commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the U. S. Military Academy. On adoption. (Adopted, 179 to 149.)	Nay.
208	do	Quorum call	Present.
209	do	S. Con. Res. 36, authorizing the appointment of 14 Members of Congress to participate in a public discussion with representatives of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. On adoption. (Adopted, 237 to 75.)	Yea.
210	do	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 355, adjusting the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department:	
211	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 339 to 7.)	Yea.
		S. 622, increasing the basic rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government:	
212	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 318 to 26.)	Yea.
213	do	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 4473, the Revenue Act of 1951:	
214	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 185 to 160.)	Yea.
		H. R. 3669, amending the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to increase the monthly benefits paid to retired railroad employees:	
215	do	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 341 to 0.)	Yea.
216	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1864, providing or assisting in providing an automobile or making a cash payment to certain disabled veterans:	
217	do	On overriding Presidential veto. (Overridden, 223 to 53.)	Nay.

May Day: United States Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I made yesterday in Burlington, Wis., on the celebration of May Day: United States Way.

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

"MAY DAY: UNITED STATES WAY"

(Address by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND in Burlington, Wis., May 1, 1955)

Fellow Americans, it is fitting today that the citizens of Burlington, Wis., a typical American community, demonstrate May Day, the United States way. The theme chosen today to symbolize this patriotic ceremony appropriately sets forth the difference between our way of life and that offered to the world by international communism. "Faith shall make you free," is not a slogan for Americans; it is the very foundation on which our country and Government are based.

Ten days ago, the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued through its official news service, Tass, 69 annual May Day slogans. These slogans

were broadcast to their satellites in Europe and in Asia and, bearing the official stamp of the Communist rulers in the Kremlin, represent communism's May Day sentiments to the world.

I want to quote you just two of the 69 official May Day slogans of the Communist Party. One reads as follows, and I quote: "Fraternal greetings to all the peoples fighting for peace, democracy, for socialism." And I might say, socialism is in capital letters.

The last slogan reads, "Under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin; under the leadership of the Communist Party, forward to the victory of communism!"

Fellow Americans, contrast those slogans with the sentiments which are in your hearts today. Contrast them with our spiritual theme today, "Faith makes men free."

Communism which is stalking over the world today, is the denial of religious faith and at the same time a denial of human freedom Communist is godless. It is also a system of slavery based on contempt for, and oppression of, the common man.

But there is that which will defeat communism. It is just the twofold vital quality which all people of courage have wielded as their weapon—faith in God and faith in human freedom. These are indestructible and while we cling to them we are indestructible, too.

At the time of Yalta, just 10 years ago, less than 200 million people were behind the Communist iron curtain. Today, over 800 million people are enslaved by the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its treaties of friendship and nonaggression with Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the Republic of China, there are still some who believe that the way to deal with an international bully is by more appeasement.

At Munich the world should have learned that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace, it is surrender on the installment plan.

The Soviet Union is an admitted violator of the United Nations charter and the resolutions in support of the Republic of Korea, a victim of communistic aggression on June 25, 1950. Yet now the Soviet Union is supporting the admission of the aggressor, Communist China, into that organization.

Such action would violate the moral foundation upon which the United Nations is supposed to rest. It would be putting a premium on aggression. It would serve notice that the quickest way to membership is by shooting your way in. It would be a betrayal of the 140,000 American casualties including 35,000 of our dead.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they hold 15 American airmen; 11 of these have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held, I shall not remain silent.

What does the United Nations intend to do about it? What are the American people going to do about it?

Based alone on the Soviet Union's failure to support the United Nations action in Korea and to abide by its charter obligations the Soviet Union should have been expelled from membership.

Have we forgotten the Biblical injunction in Second Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Communist Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless Marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

There will never be peace in our time in any real sense until the people of Russia and China have thrown out their Communist masters and established justice in their political system, freed their economy from the dead hand of statism concentrated on armament production and, more important than all, reopened their churches so that the guidance of the Father of us all may replace the godless teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The crucifix is a more potent force than the clenched fist of communism.

When the people of Russia and China gain their freedom from the tyranny which temporarily rules them we should make it known that our friendship and our assistance will be available for the establishment of peace with honor in a truly free world of freemen.

We seek not 1 foot of their territory nor control over a solitary one of their people.

We only want for them the cherished freedom to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience; to have in the hands of a truly free people the right of self-determination on who shall constitute their government and the right to change it by the decision of 200 million people rather than a cabal of less than a dozen power-mad men in the Kremlin who threaten the peace of the world; and to be able to enjoy the fruits of their labor and a rising standard of living.

We should look upon the people within the Iron Curtain as our friends and allies. Indeed, should their totalitarian masters embark upon further aggression the temporarily enslaved people may turn out to be among our stoutest allies.

Such a policy does not contemplate aggression on the part of the free world. But it does require that we never by word or deed give our moral or legal blessing to the enslavement of the 800 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Such a policy would contemplate the application of moral, economic, and diplomatic sanctions against the international Communist conspiracy which is dedicated to the destruction of the free way of life. Human freedom is a God-given right beyond the power of dictatorships to permanently destroy.

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and membership in the United Nations.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States, are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou En-lai.

I, for one, do not believe the Communist leopard has changed its spots. Their objective has been, is, and will continue to be the destrcution of human freedom.

Unless there is some formula regarding which I have not been advised and which is difficult for me now to envision, I find it hard to comprehend how we could enter into direct negotiations with Communist China without the interests of the Republic of China being deeply involved.

History teaches us that prior experience of great powers negotiating in the absence of small allies has not reflected great credit upon the large nations, and has been disastrous to the small ones. For reference, I refer to Munich and its impact upon Czechoslovakia, and to Yalta and its impact upon Poland and the Republic of China.

Patrick Henry, on March 23, 1775, in the Virginia Legislature, said: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almightly God: I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

In his day, Lincoln understood that this Nation could not continue "half slave and half free."

In 1865 at his second inaugural, Lincoln expanded this doctrine when he said:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history—we here have the power and bear the responsibility—in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American.

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way.

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time.

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

This I believe: Under the divine guidance that made us and kept up a free nations, this generation of Americans will not sacrifice principle for expediency; nor cringe in the face of brutal naked aggression and we will not barter friends and allies in the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Africa, or Asia, in a dishonorable appeasement at a Far Eastern Munich or a second Yalta.

With the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat as Philadelphia and gave us, first, our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution there, are none of our domestic problems which we as a free people cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

Loyalty Day Celebration at Burlington, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to address an outstanding patriotic celebration at Burlington, Wis., which was part of the Nation's wide observance of May Day—Loyalty Day.

I commented on various phases of the challenge to America's patriotic citizens, including our need for upholding our end in the battle of ideas throughout the world.

I also referred to the problem of the impact of American motion pictures overseas.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address which I delivered and the text of a pertinent editorial which was carried in the April 28 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "The Celluloid Ally," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

SENATOR WILEY URGES "365-DAY DEDICATION TO UNITED STATES"; URGES HOLLYWOOD SIFT OUT OBJECTIONABLE MOVIES FROM OVERSEAS SHOWINGS

Many years ago, when the first telegraph message was clicked out, the message read, "What hath God wrought?"

Today, we proudly see and hail what faith—faith in America—has wrought. We see that faith has "moved mountains," mountains of fear and despair and other limitations to bring into being and to preserve the greatest country on earth.

And so, I am thrilled to be with you today at this historic ceremony.

I am delighted that it is the patriotic leaders of my own State—you here in Burlington and surrounding areas—who are stirring this Nation by your great patriotic demonstration.

The eyes of all America are rightly upon you—and with deepest of pride.

DEMONSTRATING AMERICANISM

Here, today, you are expressing the finest in American ideals.

You are showing by the flags that wave aloft and the flags, so to speak, that wave in your hearts and shine in your faces—you are showing by these beautiful floats, by the magnificent bands and marching groups—what it means to be a dedicated, loyal, reverent American.

And what a contrast Loyalty Day here is to May day abroad—particularly in the fear-filled, hate-filled centers of our godless enemy, in Moscow and in other headquarters of the atheistic Communist conspiracy.

Today, here, in God-loving America, you are showing what it is to be a real Yankee Doodle Dandy. You are recapturing the devotion, the enthusiasm, the giving of one's self, which has helped America through all its severest crises.

This was the spirit which saw us through Valley Forge; it was the spirit of Gettysburg, and San Juan Hill, and the Argonne Forest, Iwo Jima, and Heartbreak Ridge. It is the spirit of Burlington, Wis., May Day-Loyalty Day, 1955.

INSTILLING PATRIOTISM IN YOUNG PEOPLE

I am particularly thrilled by what you are doing today—the example you are setting—for the young people in our midst.

Every parent among you who has a child at his side or a child in his arms or a child at home, can feel a well-justified glow of pride.

You are showing the children of Racine County and surrounding counties and of all America, what it means to be an American.

You proved in the houses of worship earlier today that love of God is a sinew of love of our country and all that it stands for.

And, too, in the great patriotic demonstration which we have been witnessing, you have been showing that we must prove in deeds, as well as by our words that we are faithful to this land—the finest, freest, most magnificent country ever to exist on the face of the earth.

You are proving your allegiance to your Government, to our constitutional Republic, the longest-lived major Government on earth today.

You are showing how May Day has been restored as a hallowed day, after years and years in which May Day had been taken over by the enemies of America for their own propaganda purposes.

You are establishing a basis for rededication to America, not just on one day a year, but 365 days a year.

And, too, you are today showing the full splendor of the American heritage.

It is the heritage purchased for us by blood and tears of heroic generations gone by.

It is a heritage of unparalleled wealth, not just material wealth, but, far more important, wealth in things of the spirit.

AMERICA'S MATERIAL WEALTH

In material wealth, we are the envy of the world.

Our abundance-producing agriculture, our humming factories, our crowded, thriving stores, the happy faces of our contented people—these are the admiration of the world.

We are but 165 million people out of 2½ billion on earth. But we have one-half of the wealth of the world today in our own country. The total production of all our goods and services amounts to over $367 billion; 49 percent of our families enjoy an income of $5,000 a year, or more.

And income is becoming distributed ever more equitably among our people.

OUR PRICELESS FREEDOMS

But we possess an infinitely greater wealth. I refer to our freedoms, the tangible and intangible freedoms guaranteed to us under our sacred Bill of Rights, the freedoms which make the state the servant of man, instead of man the servant of the state.

I refer to freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, freedom to own property, freedom to work at a place and under conditions of our own choosing.

And greatest of all our wealth is the wealth of the human spirit, of free men under God who are able to worship as they please—as you and I have worshipped today—in the faith of our fathers, and freedom to grow, to develop.

And there is the wealth of American culture, of our great literature, our music, our art, our poetry, to which you and I are heir.

No land in the world today enjoys wealth or a standard of living such as this, particularly the countries from which many of us here in Wisconsin and from which many of our forebears have come.

A PLEDGE OF FRIENDSHIP TO POLAND

I point out to you, for example, that next Tuesday, May 3, is the national holiday of a great land from which many of Wisconsin's people and their forefathers had come.

I refer to Poland—devout, faithful, gallant Poland, now enslaved under the heel of the Communist aggressor.

On this Loyalty Day, we pledge to Poland our continued warm friendship. And to all the other lands under the yoke of the Red tyrant—to the people of Eastern Germany, the people of the Baltic and Balkan States—we pledge they shall yet be free.

We shall never accept their condition of enslavement. We shall never recognize their domination under the heel of the godless tyrant.

WE PLEDGE VIGILANCE AT OUR RAMPARTS

We pledge, today, moreover our vigilance against the armed aggressor who has enslaved these people. We pledge our strength to be on the alert against this Communist enemy.

We pledge our awareness of our own danger to enemy attack, our awareness of the danger of an atomic Pearl Harbor—which must never occur.

For you and I know that man's ingenuity has contracted space and time. Wisconsin is now next-door neighbor to all the world in this age of supersonic speed.

We are but 3,500 miles away from Soviet airbases and launching sites.

By means of the great circle aerial route, Milwaukee and the other cities of the Middle West are nearer to attack than are the cities of the East. That is why our defense authorities have made Milwaukee a "Nike" guided missile site.

As a matter of fact, we of America today are imperiled basically by three types of possible long-range attack:

First, by intercontinental bomber;

Second, by intercontinental guided missile (guided to its target by electronic devices); and

Third, by intercontinental ballistic missile. (Such a missile can be shot from a launching site like a bullet from a gun or a shell from a cannon.)

Such a ballistic missile, unlike the guided missile, could not be "jammed" by counter-electronic devices. Once it is shot from its site at a speed of perhaps 10,000 miles per hour, nothing now known could stop it, except perhaps another missile or other device to ram it. Such an intercontinental missile, when it is developed 5 or 10 years from now, might be able to reach Burlington or any other city of Wisconsin—just one-half hour after it might be shot from its Soviet launching site. That is why it is we who must develop an intercontinental ballistic missile—an IBM—first, not second. We dare not be second-best. We must be first in this technological race. We must have the strongest possible deterrents to aggression.

It is of these facts that we must be aware. This is a part of intelligent, thinking citizenship—not just 1 day a year—but all 365 days.

We must be aware that the American continent has already been crossed by jet plane in 3¾ hours, and that the Atlantic Ocean has been crossed from Newfoundland to Ireland in less than that time.

We must be aware of the fact that we have wisely erected a worldwide chain of ramparts, defensive air bases in Greenland, Iceland, Britain, North Africa, Turkey, Greece, and elsewhere. These bases grimly tell the Kremlin in the only language it understands, the language of potential force, that we are on the alert.

WE HAVE FAITH WAR WILL NOT COME

These facts do not mean that we believe that war will come, or that war is inevitable.

On the contrary, it is our firm faith that war is not inevitable, that it can be avoided, provided we are strong.

We must, of course, be invincible in relation to Red Russia. We must be invincible in relation to Red China, strong and firm in our insistence on concrete demonstrations on her part that she means peace, not war.

Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung cannot be trusted any more than Krushchev or Molotov can be trusted. Deeds still speak louder than words.

If the Reds really mean peace with regard to Formosa, as we hope they do, then let them prove it by acts.

As for ourselves, we truly want peace in the western Pacific and everywhere else.

We will talk over issues, but we will not cringe; we will not abandon principle nor our Nationalist Chinese ally; we will not appease. The rule of reason in negotiation will prevail, but never the rule of surrender.

We want those 15 United States airmen—totally unjustly imprisoned—back; and we demand the return of all the other imprisoned Americans, as well. We do not propose to abandon a single United States serviceman or civilian.

The righteousness, strength, and faith which made us free will keep us free.

This faith which can move mountains can also move the course of world events.

WINNING WAR OF IDEAS

But guns and steel alone will not protect us in this world today. We are in a critical worldwide battle of ideas, of free ideas against slave ideas.

And it is on this last point that I should like to make these concluding remarks.

It is up to us as loyal Americans to tell and sell the American story to the peoples of the world. We have made great progress toward this end. The leading patriotic organizations of America—the church, fraternal, veterans', labor, business, and other groups—have acquainted the rest of mankind with much of the true meaning of America.

In particular, a great many Hollywood motion pictures have been shown throughout the world which have thrilled audiences to the fine meaning of America. These films have faithfully shown the real America of the grassroots—the America of devotion to God, the America of wholesome individual enterprise, of building great and everlasting and universal values.

SOME FILMS DO US HARM ABROAD

On the other hand, I say very sincerely and frankly that one of our serious problems today is that some of the motion pictures being sent abroad by private firms depict a distorted kind of America. Such films—in the name of so-called realism—have portrayed an America of sex, sin and sadism, of gangsterism, corruption, filth, and degradation.

Such films—few in number—but powerful in effect, have literally been poisoning the minds of some people in the world against us. These films are causing the very opposite of the friendly effect which should be created, if we are to defeat Soviet propaganda.

While the United States Government will be spending some $80 million of your taxpayers' money for a worldwide program of truth, a few films produced privately in Hollywood or elsewhere have been undoing, in part, the very objective for which we, as a people, are striving.

And so I want to issue this word of caution, frankly and emphatically, to the motion-picture film companies.

It is not a new word of caution. I have consulted with them in the past in connection with the work of our Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Overseas Information programs. I have advised the companies as to the seriousness of the problem. I had met with some of their outstanding leaders, and I am glad to say I found in those leaders a deep patriotic awareness of their international responsibilities. Certainly, for example, too, the president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Mr. Eric Johnston, has proven his tremendous devotion to this country both in that capacity and in many other roles in which he has served America long and well.

The major film producers themselves have done a fine job for America by and large at home and abroad. They and the theatre owners have contributed abundantly to all sorts of charitable and good-will causes. Ours is the only nonsubsidized motion picture industry in the world, and it is the envy of the world.

But a small minority among the film companies seem occasionally more interested in greedy profit, in squeezing the last possible dollar from the overseas market, than they are interested in contributing to an accurate picture of America by withholding some possibly misleading films.

The American people—or some of them—may be able to stomach some of these sinstrewn films. An American can ordinarily interpret such films in proper perspective. He will know that this is not the real America, although it may characterize a very small part of America.

But foreign peoples—who know very little of our country, who don't have a sufficient background properly to interpret these pictures, can be utterly confused by this type of misleading film.

MORE VOLUNTARY FILM SELF-REGULATION NEEDED

What is the answer? The answer is intensified voluntary self-regulation by the film industry. It must sift out more of these misleading films. It has already sifted out many such films and prevented their distribution in countries where they could do harm.

But the fact of the matter is, and it is attested by leading authorities of the industry itself, that some motion pictures have been shown in some countries overseas which very definitely should not have been shown.

Even so renowned and universally respected a trade publication as the newspaper Variety has just recently headlined the deep concern of many industry people, themselves, over some types of films which are going overseas.

I, of course, do not believe in Government censorship. I fought against Federal censorship of Hollywood when it was proposed.

But I say that the American people will insist that we not be misrepresented in the eyes of the world.

The Reds are pouring out enough filth about us without our adding to our own problem.

It is up to Hollywood, therefore to demonstrate its further loyalty—loyalty which I know to be a fact, by taking the appropriate voluntary action. An unscrupulous few should not be in a position to tarnish the good name of the overwhelming mass of deeply responsible industry leaders.

CONCLUSION

Meanwhile, it is up to you and to me at the grassroots or in Washington to do our part in telling and selling the American story right here at home. We must reaffirm our gratitude for our American blessings. We must demonstrate dynamic, active citizenship—365 days a year.

We must demonstrate our gratitude for the unexcelled privileges and rights which are ours—"the jewels of great price."

We must demonstrate our faith that this Nation, "of, by and for the people," shall not perish from the earth.

And by our faith, this objective shall be fulfilled. Our Government shall remain the light of the world and the beacon for all mankind.

THE CELLULOID ALLY

"Poor patriotism is bad business." Thus speaks the chairman of the Motion Picture Producers' Association. Mr. Y. Frank Freeman's declaration is a welcome sign of a sense of responsibility in the film industry for the effects of American movies on the United States' world prestige.

But application of patriotism to production of films to be shown throughout the world is a complex and often exacting requirement.

It involves, indeed, the challenging artistic problem of presenting American life as it really is. This is an exercise in selectivity and emphasis guided by a sense of cultural, social, and moral values which not only Europeans but Americans themselves often feel is wanting in film entertainment.

One often hears it said that Europeans "must like our films, they patronize them enough." Undoubtedly the resources, the photography, direction, and other aspects of technicial finish make American movies relatively attractive even when story content is poor or misleading. But it is one thing for mass audiences abroad to like the pictures as sheer entertainment and quite another for them to like the country they believe these films portray.

Europeans who know America well often remark the disparity between their own first-hand impressions of American life and those they receive from films. They note that Americans do not spend most of their waking hours in cocktail lounges, that they are not all glamorous mannequins or limousine-ensconced racketeers.

They note that there are families in America as in Europe, and that they live in quiet, cozy, modest little houses, planning the children's education, how to plant the new garden, where to spend a holiday.

Films that show this side of American life are sometimes seen in other countries. And when they are first-class films their audiences like not only the films themselves but the country they represent.

The Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to pay tribute to the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, which this year observes its golden anniversary. On April 27, Mr. C. E. Bell, vice president of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., and Mr. Norman Quayle, assistant traffic manager, both of Norfolk, Va., saluted the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service by presenting to the chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Richard E. McArdle, in his office a menu of the Seaboard Air Line Railroad which contained on the back cover a tribute to the splendid work of the Forest Service. I am pleased to include this information, and in so doing, I want to pay tribute to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad, which serves so much of the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, for the interest they take in the forestry improvement of our State and Nation, and I also want to pay tribute to the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service. The Seaboard's tribute follows:

We salute the United States Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, which this year observes its golden anniversary.

Established in 1905, under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, the United States Forest Service had as its first chief, Gifford Pinchot. Making forestry the Nation's business, Roosevelt and Pinchot built up the national forests withdrawn from the public domain to 173 million acres. Through their efforts groundwork was laid for the eventual purchase of additional millions of acres on the watersheds of navigable streams. Jointly they made both people and Congress conservation-minded.

Since those early years the United States Forest Service has been the symbol of integrated land use. It will continue to face new problems in making the multiple use concept a reality for the increasing population of our Nation.

The United States Forest Service has been a tremendous factor in the cooperative approach to forestry problems. Their work in fire protection, in production and distribution of nursery stock, in extension-education, and in technical service to small owers have been major factors in strengthening State forestry. The Service has spearheaded research in forest management, range management, watershed management, fire control, forest products, forest insect control and forest disease control.

Today, more than 10,000 men and women employed in this organization are charged with the responsibility of developing the multiple-use concept on 181 million acres of national forests in addition to assisting State forestry organizations on cooperative programs.

In the six Southeastern States served by the Seaboard, more than 110 million acres are classified as timber cropland. There are 15 national forests in these States, with an acreage comprising 5,427,049. These forests furnish timber for the manufacture of lumber, pulp, and paper, and furniture, valued in 1953 at $2,464,000,000. The Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. works closely with industry, State forestry organizations, and the Federal Forest Service toward forestry betterment which contributes to our higher standard of living.

The United German Hungarians Honor Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The United German Hungarians Honor Senator LANGER," which was published in the column entitled "Here and Abroad, a Weekly Chat," by Austin J. App, published in the Nord-Amerika Donnerstag, of April 7, 1955. The article concerns one of our colleagues, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

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

HERE AND ABROAD

(By Austin J. App, Ph. D.)

THE UNITED GERMAN HUNGARIANS HONOR SENATOR LANGER

On Easter Sunday, April 10, the 10th Easter after the infamous Yalta agreement, which plotted the most tragic expulsions in history, the United German Hungarians of Philadelphia and vicinity are honoring with a dinner and plaque the man who did most in the United States Senate to make known and to alleviate the plight of the ethnic German expellees—Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota. The dinner, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph Wolf, will be at 3 p. m. in the hall at 2007–2013 North Second Street.

For Senator LANGER, coming to Philadelphia will be revisiting familiar scenes, for he was twice honored here before. On March 26, 1949, at a testimonial dinner at the Adelphia Hotel, sponsored by the Pastorius Unit, Steuben Society of America, he was presented with a magnificent portrait of himself painted by Mr. Conrad Linke, outstanding artist of Philadelphia. On February 19, 1950, under the joint sponsorship of the United Action Committee for Expellees and the United German Hungarians, he was honored with a purse and dinner in the United German Hungarian Hall as the courageous champion of the cause of the German expellees. In those years the so-called Langer amendment had finally succeeded in making possible the first immigration to America of people of German ethnic origin, who had before been totally discriminated against. Since then the full German quotas have been restored, many thousands of new German immigrants have come to America and can look gratefully upon Senator LANGER's pioneer efforts in their behalf, and West Germany has been given sovereignty and admitted to a nearly equal partnership with America, Britain, and France in the defense of Europe.

Senator Langer still on the job for justice

By a strange irony when the Senate on April 2 ratified the Paris Pact, by a vote of 76 to 2, one of the dissenting votes was that of Senator LANGER. The first voice in the Senate which from 1945 on was raised against the criminal Allied policies of dismantling, perpetual disarmament, dismembering Germany was now once again almost a lone voice to protest the most shameful provisions of the Paris Pact, the Saar Statute. It was a shameful choice which the Western Big Three had given the Bonn government: either to sacrifice the Saar and its people to France, or to suffer denial of sovereignty and self-defense. In such an alternative, what could Bonn and the West German people do but accept the betrayal of the Saar in return for sovereignty and self-defense, both inalienable rights which it had been a crime in the first place to take away.

But what the German people had to accept in silent desperation, an American Senator had the right and the courage to protest. When he saw that the Paris Pact, the best bone Germany could get from the dogs at her throat, was sure to pass, he rose to register his protest against their flagrant anti-German injustice of the pact. As the Philadelphia Bulletin reported it (April 2, 1955):

"Senator LANGER who voted with Senator MALONE against the treaty predicted that 'the Saar question will rise up and haunt the signatories of this treaty and in my opinion will be one of the causes of a world war'."

God bless Senator LANGER. Of all the men in the Senate Senator LANGER most courageously and farsightedly has from the beginning and even now seen the German problem steadily and seen it whole. He alone seems fully to understand that the only thing wrong with the Germans is that the power politics of envious neighbors has not permitted them to form that more perfect union of all German lands which is their inalienable right.

Senator Langer on the German expellees

Senator LANGER fought the brave fight to get the mails opened to Germany, to get relief allowed for the Germans, to stop dismantling, to get confiscated private German property returned, to get justice for German soldiers accused of war crimes at Malmedy and elsewhere, to have German prisoners of war sent home, and to remove the IRO and UNRRA discriminations against German immigration.

But what the whole world will probably longest thank him for is his championship of the 12 million surviving German expellees, victims of the greatest of the many crimes imbedded in the Yalta and Potsdam pacts. Here are just a few excerpts on the "Inhuman Mass Deportations" from his great speech in the Senate on April 5, 1949, entitled, "Germany and the ECA: If Western Civilization Is To Survive in Europe It Must Survive in Germany."

Referring to a directive entitled "Population Transfers," Senator LANGER says it concerns "one of the greatest crimes against humanity in all history," and declares:

"Nowhere in recorded history has such a grim chapter of brutality been written than in the account of what has already taken place in eastern Europe. Already, from fifteen to twenty million people have been uprooted bodily from their ancestral homes of a thousand years and thrown into the torment of a living hell, to perish, or be driven like cattle across the wastes of eastern Europe. Women and children, the old and the helpless, the innocent and the guilty alike have been subjected to cruelties which have never been surpassed, even by the Nazis themselves."

Langer first in the Senate to prove expulsions a war crime

Senator LANGER then cited count 3, section J, of the Nuremberg indictments and boldly declared: "as far back as November 17, 1944, President Roosevelt agreed in principle to the very procedure which is now listed as a war crime by the Nuremberg tribunal."

He then also cites Churchill's statement in the House of Commons on December 15, 1944, in which Churchill likewise proposed this crime of expulsion, urging (in Churchill's own words) "the total expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the south." Churchill at that time added, "For expulsion is the method which, so far as we can see, will be the most satisfactory and lasting."

Well, while Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin were plotting the expulsion of millions of East, Sudeten, Balkan Germans, in the greatest mass crime of history, they were also blueprinting how to hang Germans for having committed a few minor expulsions involving thousands of people, not many millions, as behooves master-criminals who at Yalta presumed to remake the world in 5 days.

We resolve: the expulsion must not prove satisfactory and lasting

It was Senator LANGER, who more clearly than anyone else in the Senate, recognized the mass expulsions of Yalta and Potsdam for the enormous crimes that they were—and who spoke out against them. He was one of the first to help prove Churchill wrong in making these criminal expulsions satisfactory and lasting. It is up to all of us to see to it that these expulsions will not last, that the expellees will get their homes and homelands back. We must dedicate ourselves to proving that this greatest of all

international crimes, the expulsion of 15 million Germans, will not pay.

Let the Langer dinner this Easter at the United German Hungarian hall both honor Senator LANGER for his great work and also strengthen our resolve to carry on what he started. The United German Hungarians, their president, Mr. Joseph Ball; the chairman, Mr. Joseph Wolf; their helpers; and the Ladies Auxiliary—all deserve our support and thanks for this dinner in honor of Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

Power Politics is Our Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, high in the Cascade Mountains where the weather and climate of Washington State is cut in two is Cloudy Pass. Trying to count the distant and surrounding snow-clad peaks from this lofty ridge of rock, someone once counted to 10,000—and then gave up. The beauty of this spot is surpassing. Standing here once, a woman, with eyes uplifted said, "Thank you, God."

There was more than the beauty of nature to thank God for, although she did not think of other blessings, because our greatest resource in the Pacific Northwest is not scenery, priceless as that is—it is water. In the mountains, the moisture of the sky is gathered and harbored on high, and as the snows melt, by rivulet, lake, and stream, the water descends endlessly and irresistibly to the sea. Thus, our great resource of power—the force that gives our region the cheapest and greatest potential waterpower in the Nation.

In the Pacific Northwest, people and politician alike, say, "Thank you, God," for their natural resource of water—not only for its potential for needed cheap hydroelectric power, but also because nearly a million acres of arid soil, rich in minerals, lie here awaiting water by irrigation to transform a dry desert into a paradise of food-producing farms.

This makes for a complementary economy; the cheap power means industrialization and more jobs; the reclamation and agricultural development mean an outlet and prospective purchasers for the products of industrialization; and the workers in the factories mean more consumers for the farmers' produce.

Out in the Pacific Northwest, the people are united when it comes to the immediate and pressing need of further developing their resource of water. Strangely enough, of all the areas of the United States, we are the most power starved; yet we have the greatest potential. It is somewhat analogous to the Nile delta in Egypt where the poorest people in the world live on the richest soil. Our problem is that it takes 5 or 6 years after construction of a project is commenced before we will begin to get needed power. Normal population growth means our power shortage will become increasingly acute by 1960, so we must get a major power project started at once.

Aware of the growing reluctance of the Congress for the Federal Government to assume the huge financial investment of the Pacific Northwest power projects, President Eisenhower proposed a partnership program where local interests would pay for power-generating facilities while the Federal Government would contribute toward flood control, navigation, and other improvements properly coming under its realm of responsibility. I think it is fair to state this plan met with widespread approval. Of course, those who wish to see a Federal power monopoly did not approve. These socialistic and bureaucratic-minded individuals were not left to their own devices and desires. An unholy alliance was immediately effected with the keepaways, those secret obstructionists who would sacrifice the needs of this great region on the altar of their own political advantage. Thus, there does exist a small but vocal bloc who would hope to generate votes in 1956 rather than kilowatts because a failure now to carry out the President's program would allow them to scream that this is a do-nothing administration.

To tie in with the partnership program, the 83d Congress deauthorized the Priest Rapids site on the Columbia River to allow local interests to proceed under this plan. Our distinguished and able colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] is entitled to great credit for this legislation to meet the impending power shortage, and I am happy to say there would seem to be reasonable expectation that the Grant County Public Utility Department in Washington State will successfully resolve the financing and problems incident to starting such a project.

However, partnership is not the only answer. We have certain multipurpose dam sites which require Federal financing and construction. Here the vast Federal appropriations involved constitute a serious barrier which has seemed almost unsurmountable because the projects are needed now. Defense is a huge drain on the Federal Treasury and the tax burden has been so heavy that it is difficult to get support for appropriations which would have such an effect on the budget.

Our colleague from Oregon [Mr. COON] has introduced H. R. 5789 calling for construction of the multipurpose John Day Dam on the Columbia River. He has recognized the need—that a new start must be made now. The gentleman from Oregon has also recognized fiscal responsibility and the budget situation. In his measure he provides, therefore, that local groups put up the money for the Federal Government. So while the dam would be owned, built, and operated by the Federal Government, like other multipurpose projects, the money to build the generating facilities would be advanced by local groups, as advance payments for the power they will receive when the construction is completed. Thus the Federal budget is not increased; nor are the taxpayers in other areas putting up money for the Pacific Northwest.

Hearings on H. R. 5789, I understand, will be held soon. There are many details which will have to be spelled out. No doubt there will be some areas for dispute as between private, municipal, and local, publicly owned distributors of electric power. But in general the people of the Pacific Northwest will wholeheartedly support this measure which may well contain the solution to their future. It may be the difference between economic salvation or ruin in the area. If this bill passes, the citizen can raise his eyes unto the hills and reverently and prayerfully say, "Thank you, God."

Of course some political sour grapesters will wrathfully oppose this legislation, for surely it precludes the issue in 1956 of do-nothing. The slogan of such obstructionists might well be "Power politics is our politics."

I strongly urge consideration of H. R. 5789.

Excerpts From Addresses by Governor Harriman, of New York, on United States Far Eastern Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, among the courageous voices which have been publicly heard in recent weeks on the question of our Far Eastern policy is that of the distinguished Governor of my State, Averell Harriman.

All except a few of us here in the Senate were silent in the face of the catastrophic implications of the administration's policy in the Formosa Straits. That policy seems to have been sharply modified in the past fortnight—largely as a consequence of the mobilization of public opinion against that policy. One of the courageous public figures who helped mobilize that public opinion was Gov. Averell Harriman.

Governor Harriman is in Washington this week, attending the Governors conference. I am happy to call the attention of the Senate to speeches on this subject which Governor Harriman made, one as long ago as March 8. I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from a speech Governor Harriman made on March 8, in New York City, before the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with similar excerpts from a speech he delivered on April 3, at the inaugural dinner of the joint defense appeal, also in New York City.

Governor Harriman's views command public interest and attention because he is not only chief executive of the largest State in the Union, but he is also a man who speaks with consummate authority on foreign affairs. He was, as everyone knows, one of the principal architects

of our foreign policy and one of the principal leaders of that policy for more than a decade. When he comments on our foreign policy, he speaks from a background of knowledge and experience which few individuals in America can match.

New York State is fortunate to have him as governor; and in these difficult times the Nation is fortunate to have the counsel of his authoritative voice on matters of foreign policy.

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

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE DINNER OF THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, MARCH 8, 1955

* * * * * * *

You who are here tonight have an especially deep and personal understanding of the need for the United States to take its proper place of leadership in the world.

No nation can go it alone—not even powerful America.

From a military standpoint, we cannot.

From an economic standpoint, we cannot.

* * * * * * *

Last November, Secretary Dulles and Mr. Stassen were talking about what was called a bold, new economic program for Asia. Although late, this made sense. Under President Truman's point 4 program, we had learned much about these countries and what can be done by America to help people to help themselves—in developing resources and raising living standards and productivity and morale.

In this proposal, the Administration seemed to realize that what is needed to counter the external and internal threat of Communist expansion in Asia is a program bold enough to capture the imagination of the people, and vigorous enough to demonstrate that a decent life can be achieved under freedom. They seemed to understand that the cost to us of such an economic offensive would be a tiny fraction of our expenditures for military defense and military aid. And the effect of our help would be multiplied if cooperative undertakings could be developed among the participating countries as was the case in Europe.

So the talk went on. But the men who appear to have had the last word with the President are those who regard this sort of thing as beyond America's capacity—or not worth bothering about. So the idea was laid aside. Great had been the expectations—and equally great was the letdown throughout free Asia.

In this connection, it is significant that a conference of most of the Asian and African nations has been called to convene in Bandoeng, Indonesia, next month. Red China has been invited to participate—whereas Chiang Kai-shek is excluded. We can be sure that the Communists will try to turn the whole meeting into a "hate America" crusade.

Compounding the effects in Asia of all the lack of understanding has been the incredible story of the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek.

You recall that President Truman, in 1950, ordered the 7th Fleet to neutralize the Formosa Strait—preventing attacks upon Formosa by the Communists and forbidding attacks upon the mainland by Chiang. And you remember how President Eisenhower, in his first message to Congress, reversed all that.

I doubt that anyone would now deny that behind this "unleashing" episode was domestic politics and appeasement of members of his own party.

Yet to the rest of the world it sounded ominous. To the rest of the world, it could only mean that we intended to support Chiang's ambition to return to the mainland; and that, in turn, could only mean world war.

The "unleashing" episode, and the continuing failure to explain or retract it, injured our relations with our European allies—who were quite understandably not ready for such recklessness. And it soured our relations with many countries in Asia.

Last week, Chiang Kai-shek was still asserting that he intended to return to the mainland, with the help of this country. Asked about this, the President finally said "the United States is not going to be a party to an aggressive war." In effect, after 25 months, Chiang was to be leashed again.

The President appears to have realized at long last the wisdom of President Truman's policy of neutralizing the Formosa Strait.

Of course, we should and will defend Formosa. There has never been any doubt about that. But it should also be clear that there is no future in any Asian policy which pays more atention to the objectives of Chiang Kai-shek than to the aspirations of the 900 million people of the other free countries of the East—as well as the peoples of Europe.

I am sure of this: The first thing we must do in the Formosa area is to end our desperately dangerous policy of going it alone. Whenever we take positions alone, it offers a temptation to the Comunists to take risks in the hope of furthering their basic objective of splitting us from our North Atlantic allies, and our friends everywhere. We must get our diplomacy back on a basis of collective action. We must internationalize the defense of Formosa, and do this, if possible, through the United Nations.

What we need now is a new spirit in the conduct of foreign affairs—a spirit of humility, of moderation, of partnership, and of peace—a spirit which would ring with a new sound in the ears of the world, but which would gain its strength because it would be a reaffirmation of the finest strains of American realism and idealism—of the values which made our Nation so long the refuge of the suffering people of mankind and the embodiment of the hopes of freedom and justice in the light of God, everywhere in the world.

Only as we return to this spirit can we hope to lead.

Only as we return to this spirit can we hope to survive.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AT THE INAUGURAL DINNER OF THE JOINT DEFENSE APPEAL, WALDORF ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 3, 1955

* * * * * * *

What we are saying applies to world affairs in the same way. In the free world, just as at home, there can be no true strength without unity. And unity in turn depends on a mutual respect and equality of status among peoples of all races and creeds. Prejudice and claims of inherent superiority have no more place in international life than in domestic life.

I submit that we are in danger of losing the whole cold war if we fail to recognize this principle and make it live.

Every time an American rattles the atomic saber in Asia, every time an American talks about Asians fighting Asians, we lose friends among the uncommitted peoples.

Perhaps most tragic of all, for months now our policy in regard to the Formosa Strait has failed to take into account the sensibilities of either our Asian or our European friends and allies. Unhappily, there are those who have put our country in the position of appearing not to care for the judgment of those whom we would have as our friends. This is basically, I am afraid, an expression of that intolerance which we are seeking to stamp out in our domestic life and everywhere.

Surely there is yet time to bring together all of the countries involved—not only in the East but in Europe—in order to internationalize the defense of Formosa, so vital to our own and free world security. The whole world is a party at interest—and it has been not only illogical but deadly dangerous to arrogate to ourselves the sole responsibility for decisions which involve the future of many peoples.

It is a great enterprise in which we are engaged—that of making America and the world more tolerant and happier and stronger. There have been temporary setbacks, and there will be more. But over the years there have been even greater advances, and there will be more. The setbacks serve to make us realize how precious are our liberties, and to stimulate us to work harder for their protection. As long as we are in there doing battle, in good spirits and with confidence, I shall not doubt the outcomes.

For I have infinite faith in the triumph of true brotherhood, not only in this great country of ours, but—with our inspiration and our patient and steadfast leadership—throughout the world.

New Orleans-Mexico Air Route—Let's Not Cut Latin Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, George Chaplin, editor of the New Orleans Item, has directed my attention to two editorials which recently appeared in the Item and which I believe should be brought to the attention of this body.

Both editorials pose very serious problems. One is more or less limited in scope to a local condition but most definitely involves a very serious and basic deficiency in the operation and conduct of the Civil Aeronautics Board. There is indeed something very peculiar and most strange in connection with the activities of this particular board. As a matter of fact, there is such great suspicion as to its operation that my distinguished colleague from New Orleans, HALE BOGGS, has before the Rules Committee a resolution to which I heartily subscribe, to investigate, fumigate, and ventilate the whole business.

There is one thing certain about the granting of a permit for direct service between New Orleans and Mexico City and that is that it is most assuredly bipartisan. When President Truman was in the White House he voided an order of the then constituted board, and now President Eisenhower refuses to vacate the order of his predecessor. I have always been of the opinion that what one President can do the other can undo, but apparently neither the desire nor the inclination is here.

The failure to establish a direct airline between New Orleans and Mexico City is one of the most discriminatory acts charged against any board created by the Congress.

There is something present which does not meet the eye, and I frankly do not

believe all the cards have been placed face up on the table, and I would not be at all surprise if there were several cards concealed in somebody's sleeve. How to shake them loose is the real problem.

The item in its editorial gives a splendid statement of the case.

In the second editorial which Mr. Chaplin has called to my attention the very provocative question of Latin oil is dealt with.

Here are the two editorials in question:

DIRECT FLIGHT 9 YEARS OVERDUE—NEW ORLEANS-MEXICO AIR ROUTE

The 22d of next month marks the 9th anniversary of a frustrating case in New Orleans' aviation history.

On that day in May 1946, President Truman authorized a direct air route between New Orleans and Mexico City. He was acting under executive power, pursuant to the Civil Aeronautics Act.

What's happened since shouldn't happen to a dogma—much less to a great transportation center like ours. New Orleans today is the only large city on the United States southern border without direct air service to the Mexican capital.

Here, in brief, is the story:

After Mr. Truman O. K.'d the route, the State Department and Eastern Air Lines—which was given the permit to operate the service—ran into snags with the Mexican authorities.

These included a Mexican demand that the United States grant similar rights to a Mexican airline, with the proviso that the agreement would be in force only as long as the Mexican company continued service. The State Department objected that this proviso would set a bad precedent for other bilateral pacts.

This stalemate continued until Mr. Truman on September 8, 1952, withdrew his approval of Eastern's permit and of two other unimplemented certificates concerning service to Mexico City from Laredo, Tex., and Los Angeles.

His view was that this would clear the air and enable a more effective new negotiation.

This was the situation when last November the Civil Aeronautics Board began hearing Eastern's request for a New York-Washington-Mexico City service.

The airline contended that the way in which President Truman had revoked its New Orleans-to-Mexico City permit was unconstitutional. On April 18, CAB bureau counsel made the same argument, that the President had not complied with the procedures set out in the law of canceling, suspending, or revoking a certificate.

Earlier in the hearing, there had been several different approaches taken on behalf of New Orleans.

Mayor Morrison and a spokesman for Governor Kennon asked the CAB to suspend the hearing of the New York-Washington-Mexico City case until our prior claim is satisfied.

The chamber of commerce took—and presently maintains—a somewhat variant view. It is less concerned with whether the New York-Washington-Mexico case is halted—possibly because it doubts that it will be—than with whether New Orleans-to-Mexico City service can be made a part of that case.

Contends the chamber: No agreement as to any route should be negotiated between our country and Mexico, unless such agreement includes the New Orleans-Mexico service.

That's a sound, practical stand.

New Orleans is entitled to such a direct route.

This is an international city—in location, in ideas, in trade and in communication.

Particularly is all of this true in relation to Latin America. We are a natural north-south gateway, a fact of which the CAB is, of course, fully aware.

We urge the CAB to end this delay and to make direct service between here and Mexico City a requisite of the next bilateral air agreement between the two countries. Let's "rev" up and get off the ground. This flight is 9 years overdue.

NEELY PROPOSAL HARMFUL—LET'S NOT CUT LATIN OIL

An amendment by Senator MATTHEW NEELY, West Virginia Democrat, threatens to cut the heart out of President Eisenhower's foreign-trade program.

NEELY hails from a State whose coal industry unfortunately is having a rough time. But the Senator's plan to drastically curtail oil imports into the United States—especially heavy-fuel oil imports—isn't going to solve whatever is wrong in the coal fields.

Homeowners who heat with oil or natural gas aren't going back to coal furnaces. Ships and factories fueled by oil won't turn the clock back either. And diseled locomotives are going to stay dieselized.

We can understand NEELY's feeling that something must be done to help coal. Certainly, a thriving domestic coal industry is desirable. But his amendment, while failing to provide the remedy he seeks, would work incalculable harm to our foreign relations.

Reciprocal trade is a cornerstone of our foreign policy. To sell abroad, we must buy abroad.

The State Department stressed this among the 10 points it advanced this week why the Neely amendment is contrary to the national interest.

A good example of what the State Department is talking about is one of our neighboring lands to the south, Venezuela, whose economy largely floats on oil. (In the last 9 years, United States companies have invested $800 million in Latin American oil; of this $575 million in Venezuela.)

Our trade with that country has jumped thirteenfold since World War II. She spends almost a billion dollars a year for United States goods and services. And on a per capita basis she buys more from us than any other country in the world except Canada.

The investment climate there for United States capital is healthy—and our venture dollars have helped Venezuela to develop her resources, expand and begin to diversify her economy, and to raise her living standards.

The desirability of such conditions was the dominant theme of the recent Inter-American Investment Conference here. The Latinos sought United States capital. American businessmen wanted assurances of a favorable atmosphere in which to operate. Venezuela, now the world's largest oil exporter, combines both.

We have in recent years cited her as a model of what good trade and friendship with us can achieve. It has been a big talking point in our good-neighbor policy.

But such legislation as that proposed by Senator NEELY would wreck this policy and convince the hemisphere, in particular, that our actions do not square with our words.

* * * * *

Some independent oil men share the coal industry's belief that legislative quotas should be placed on petroleum imports.

Their views, too, must be fairly weighed in terms of both our domestic economy and our foreign relations.

The State Department, in expressing its opposition to NEELY's amendment, noted that the domestic oil industry is operating at or near its all-time peak, that it is prosperous and its outlook is bright.

We use about half of the oil the free world produces. But our known reserves are only about a fifth of the free world's.

The demand for oil products in the United States is expected to double by 1975. And we must not overlook the possibility of having to sharply and quickly step up the rate of domestic oil output in event of war.

Against this backdrop, the State Department's stand makes good sense.

There should be an intelligent balance between oil imported and oil produced domestically, but it is best to achieve that balance by voluntary action of importers.

Unless and until it is demonstrated, after a fair test, that such voluntary restraints will not work, we as a Nation should steer clear of legislative intervention. The Neely amendment should be roundly defeated.

Senator George: Preeminent Senator of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

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

WASHINGTON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

PREEMINENT SENATOR OF 1955

Who would you say is the preeminent figure in the United States Congress today?

Would it be Representative SAM RAYBURN, the shrewd, respected Speaker of the House? Or Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the able, malleable leader of the Democratic majority? Or Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, the earnest, lone-wolf Senate Republican leader who sometimes speaks for the administration?

If you name any of these you will at least be going against the majority judgment of the Washington press corps.

Their almost unanimous judgment today is that the single most powerful, most influential person in the whole legislative branch of the Government is Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, the veteran Georgia Democrat, who accepted the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to President Eisenhower's great satisfaction.

Senator GEORGE is today proving himself to be a more positive force than any of the other preeminent Senators of the last quarter century.

He is far more powerful constructively, say, than Senator William Borah, who was largely a negativist, and who in his implacable isolationism stood astride the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when the United States was trying to free itself from a policy of neutrality as Hitler began to topple Europe and strike at the shores of Britain.

He is more influential than Senator Arthur Vandenberg whose great influence centered principally in foreign affairs.

He seems to me to be more influential than even Senator Robert Taft, whose interest and talents were mostly focused upon domestic legislation, and whose influence did

not cut as widely across party lines as does Senator GEORGE'S.

This Congress is hardly 4 months old and Senator GEORGE has personally put his imprint on the mood and substance of the largest and most significant congressional actions.

I think it no exaggeration to report that today the quiet, poised, deep-voiced Senator GEORGE is the second most powerful and most influential man in Washington—second only to the President himself.

When this session of Congress began last January, Mr. GEORGE was the ranking Democratic member of both the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He could be chairman of either one. He chose Foreign Relations because his primary interest was foreign policy, and because he knew that the Senate's greatest decisions would almost inevitably be in the field of foreign policy.

He chose the Foreign Relations chairmanship knowing that President Eisenhower had privately expressed the hope that he would do so. He knew that they could and would work together well. He knew that it would be important—important for the country—for him to help create the climate which would give the President the maximum freedom and flexibility of action to take steps which might run counter to short-run public opinion.

He is accomplishing this objective decisively, sometimes against considerable odds.

By his own quiet authority, by his detachment and by his leadership, he has erected a strong barricade around the bipartisan conduct of foreign policy—a barricade against both Democratic attacks and Republican attacks.

Mr. GEORGE helped put through the Senate the President's fight-if-we-must Formosa resolution with only three votes in opposition—two from Democrats; this at a time when many of his Democratic colleagues were looking hungrily at this issue as a means of belaboring the Administration and when, without his restraining influence, many Democrats might have leaped off the reservation.

He deliberately stepped out ahead of the President to break ground in favor of a Big Four conference at the summit at a time when Mr. Eisenhower needed to have public opinion responsive to a Big Four meeting he couldn't avoid if he wanted to.

While the White House was being indecisive, he spoke out instantly in favor of accepting Chou En-lai's offer of direct negotiations over Formosa, and undoubtedly influenced the administration's policy.

In domestic legislation, it is probable that no single Senator was as influential in helping the President defeat the quickie, premature $20-for-everybody tax cut as Mr. GEORGE.

This is some of the evidence that WALTER F. GEORGE is more powerful than any other Democratic or Republican Senator today.

Atoms for Peace—Phases of the Great Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on August 8 there will convene in Geneva the United Nations Conference on Atoms for Peace.

At that time, the United States will open an historic exhibit, where a research reactor will actually be demonstrated.

The participating nations among the 84 governments who have been invited will be able to see at first-hand how the United States is moving ahead toward harnessing of the atom for peace.

The following month, I am glad to say, here in our own country, and indeed in our own Nation's Capital, will occur an important event when the first Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry will open. This will mark a significant occasion in America's own progress of applying the atom for an ever-higher standard of living for our own and other peoples.

Of course, the making available of the atom for peaceful purposes has not been without its problems.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission, heavily burdened by its massive responsibilities, has been moving ahead, although numerous suggestions have been made to it for intensified efforts in "flashing the green light" so that United States private industry can carry the ball more and more.

Meanwhile, on the international front, the need is increasingly apparent for the United States to accelerate its efforts to bring the peaceful miracles of atomic energy more meaningfully to foreign countries, particularly among underdeveloped peoples.

I have in my hand three important expressions on the various phases which I have mentioned.

The first is a welcome release from the Atomic Industrial Forum announcing the First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry. I know the fair will receive the fullest cooperation from the Washington community.

The second is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 12. It comments frankly on the need for encouraging increasing private participation in atomic work so as to speed what has been called the "atomic revolution."

And, finally, there is an important editorial from the April 27 Milwaukee Journal stating that the atomic power ship of peace, while an outstanding contribution, is by no means more than an introduction to what America can and should do in bringing the atom miracles to the attention of foreign lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these three items—each pointing up an important phase of the problem—be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The First Trade Fair of the Atomic Industry will be held in Washington, D. C., at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, September 26–30, it was announced today by the Atomic Industrial Forum. The trade fair, which will be held in conjunction with the forum's fall meeting, will have as its theme, "Marketing the Products of Atomic Energy."

According to the forum's executive manager, Charles Robbins, this pioneering trade fair will demonstrate the extent to which peaceful atomic energy and its associated products and services have advanced as an important sector of our industrial economy.

The fair will be seen by an audience of key management and operating officials in organizations engaged or considering participation in atomic-energy development and use, Members of Congress, the staffs of interested Government agencies, and the commercial and scientific attachés of the various embassies and legations in the Nation's capital.

A survey of the exhibit plans of member organizations indicates that there will be displays in such fields as design engineering, package power, medical and research reactors, control systems, reactor materials, instrumentation, construction and fabrication techniques, isotope sources and applications, shielding materials and devices, and reactor components and auxiliaries, in addition to various consultant services.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—ATOMIC INITIATIVE

At a conference on atomic energy in industry held in San Francisco last week, it was evident that many companies are putting far more manpower and money into the field than anyone expected at this early date.

At the same time the Atomic Energy Commission announced it has received four new proposals for the construction of demonstration nuclear electric powerplants to cost an estimated $150 million and produce a total of 455,000 kilowatts. These were in response to the AEC's offer of financial aid in such construction. Significantly, though, the share asked of the Government was only 10 to 20 percent—far lower than had been expected.

These 4 projects, all except 1 of which were suggested by groups of private companies, are in addition to the 250,000-kilowatt, $55-million powerplant New York's Consolidated Edison Co. plans to build without any Government help.

All this—the specific power projects and the general industrial atomic fever reflected at San Francisco—is a direct consequence of the amended atomic energy law enacted last summer. It is a startling tribute to those who got the bill through against the embittered opposition of men willing to stultify progress for the sake of what they thought could be a political issue.

But the progress, impressive though it is, is not an occasion, for complacency. To speed the atomic revolution the amended law will need further liberalizing, and it is none too soon for Congress to be thinking about this.

For the 1954 law did not make atomic industry so much a free enterprise as a mixed Government private enterprise. That is better than leaving it a wholly Government monopoly, but the faster the emphasis can be further shifted to private activity the faster will the benefits of the atom be realized.

Meanwhile there is reason to believe that more could be done even within the framework of the present law. Several witnesses before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy have pointed to continued secrecy as 1 of the major deterrents to more widespread participation in the field.

Partly the complaint is that the AEC could make nonsecret material more readily accessible and explain to industry just how much is already available in the nonsecret category. But there is also a strong feeling that much information presently classified could be made generally available under the 1954 statute without impairing national security.

One recent witness, Francis McCune, vice president and general manager of the Atomic Products Division of the General Electric Co., put the case for more information particularly well. Noting that bars to the availability of information about atomic energy cannot but operate as obstacles to entry into the industry, he said: "Information should be made available not merely to those who are already interested but, perhaps even more importantly, to those who are not yet interested, for information is required to stimulate interest."

The suggestion here is not that any and every kind of company would promptly plunge into atomic energy if more were known. Rather, it is that a company cannot determine whether or not it should be interested in atomic energy in the absence of sufficient knowledge. "Without adequate information," Mr. McCune said, "industry cannot be expected to show real initiative."

Considering the hobbles on it, industry is showing considerable initiative. It is in the interest of the AEC, Congress and the people that this initiative should not now be frustrated either by too much law or by too little knowledge.

ATOM SHOW SHIP NOT ENOUGH

President Eisenhower's announced plan for an atomic-powered ship of peace is a dramatic proposal. Sent on a world cruise, the merchant vessel would be a floating showcase in which people everywhere might see the promise of atomic science to improve human living—not destroy it.

For us, the vessel would have additional practical value. Its construction and operation would teach us valuable lessons about the cost and efficiency of an atomic surface ship now that we have the submarine *Nautilus* in use and other atomic submarines under construction or planned.

A danger inherent in the President's plan, however, is that the peace ship might become a gimmick that would constitute our do-all in the field of international atomic energy. Instead of a supplement, it might turn into a substitute—a huckster's blurb rather than the production followthrough.

People of the world, we are sure, will be mightily impressed when a sleek ship, driven by atomic power and displaying the good things the atom can bring, sails into their harbors. But unless they are shown a way whereby they can enjoy these atomic benefits, won't they feel like a waif at the candy shop window, permitted to admire the mouth-watering sweets but denied the means of obtaining them?

Like the test reactor that America plans to display at the International Conference of Atomic Scientists in Geneva this year, the peace ship should represent the salesman's sample case of products which America stands willing and ready to help bring to the world.

The peace ship must implement President Eisenhower's atoms-for-peace plan. An atomic powerplant in India, Japan, or Egypt—built with American technical help, manned by native technicians trained in American skills and fueled with some of the fissionable material America has earmarked for world use—will do more to demonstrate American good will than just a showcase ship.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pride and gratification to me that the Governor of my home State of Georgia has proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day. I am proud also that many of the mayors of cities and towns in my congressional district at home likewise proclaimed May 1 as Loyalty Day, and that pursuant to these proclamations Loyalty Day was observed by parades, rallies, and patriotic activities. Participating in these ceremonies were many of our officials, numerous patriotic groups and veterans organizations, as well as individual men and women, boys and girls who love our country and appreciate the priceless blessings which we enjoy as free American citizens.

It is fitting that May 1 has replaced the spot on the calendar that for many years was a rally day for Communist organizations and the other units of radicalism which oppose every concept of patriotism, every right of free men, embodied in our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Loyalty to flag and country is the keystone in the arch of good citizenship. Designation of May 1 as Loyalty Day takes the battle to the hordes of subversion on the date such forces had preempted over many years as their day of demonstration.

Today I received a letter from Charles A. Moran, chairman of the loyalty day committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Atlanta, Ga., who has enlisted the aid of radio stations, newspapers, and speakers in publicizing Loyalty Day by repetition of patriotic slogans.

I would like to place 1 or 2 of those slogans in the RECORD. One reads:

On Loyalty Day let us recite the new pledge to the flag: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Another reads:

Loyalty means liberty. Observe Loyalty Day May 1 in your own way. Reaffirm loyalty to God, our country, and our flag.

To these sentiments, Mr. Speaker, I join with millions of Americans in saying a fervent "Amen."

Address by Representative John J. Rhodes, of Arizona, Before the Indiana Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on April 22, 1955, Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, addressed the Collegiate Division rally of the Indiana Young Republicans, in Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. RHODES, OF ARIZONA

In deciding the mental makeup of the 1955 model Republican, it might be well to first consider the type of party which the Republican Party has always been. It was born amidst the strife and dissatisfaction preceding the War Between the States. It came of age during the terrible test of physical and moral courage which this country underwent and which we know as the Civil War. It presided over the destinies of this Nation during the boom period of the 19th century, which saw the construction of railroads from coast to coast, the western land migration, and the beginning of the industrial revolution in this country.

This era also produced such industrial giants as the oil and steel trusts, and witnessed the evils of railroad rebates, yellow-dog contracts, and other abuses of "bigness," which were to the detriment of all American people. This party was responsible for the Interstate Commerce Act, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, and many other pieces of legislation aimed at maintaining the interests of the average individual as against the industrial giant. It is to the credit of this party that this great purpose was accomplished without materially slowing the rapid development of our natural resources and industrial plants. This party ended the spoils system when it enacted the Civil Service Act.

In the early 20th century, the Republican Party was responsible for the Reclamation Act which has been so instrumental in the development of the West. The Panama Canal was conceived and constructed during a Republican administration. The first attempts to protect the farmer from the speculator at the market place, and to assure the farmer of a fair return on his investment and labor occurred during the Republican administration in the 1920's.

Domestically, the Republican Party has always stood for progress under the mantle of free enterprise. Yet this party has always jealously guarded the rights, political and economic, of our citizens. In other words, this is a party which does not believe in giving advantages to special groups or interests, or allowing such groups or interests to possess advantages which are used to the detriment of the average citizen. Our theory of government places the Federal Government in the middle of a teeter-totter, acting as a balance so that neither side is able to gain advantage to the detriment of the other side.

It is significant to note that although the Republican Party has brought this country its greatest periods of prosperity, it has not, in this century, been in power at the start of any war. Therefore, Republican prosperity is based upon sound economy and does not arise from the stimulus provided by emergency situations. We have not, and I pray that we may never follow the policy of government by crisis.

So what kind of a party are we?

We have never been moss-backed; we have never been reactionary. Whether we are dynamic-conservative or enlightened-liberal, we have never believed in standing still or going backward. We have created a climate favorable to the full development of our resources by private endeavor, with only such help from the Government as is needed to get the job done.

The 1955 Republican should continue to provide a government which balances all interests to benefit the whole Nation. We should neither insert the Government into situations where it is not needed, nor should we shirk governmental action where such action is necessary. As President Eisenhower has said on occasion, "We should walk forthrightly up the middle of the road, because no real progress is made by those who walk in the gutter to the right or the left."

It is hard to be a Republican. During the New Deal era, the pendulum swung to the left. The cry of "soak the rich" rose. This fallacy, sponsored by the Democrats, failed to take into account the facts that: (1) All income of persons who made more than $100,000 a year was very small compared to the Federal budget; and (2) to provide jobs, you must provide a climate favorable to the investment of capital. Roosevelt recognized this, finally, when in 1936

he tried to get Congress to exempt all dividends from taxation. (When we just exempt 5 percent, Democrats say we favor the rich.) But priming the pump did not produce prosperity, nor build it.

But we still have attempts made to prime the pump for the political advantage to be derived from posing as the friend of the little man.

I deny there is a permanent class of people known as little men. There are many of us who are not doing as well as we would like to. We can afford to help those people when they are unemployed, injured on the job, and too old to work. But we can best serve the little man by creating a climate in which he can (1) get a job and hold it, at fair wages; and (2) get as big as he is big enough to get. Do not make him a little man all his life. A job is worth more to a man than is a $20 tax cut.

In order to provide this climate for investments which means jobs, we have had to make some unpopular decisions. In the 83d Congress we had to forego the pleasure of increasing the personal exemption by $100. In this one, we had to vote against a $20 tax cut across the board. We have had to cut spending, curtail contracts, and thereby create local economic crises, and, in general, "kill Santa Claus." This is because a serious Government deficit would cause another round of inflation, and siphon off the capital needed for industrial expansion, which, in turn, means jobs.

After the free-and-easy days of New Deal hand-outs, it is hard to explain to our average citizen that he must forego his candy to have his bread. But we Republicans must continue in the path President Eisenhower has set up for us, and sell Mr. Average American on the wisdom of this course.

I repeat, it is hard to be a Republican.

At home, it must be the job of the 1955 model Republican to keep our country strong, free, and prosperous, by maintaining conditions in which the inherent ambition, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of our citizens may have full sway. But today we live in a world which is becoming, more and more, one community. We of this generation will mold the face of this community. Our actions, or inactions, will determine whether this community will be devoted to individual freedom, or to the 1955 model of slavery known as communism.

I do not believe that Republicanism and communism can exist in the same community, or world. Therefore, we must inevitably conclude that we must pit our way of life against theirs in a struggle for survival.

When we think of such a struggle we inevitably assume that trial by arms will become necessary, as indeed it may. But to assume that this is our only means of triumph is to sell our way of life short. The peoples of the world, if fully informed and free to choose, would certainly choose our free society to the chains of communism. Our task is to so inform them, and to help create a situation in which their composite will may assert itself.

The Bible tells us that at one time all men spoke the same tongue. Then man got too big for his pants, and to chasten him, God caused all men to speak different tongues. The inability of man to communicate with his fellowman has ever since provided us with our greatest inconvenience and our greatest challenge. We have means of sending signals throughout the earth, but still a very few methods of really communicating thoughts. It is still very difficult to determine the composition of the soul of our fellow man.

I hope that some day we will put our brains and treasure to work to learn to communicate thoughts to each other. But maybe something else comes first. Maybe there is still a lesson to be learned from the ancient punishment visited by God on Man. Maybe the sentence was that we must learn to live together before our souls may communicate.

Therefore, with the feeble means at our disposal, let us try it. Let us keep our guns, tanks, planes, and hydrogen bombs, but let us add a new weapon to our arsenal—truth.

Our Government, and most of our people, believe in telling the truth. Most of us can spot a lie—it takes some longer than others. On the other hand, communism, fascism, etc., are nurtured by lies, for they are themselves the greatest fabrications of all time.

Therefore, our best weapon is truth. It is devastating to the enemy; beneficial to us. Imagine the impact it would make on the world if we were to offer Russia free space in our newspapers, free time on radio and TV, to tell whatever they might desire, in exchange for similar free time and space in Russian mediums which would reach an equal number of people, who would be free to listen.

There is no doubt in any of our minds that the Communists would feed our people their choicest selection of tall tales. Let them. We will tell the people of Russia the truth, which the rulers of Russia will brand as lies. But truth can be masked only for a short time, and lies can remain undetected for a neven shorter period.

The end result would be a thorough knowledge on the part of the Russian people of our lives, our aspirations, and our souls. Also, they would be able to see that our republican form of government creates a climate for a better life than the one the Russian people have under communism. Once this realization occurs, all the secret police in the world cannot save communism.

An immediate benefit might be a lessening of war tension; 99.44 percent of the peoples of the world want peace. With direct knowledge of our own peaceful intentions, you can imagine the resistance the Russian people would have to aggression and saber-rattling on the part of their leaders. Not even a police state can wage a major war successfully without the support of the people.

I do not offer this idea as a panacea to cure the world's ills, but as a step in the direction of a peaceful world, devoted to the preservation of the freedom of the individual. In this struggle with communism, we must win the minds of men, or the product of those minds may destroy man and our planet. These thoughts consist of my individual ideas on the best weapon to use in winning this war for the minds of men. Only by winning this war can we avoid fighting another and far different kind of war.

This, then, is the challenge which is faced by the 1955 model American of all parties. God give us the strength, wisdom, and courage to face up to this great responsibility.

H. R. 5928

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I introduced H. R. 5928, a bill which extends tax-amortization benefits to those who construct new plant facilities in areas of labor surplus as designated by the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

In remarks made on the floor at that time, I referred to a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Pennsylvania memorializing the Congress to enact legislation of this type. As a part of my remarks, I include the text of the resolution to which I referred:

Whereas under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code it is permissible to amortize more rapidly certain expenditures made for emergency facilities; and

Whereas the President of the United States if he so finds may declare any area in the United States an acute distress area because of unemployment surplus of labor or other economic cause: Therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and enact into legislation amendments to the Internal Revenue Code so that capital expenditures in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment surplus of labor or other economic cause may receive the same treatment with regard to depreciation allowances as emergency facilities receive under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Resolution Adopted by the County Commissioners Association of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Georgia, a board of commissioners constitutes the governing body of the individual county governments. These county commissioners have formed an association which is known as the Association County Commissioners of Georgia. Each year this association holds an annual convention at which convention discussion is had and action is taken upon current problems and subjects of importance to these county government officials.

These county officials are elected by a vote of the people in their respective counties. They are persons of recogized ability and standing. I would say that their collective judgment is an accurate reflection of the sentiment and collective judgment of the people of Georgia.

This County Commissioners Association held its annual meeting last week in Augusta, Ga., and one of the subjects which came under discussion at the meeting was the United States Supreme Court school decision of May 17, 1954.

This attempt of the Supreme Court to usurp legislative functions which the Court does not possess has been the subject of discussion at a number of meetings and gatherings which are representative of Georgia citizens and which reflect their feelings. Such a meeting

was the State convention of the Democratic Party held at Macon, Ga., in the autumn of last year. A strong resolution was adopted at that convention condemning the outrageous action of the Supreme Court in attempting to amend the laws and change the Constitution illegally.

There have been other meetings, some statewide, some local, at which similar resolutions have been adopted expressing the resentment which people of Georgia feel and expressing their condemnation of this high-handed action on the part of the Supreme Court.

At the County Commissioners Association convention above mentioned, on April 26, 1955, that group of representative Georgians adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the people of this sovereign State of Georgia have been and are devout and law-abiding people, and throughout the history of our country have opposed tyranny in any form; and

Whereas on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court chose to abandon all principle and to strike down legal precedent established by able, representative, and distinguished jurists, and by such untoward decision it threatened to attempt to destroy the peaceful relationships existing between the white and black races in the South and Nation; and

Whereas this untoward and unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court was encouraged by the President of the United States through the office of his appointed Attorney General; and

Whereas such a decision is an affront and challenge to the traditions of our people, to the peace and goodwill of our black and white citizens and to our way of life; and

Whereas this decision will breed chaos where there is now harmony and mutual progress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Association County Commissioners as follows:

(1) That this association and the members thereof both jointly and severally pledge to the Governor and all public officials of the State, full support in each and every way or means required or necessary, or advisable to protect and maintain the segregation of the races in our schools;

(2) That regardless of what the Federal Government or any division thereof says or does, that there will not be a mixing of the races in our schools and we positively and unequivocally so pledge ourselves;

(3) That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, to the Governor of Georgia and to the governors of each of our sister Southern States, and to each member of the Georgia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I pointed out on the floor of this Congress as long ago as 1949 that the Supreme Court was planning to usurp legislative functions, and to assume authority which the Court in fact does not possess, by handing down a so-called decision, the effect of which would be to amend the Constitution and to change the law of the land.

The Court has endeavored to do exactly that. When this so-called decision was published, the then Governor of Georgia characterized this outrageous and highhanded action of the Supreme Court as an unwarranted assumption of authority, and as the chief executive of a sovereign State, declared that Georgia would not submit to any such assault upon her rights as a State and upon the constitutional rights of her citizens. The present Governor of Georgia has likewise declared himself and stands firmly upon that same position.

This resolution of the County Commissioners Association is another declaration by the people of Georgia that they know their rights, and that they will not suffer those rights to be wrongfully taken from them by a group of would-be reformers who happen for the moment to be sitting in high place in one branch of our Government.

Shorter Route to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a little news item in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer brings to mind the ancient Chinese saying "A picture is worth 10,000 words." On May 10, 1955, this newspaper described 10 American soldiers with their wives and children at the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport after disembarking from a regularly scheduled commercial flight from the Far East.

This article depicted the fathers wrestling with paperwork in connection with processing by officials of the Seattle port of embarkation, while wives, mothers, and children drank milk, munched cookies, or watched TV. Significant was this statement:

The group was the first of 357 men and dependents who will make the trip by air during May. The armed services are making use of regularly scheduled commercial flights.

The point is this, and this picture does not require 10,000 words. Whoever is responsible for this travel routing should be commended. Someone has recognized the advantage of the shorter circle route to the Orient, which, according to the Library of Congress, is as follows:

	Miles
By sea:	
From San Francisco to Yokohama (via Honolulu): Actual steaming time (15 days 18 hours and 30 minutes)	5,488
Distance taking great circle route: Actual steaming time (13 days and 45 minutes)	4,536
Difference in miles, 952; difference in time, 2 days 17 hours and 45 minutes.	
By air:	
From Seattle to Tokyo (via Anchorage and Cold Bay): Flying time (10 hours 45 minutes)	4,806
From San Francisco to Tokyo (via Honolulu and Wake Island) (Pan American route): Flying time (17 hours and 15 minutes)	6,256
Difference in miles, 1,450; difference in time, 6 hours and 30 minutes.	

By sea or by air, whether it is personal property, postal mail, or perishable food, there is only one answer—the saving in distance is a saving of time and dollars. All oriental service should be concentrated through the Port of Seattle, even though the Chief Examiner of the Federal Maritime Board classified Seattle as "economically tributary" to San Francisco.

Low Strike Record in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a release from the Department of Industrial Relations of the State of California calling attention to the State's outstanding 1954 labor-management relations record. In actual man-days lost on account of strikes, the 1954 record was the lowest in 10 years. The time lost in 1954 represented a 64 percent decrease from the 1953 figures. This splendid record is even more remarkable than it seems at first glance when we take a look at some of the other factors involved.

In the 10 years since the war California has had a tremendous influx of people finding new jobs in the State. There has been a corresponding increase in new industries and plants, and a terrific expansion in size of existing industries in California. Nonagricultural employment in the State varied between 3,800,000 and 3,900,000 wage and salary workers in 1954. The corresponding figure in January 1946, following the war's end, was 2,787,000—so we have over 1 million more nonfarm workers at this time. Normally, with such conditions industrial unrest could be expected to follow. This is well demonstrated in other sections of the country right now, where an expanding industrial economy is plagued with serious labor-management difficulties and where such difficulties can be expected to multiply unless a way is found to promote harmonious relationships.

It might be well to look for a moment at the reasons for California's stable labor-management picture. Let us remember that the tabulations in the release accompanying these remarks do not tell the whole story. While the numerical decline in strike situations shown is encouraging in itself, when we consider the great expansion of industrial activity and total employment in the State at the same time it is truly remarkable. California is one of the most highly organized States in the country, unionwise. Through a long period of years, during which I played an active part, labor organizations and management groups in the State have worked out a highly effective technique for composing their differences and negotiating issues with a minimum of strain and violent reaction. The methods used require that each of the groups recognize and respect the rights and position of the other. The statistics in the accompanying release show how this mutual respect has paid off in dollars and cents

for both sides, to say nothing of the avoidance of tension and physical violence now widespread elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a lesson in this from which other areas in the country might well profit. As a tribute to a successful labor-management cooperation in my own State, and for the benefit it may have for others, I ask that the release to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

TEN-YEAR LOW OF STRIKE ACTIVITY IN CALIFORNIA

Idleness in California due to labor-management disputes was lower in 1954 than in any of the last 10 years, Ernest B. Webb, California director of industrial relations, announced today. Work stoppages during the last year caused 1,070,000 man-days of idleness. This represents a 64-percent drop from 2,960,000 man-days idle in 1953.

The number of workers involved in California work stoppages beginning in 1954 was 88,100, well under half of the 1953 figure of 210,000. In only 1 of the last 10 years did fewer workers participate in strikes. That year was 1949.

Altogether last year there were 206 stoppages compared with 269 which began in 1953. In only 2 of the last 10 years, 1945 and 1948, California had fewer strikes than were counted in 1954.

The largest work stoppages in 1954 in terms of man-days idle resulted from 3 disputes, 1 in the lumber and 2 in the rubber industry. These were 3 multi-State disputes affecting California; they accounted for more than 40 percent of all man-days idle in the State in 1954.

Major issues: Nearly 90 percent of California's strike idleness in 1954 resulted from disputes over wages, hours, and wage supplements, such as welfare and pension plans. Inter- and intraunion disputes (sympathy, jurisdictional strikes, etc.) played a very small role in the strike picture of last year, resulting in less than 1 percent of all man-days idle.

Los Angeles metropolitan area: Strike idleness in the Los Angeles metropolitan area decreased sharply last year. Man-days of idleness dropped by 61 percent between 1953 and 1954—from 957,000 to 373,000.

The number of workers involved in Los Angeles strikes in 1954 was 44,700, about 22 percent less than the 57,000 workers idled in 1953.

Last year 88 work stoppages occurred in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. This was nearly one-third less than the 122 stoppages counted in 1953.

San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area: A similar sharp reduction of strike idleness occurred in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area where 186,000 man-days idle were reported in 1954. This was 75 percent below the 731,000 man-days idle in 1953.

The number of workers involved in strikes decreased even more sharply, about 80 percent. In the past year 11,100 workers, contrasted with 58,900 workers in 1953, participated in strikes.

Work stoppages beginning in 1954 numbered 70 compared with 81 in 1953.

Area	Stoppages beginning in year				Man-days idle during year	
	Number		Workers involved			
	1954	1953	1954	1953	1954	1953
California	206	269	88,100	210,000	1,070,000	2,960,000
Los Angeles metropolitan area	88	122	44,700	57,000	373,000	957,000
San Francisco metropolitan area	70	81	11,100	58,900	186,000	731,000

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 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:

O merciful God, whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever: We beseech Thee to grant unto us who, in the morning, seek Thy face, fervently to desire, obediently to fulfill, all that is pleasing unto Thee. Out of the shadows we would lift our faces to the one true light, knowing that if we keep our hearts with Thee there is no darkness from without which can quench the light within.

We would lay aside any selfish, partisan ambitions, so that with tallness of stature we may see above the walls of our prideful opinions the good of the largest number. As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, make us worthy of these demanding times that call aloud for wisdom and character. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 2, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

H. R. 1602. An act 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;

H. R. 2679. An act to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.;

H. R. 3123. An act to modify the acts of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 584), May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1274), July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 357), August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 923), and June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 211), with respect to the recoupment of certain public-school construction costs, and to amend the act of August 17, 1950 (64 Stat. 459), relating to the expenditure of funds for cooperating with the Public School Board of Walker, Minn.;

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.;

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4659. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department," approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 632; 39 U. S. C. 876c);

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

H. R. 4936. An act to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating-plant operations; and

H. R. 5089. An act to extend the time for filing application by certain disabled veterans for payment on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, to authorize assistance in acquiring automobiles or other conveyances to certain disabled persons who have not been separated from the active service, and for other purposes.

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:

S. 37. An act to amend the act increasing the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service in order to make such increase permanent;

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

S. 1094. An act to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

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

H. R. 208. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; and

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1602. An act 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